Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
September 27-28, 2013  
Southern Oregon University (SOU) – Ashland, Oregon

Friday, September 27, 2013

Noon – Hosted Lunch with invited guest Lee Ayers, HECC member, and Dave Carter  
SOU Faculty Senate President

Call to Order, Introductions
The meeting was called to order at 1:28 PM.

Present: Shari Carpenter (EOU), Jeff Dense (EOU), Maude Hines (PSU), Grant Kirby (OIT Portland West), Charles Lane (SOU), Candyce Reynolds (PSU), Feng Shi (OIT), Lisa Mick Shimizu (UO), and Jody Waters (SOU); via phone: Mary Cluskey (OSU), Karen Hooker (OSU), Rob Kyr (UO), and Laura Zeigen (OHSU). President Bob Mason could not be here today because of a death in the family.

Questions about HECC
Lee Ayers, HECC Member, and Dave Carter, SOU Faculty Senate President, gave the IFS updates on the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) and the SOU Faculty Senate.

Legislative Update – Jeff
Jeff Dense provided an update on this year’s legislative session and the process of advocating for faculty representation on the HECC and individual institutional boards.

- Jeff went to Salem to testify before the Higher Education Workforce Development Committee (Representative Dembrow) over the summer while Bob Mason was doing his field work. Jeff talked about voting on the boards and emphasized that we were looking out for students. Dembrow asked Jeff to come to a meeting three days later to convey this information directly.
- Jeff feels we have a compromise between Senator Hass (no faculty involvement at all) and Dembrow, who is a heavy higher education supporter. We wanted voting membership on HECC and we did not get that. The governor had the ability to decide if individual institutional boards could include faculty who vote or not.
- Lee reported some pushback on voting membership for tenured faculty on these boards because of potential conflicts of interest. Faculty should be trusted to know when there are situations in which there might be conflicts of interest. The faculty on the individual institutional boards are able to vote. Powerful leadership from the institutions (e.g. the institutional presidents) will make a difference.
- Jeff thought his statements were well received and felt Bob helped build up a lot of legitimacy.

SOU Vice Presidents
SOU Vice Presidents Craig Morris (Finance and Administration) and Sylvia Kelley (Development), Liz Shelby (Executive Assistant to the President) and Provost Jim Kline gave updates about various activities at SOU, including the new “HOUSE” experience for freshmen and trying to figure out their structure as a destination or regional campus and a financial structure that would help provide stability in the long term.

SOU combined its academic affairs and student affairs last year. They did this to link the academic programs to more what happens outside of the classroom. 1) academic reorganization – is there a more cost effective way of doing this?; 2) new program this fall called the HOUSE experience – an alternative general education program done in a
cohort with a team-taught environment; social justice house, green house – each has 50 students and have come early to campus to build their cohort; have been partnering with community groups; 3) started their honors college this fall; working with OSU on some joint projects – a systems wide honors college symposium show and tell of research projects going on; and 4) working on campus vitality and how to improve student retention and success. One area of conflict between academics and student affairs is athletics.

They are looking to how they can become more of a destination campus. SOU has almost 1000 students from California, but they need to figure out how to get students from other parts of the state, and so are going through a process of rebranding and restructuring. The house structure has been good.

The plan is still in its formative stages – 1) stop free fall of fund balance. Enrollment is challenging, down about 4 percent; enrollment going forward needs to be addressed in this plan. Will be making a series of fund transfers; $2.5 million this year; 2) opened new residency halls in a public/private partnership; only ½ years debt service. Will have $2.5 mill available to them about a year from now; this will stop the free fall; 3) academic reorganization will stabilize the fund balances; and 4) recruitment and retention for 2015-17 – theoretically will get them to 10%.

Regional presidents are working to identify the costs incurred because of changes in the governance structure.

Mary Cullinan, SOU President
Mary Cullinan, SOU President, spoke about how the governance changes in the system might be affecting the regionals schools and how they (“TRUs“ – technical and regional universities) could collaborate in the future.

The group asked her perspective on how the governance changes are changing the regional schools. The question is how these changes will work for the students of Oregon. They would like a plan that does not cost more. We need to look at finance as much as governance. There are different models, including consortium model, individual model, and loose aggregation model. Cullinan and Ray (OSU President) have been at institutions with their own boards already. They want a governance process that is knowledgeable and cares about SOU.

How do they grow the programs? Last year they ranked and prioritized them. They need to put resources where there is demand. OSU has a full policy around this kind of process. People are attached to their programs, and it is easier to add programs than take them away. Prioritization felt like an inclusive process, but still presents challenging timeframes in which to do this. Putting more of an emphasis on finance and support would have been helpful last year given current circumstances this year.

Interinstitutional programs (OHSU/PSU, OSU/WOU) – is that kind of collaboration in jeopardy? The technical and regional universities have come together more in the last year. There will be at least four schools connected in a lot of different ways.

Representative Peter Buckley
Representative Peter Buckley described his perspective as a legislator in the process of developing the HECC and the individual institutional governing boards. Where is the money coming from to pay the regional schools for loss of revenue from the larger schools that choose to not participate in the shared services?
There were concerns that giving more autonomy to each university would make tuition unaffordable and cut down access to higher education for students. If UO, PSU and OSU had their own boards, what would happen to the regionals and OIT? Wish for more legislation for a comprehensive university system, but a scarcity mentality for not funding higher education (47th in nation for higher education funding).

There was a need to deal with the “TRU” (technical and regional universities) board now. The Governor is against the regionals having local boards and believes there should be an umbrella for regionals and OIT. OIT is moving for a local board model. There is fear that EOU and SOU would become branch universities.

The bill to provide UO, PSU, and OSU with individual governing boards was contentious, but passed. If the shared services agreement ends up with a financial loss to regionals institutions, they will be compensated for that financial loss. It will be more transparent if regionals are subsidized at a higher level in a way similar to the K-12 system, where smaller districts are subsidized by the larger ones.

HECC will be the entity to give a recommendation to legislature on finances for shared services and what changes and distributions will work. In 2015, UO will be able to go off on their own if they don’t want to do shared services. The flipside is if they do this it could result in financial loss to regional campuses. UO has an enormous endowment due to Phil Knight, but would PSU and OSU likewise see an increase in donors? What other path do we have to make things better? The composition of the boards has been controversial. Buckley was adamant that they had voting student, staff, faculty on each board, but when the governor appoints the boards he would decide.

Where is the money coming from to pay the regional schools? Where is the subsidy for the shared services? There is language in the statute that they “shall” (not may) come up with a plan to balance the finances. If PEBB splits up, the regionals will take a larger share of costs. HECC will have to mitigate for PEBB. Does the university causing the disparity pay? It would come out of their share of the state funding. This would mean, for instance, that UO would get less from the state to mitigate the shortfall. They are also looking at Western to see what happens with their locked-in tuition.

The theory is that the UO endowment would be $2.5 billion; to University of Oregon it won’t matter. HECC is responsible for coordinating the budgets and the legislature puts together the policies they think will give the best bang for the buck. Regionals depend on the sports lottery dollars, but UO and OSU not so much.

The PERS board will need to do a review in 2019 to increase COLA (cost of living) back to 2% if the system is funded stably at that point. Over the last 20 years the ROI has averaged over 10%, but will be 6% in future because of the way municipal bonds are handled by Wall Street. It was 100% funded in 2007 before the crash. They are trying find ways to stabilize the system. Email Representative Buckley if you have input on this – he said he would answer within 48 hours.

**Campus Reports**

OSU – The College of Public Health and Human Sciences is going forward with accreditation. Looking into health of faculty and staff as well as students. We will ask Bob for a written report. Campbell Gates asked questions about the OSU board.

OHSU – OHSU has received a $500 million dollar challenge from Phil and Penny Knight for cancer research. Many efforts are underway involving interprofessional education
and the School of Medicine Curriculum Transformation as all await opening of the new Collaborative Life Sciences (CLSB) building.

OIT – The Wilsonville campus has moved into the old InFocus building. Had record enrollment this year and record graduation last year. OIT Klamath Falls has installed a lot of solar panels and hot water to get to a zero energy footprint. Last year they lost a lot of unclassified people. OIT fund balance is way down from 5%. Salary increases over the next year were unclear, but the administration moved in this direction in response to OIT faculty not being unionized and people are getting tired of no professional development funds and no raises.

UO – Rob Kyr – Faculty voted for unionization and this went through the collective bargaining unit (CBA) this last year; a contract has been reached. Provost stepped down this last year and they are involved in a Provost search; Kyr is on this committee. They hope to have someone in place by January 1, 2014. They will be hosting the PAC-12 Faculty Leadership Coalition on November 1-3 at the University of Oregon. This is just the fifth conference. They are excited to have their individual institutional board.

WOU – No representatives from WOU for a report. Jeff and Bob will ask for a written report.

PSU – PSU is dealing with how to create more degrees for less money; at PSU it is 180 credits. The other is the reliance on contingent faculty and the push to hire non tenured track faculty. Our function is not just to compare notes, but create positions on issues. Other campus reactions re: finance. Is there a line over which we could walk? Another push on campus is a push for credit for previous learning. CPL has already started taking the positions Maude thinks the IFS would take. Go back on reliance to contingent faculty.

EOU – Eastern is doing a big push on Eastern Promise – giving college credit for high school classes. Students coming in and graduating in a short time is becoming a norm for EOU students. Going straight from high school to a 400 level class, however, creates stress for the students and devalues the process. Instructors of those providing college credit for high school courses have to be approved by the EOU program. They are not sure about the integrity of all programs, including a summer institute in which high school students can accumulate 9 credits in 3 weeks.

SOU – SOU is also dealing with this issue of student credit hours (SCH). They look at the vitae of the high school teachers to review them. There is huge pressure from the governor's office for prior learning at SOU as well. If they push back, they are not considered team players. Makes good business sense to do this and feeds 40-40-20. This may be a place for formulating a policy position and sharing with Lee and HECC. The achievement compacts have stated that a certain percent of our students will have come in with a certain amount of credits before leaving high school.

Charles and Jody discussed the changes at the university, including the removal of deans and directors to create a flatter structure and the creation of centers (humanities) and doing away with departments by January 2014. The cost savings are supposed to come from the reallocation of former departmental chair time, like in the classroom. They also have largely cut adjuncts. Director positions will be non-union and at higher salaries. The OUS chancellor is coming in October to meet with SOU about
these changes. The fiscal situation is an enormous driver in all this. When people retire, they will not necessarily be replaced. Part of the challenge at SOU is the large percentage of first generation students, leading SOU to feel a need to bring in more well-off students from California.

Grant proposed IFS re-chartering themselves. Our focus for the last year has been interacting with the legislature. With a de-focus of OUS, what will our role be going forward? Don’t see a purpose for us going forward in the new structure. We need to figure out what it is we stand for and interact with HECC and other bodies in between the legislative sessions and adjust our strategies for the new structure. This doesn’t work if people don’t participate. Facilitating communication between campuses at the very least.

What are some of the points we can bring to the chancellor and legislature, and how can IFS make a difference? Provost’s Council, HECC – do we really understand that and do we have clear and unified messages going on to those touch points? What about the relationships with our faculty senates? Bringing back information and decisions from individual schools? Faculty leadership caucus – this idea was raised in this a couple of years ago. To change this on some campuses is difficult. The senior IFS senator is on an ex-officio committee of the senate. There are a variety of ways to have legitimate connections to help give us voice. Legitimizing IFS in relation to whatever OUS becomes.

Adjourn

---

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Call to Order: Working Breakfast; Virtual Program Reviews – Maude Hines (PSU) brought this issue from the Provost’s Council. The group had concerns about the loss of human interactions and accuracy of assessment in the virtual process.

The group discussed the concept of virtual program review. The group had concerns about the loss of human interactions into the process. Institutions would volunteer to do it first. It might become more of creating a digital identity, whereas face to face you cannot whitewash everything. Only in person can you get a real sense of the campus. Things would be lost in an online review. Suggestion to have a pilot where the campus going through the virtual review writes up its experience. How can they actually check out all the facilities this way? The fundamental issue is one of accuracy – you might get a more positive or negative review than you should. Privacy issues – how does the information on these virtual meetings get shared?

Maude’s notes to Laura for inclusion in the minutes:
- Need a chain of communication with our faculty senates. Bring to faculty senate executive committees to review.
- WHAT is the model? WHO else is doing this?
- Concerns, questions, advantages.

Initial questions:
- What do faculty on your campuses think about the idea of virtual review?
- Other ideas for cutting down time of reviews?
- Hybrid reviews--maybe visit by review chair or members of the team, and others experience it virtually?
If the policy were to change, what should be taken into account in determining eligibility for external review?
- Give the accrediting agency the decision about virtual or on-site review?
- Which kinds of programs would be appropriate (on-line programs, e.g.)?
- What about nature of facilities and infrastructure used?
- How to ensure reviewers feel comfortable making judgments?
- How to take into account faculty and program preference for interaction (bottom up)?
- What about new programs closely related to existing programs (vs. programs that are totally new)?
- Is there also an external accreditation for the program, or is this the only review the program is going to receive?

Concerns:
- On the ground human interaction where the real learning/understanding takes place.
- Virtual reviews would eliminate the essential element of an accreditor being able to walk across campus and talk with a student.
- How would the accreditors get a real sense of the campus?
- What about programs like those in Engineering, with a lot of labs and facilities? The reviewers need to see these in person. That would be lost with virtual reviews.
- Facilities need to be seen in all disciplines: cleanliness, infrastructure.
- Thinking on your feet situations are important in a review—too polished?
- Issue of who’s invited to the (virtual) table.
- Implementation issues when coming into an institution in the middle of a cycle.
- Fundamental issue is one of accuracy.
- No place for (essential) whispered comments
- Some of the same frustrations as those with the SBHE no longer making the rounds.
- Privacy issues—how does information get shared?

Advantages
- Cost savings: it takes some money to launch a full-tilt assault on a university with a team of 10
- For joint programs, there’s an equity gain (solves problem of which campus hosts, e.g.)

Questions:
- Who else is doing this? What can we learn from them?
- Wouldn’t it make even more sense to virtually evaluate existing programs than new ones?
- What about running a pilot (of an existing program), where the program gives feedback about what is lost/gained with virtual review?

Approval of May 2013 Minutes
The May 2013 minutes were approved, with one abstention.

IFS Draft Bylaws Discussion – Jeff
The IFS Draft Bylaws were reviewed and discussed. We are trying to articulate what the IFS stands for. We were clear that IFS, as the representative voice of Oregon faculty, provides collegial communication and a voice to remain mindful of the need to maintain academic quality.

Future of IFS – Jeff
We discussed the future of IFS in terms of how we currently share what goes on at IFS with our individual Faculty Senates.

- We did a free-write for 10 minutes of what we thought IFS should stand for. Below are less a set of minutes and more the notes of pieces of language and ideas we wanted to include.
- Keeping faculty issues in mind. Coordinating across campuses. IFS represents the voice of the faculty across the state. Recognize contributions of individual institutions to the whole systems. We are the elected voice of the faculty.
- How do we decide how many reps come from each university? The number of reps is determined in the constitution, not in the bylaws. Talked about increasing reps for regionals from 2-3, but died because of cost concerns and because no one wanted to do it. Maybe it makes sense to revisit this. Community colleges in our structure?
- Our professional and academic expertise.
- We adhere to standards of informed dialogue, the value of bringing voices together, being accountable to our individual faculties and the body we represent, possible to take on hard issues that affect all universities – we can overcome and are committed to overcoming differences between big and small.
- The issue of representation is very important – who do we represent? This points to the involvement of the senates, which are elected, versus the administration. Are we all elected or are some of us appointed?
- The procedural issue should not be in the mission statement. It is a representative body. Broad language is important.
- Jeff – Maude captured most of it. Foster collegial communication – not you against my campus, but all of us working together, sharing information on matters of mutual concern. Advising stakeholders (HECC, etc.), and using our professional and academic expertise to promote goals related to academic excellence and academic quality.
- The bottom line does not necessarily mean sacrificing academic quality; rather it is providing a voice and remaining mindful of the need to maintain academic quality.
- Interface between the Chancellor and legislature on issues that impact faculty employment and teaching. There are important issues that only surface in a meeting, such as IFS. We have a responsibility to aggressively seek out these issues and put them in bite-sized chunks for our respective senates, which we represent.
- University senates need to identify issues of shared system-wide concern; IFS has a role in this process providing a unified voice. Collectively, we are one faculty of the state of Oregon. We stand for the quality of the endeavor. We are here to deal with the nature of shared governance in this endeavor.
- AOF focuses on the financial issues for faculty; IFS is concerned with the quality of the endeavor; we need both groups. We can bring AOF Issues and have them lobby on these. It makes sense to take our issues of academic quality and student issues as faculty issues (e.g. tenure lines, etc.); we should at least communicate with them.
  - What do we need to do in our transition to maintain legitimacy?
  - The legitimacy of the IFS needs to be affirmed during this time of transition with governing structures.
  - Emphasize that we have played a historical role in governance.
  - We need to be at the first meeting of HECC and insist we exist.
  - These are public meetings – show willingness to travel and show up.
  - Ask Lee to recognize we are there? Or we get on the agenda and she makes the first comment. For future planning, the Higher Education Coordinating Commission meeting schedule and materials are online.
  - Communication with people on state board a place to start? Tim Nesbit
- From Jeff: foster communication between campuses; share information on matters of mutual concern; advise stakeholders; promote academic excellence/quality
- Key: IFS was created by the state.
- Need to put together pre-amble for the first HECC meeting and determine how to be most effective when there.

Language around rest of the bylaws, the desire was to look at this at this meeting and have it go up for a vote at the November meeting. Has to be presented and discussed at one meeting.

- Change language in by-laws (system regardless of the current set up).
- On matters of importance to Oregon’s public universities.
- If we are going to have legitimacy, we need consistent participation on the part of the representatives; IFS needs to adhere to bylaws.
- We need to refer in general to “the governing and decision-making agencies for public universities in Oregon.”
- Organic camaraderie beyond the Robert’s Rules is important.
- Take out II 1. That we follow Roberts rules of order.

**Action:** Charles, Maude, and Jeff will work on a draft.

- In the interest of collegiality, Roberts Rules will not be followed.
- What constitutes a carrying vote – 2/3, a majority? For constitution it is simple majority, for all else is 2/3.
- What constitutes present at the meetings in terms of being able to vote? Is phone participation OK? What constitutes a quorum? Need a quorum, then a simple majority of those physically present? If you have been on the phone, you should have a right to vote.
  - As long as you have a quorum it is a simple majority of the quorum.
  - What if only phone-in for part of the meeting?
  - Physical vs. mental presence.
  - By-laws require 2/3 votes, but all other votes are from simple majority present.
  - What we are formulating now will be voted on by membership.
- Because our bylaws will be online, and if they don’t see that Robert’s Rules are not the default setting, won’t take it very seriously. People can vote to suspend during different parts of discussion if they think would make better collegial atmosphere. Robert’s Rules used to resolve procedural conflict?
- Communication for future IFS? How to enhance communication with our constituencies to make sure we are acting as a representative body. Do we want to follow-up on our campus reports and what might be topics of interest to all of us on, and have a strategic plan for going back to our universities to gather data and opinions?
- How do we currently share what goes on here at IFS with our faculty senates, and how is that communicated? Do we all have executive committee of the faculty senate? The IFS should be on the executive committee. Currently it is just reporting back. It would be useful to have a running list of IFS issues we are working on
- Reports should have two parts: 1) reports on positions we have taken; and 2) distillation of feedback.

**Action:** Laura will send the short bullet list to everyone.

Web page maintenance from OUS previously. We need a short blurb that we find a common perspective on what it is and get that communication back to them and collect them.
1. IFS looks forward to working with HECC. The HECC appears to be a new governing body for state system of public education, so it is critical for IFS to be in continuing communication with the HECC.

2. Virtual reviews.

3. A need for more collaboration in online education versus cannibalizing each other.

**Online Education (Continued from May meeting) – Shari**

We discussed the need for more collaboration in online education, leveraging the best aspects of each institution for the benefit of students and so our programs don’t compete with each other.

- A need for more collaboration in online education versus cannibalizing each other, versus using best aspects of each college. We all have things we do really well. If a student is looking for a degree EOU does not provide, how do we direct them to other Oregon universities to better meet their needs? A lot of competition is occurring from outside. How do we work together to keep students in the Oregon system? How do you develop this kind of atmosphere to help each other? How do you develop that language within our system?
- Shari brought this up a couple of years ago before we had the current state of urgency. Work with college and high school advising groups? Discussion around shared services – what do the remnants of OUS look like a year or two out, shared service elements, etc., is there the possibility of an opportunity?
- Lots of functions performed by OUS will have to be performed in some fashion.
- Create one house that students can go to – Oregon educational system. Flowchart. WICHE _ Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. Exchange opportunities for learning and tuition – foreign exchange but in western states – packaging programs.
- Need a CE Session on all this? Does it exist at your institution already? Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education Joint Campus Program – OUS or Washington State? OSU Joint Campus Registration Does this serve our students? This feels competitive. How do you keep from poaching?
- Cooperative part of WICHE for online stuff is ICE (Internet Course Exchange). What is the revenue share on this? Help prevent students from transferring – and also allows you to sell your empty seats. This also is a revenue issue. HECC will be deciding this – do they understand the gravity of this decision? How do we value the vo-tech part of our universities?

**Action:** Maude will request this information from the Provost’s Council and Karen Marrongelle. OUS institutions used to be able to call other universities with a 5-digit extension – we have grown and are fighting over scarce resources.

What is the process now for an existing program on campus with program approval to bring these online – any check? There is no discussion – doesn’t it matter if there is another program in the system already online? What is the check at the system level for rolling out online programs to ensure collaboration of universities in the system? NWCCU also has a role in that.

**Adjourn**