

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting  
Portland State University  
December 2, 2005

**Friday December 2, 2005**

**Present:** Lee Ayers (SOU), Jeff Johnson (EOU), Robert Mercer (PSU), Steve Teiche (OHSU), Larry Curtis (OSU), Scott Burns (PSU), Sarah Andres-Collier (PSU), Jeanne Wagenknecht (UO), Steve Tanner (EOU), Maureen Sevigny (OIT), Mina Carson (OSU), Marny Rivera (SOU), Kathie Lasater (OHSU), **Joel Alexander(WOU)**, Paul Doescher (OSU)

**Absent:** Marye Hefty (OIT), Solveig Holmquist, Paul Engelking (UO), Grant Farr (PSU), Dick Fairley (OHSU), Peter Gilkey (UO), Katie Lasater (OHSU), Muriel Shaul (OHSU), and Jim Tooke (EOU)

- I. **PSU Provost Dr. Roy Koch** (welcome and how PSU is dealing with growth)
  - A. PSU participated recently in 10 year reaccreditation which resulted in positive comments. Committee reinforced campus concerns. The accreditation report was done as a web based portfolio. Visit the website to see the self study. Other individual programs (Engineering and Urban Studies) are being accredited.
  - B. A big issue at PSU is enrollment growth. Enrollment is up 3% after being flat. PSU is now over 25,000 and 16-17,000 FTE, making this its largest group of students.
  - C. PSU has institutionalized community integration through general education and a devoted committee on campus. One out of three undergraduate students has been engaged in the community which benefits both students and the community.
  - D. New Programs at PSU
    1. An external review team is looking into a Biology Ph.D. program and seems to have positive inclinations. Although they are concerned about faculty salaries, the commitment to building this program is strong.
    2. Another Ph.D. program in Technology Management will be undergoing an external review next quarter.
    3. Also launching an online CJ degree completion program. This is PSU's first online degree program at PSU.
  - E. Within U.S. News and World Report there are eight categories of general education in which PSU has been identified in 5 of those as frequently or more so than other well known and respected universities. PSU sees success as tied to community programs.
  - F. PSU has also been working on sustainability and now offers a minor in sustainability. PSU ranks highly in its commitment to social responsibility and sustainability institution wide.
  - G. Research expenditures are up to over \$36M and possibly as high as \$41M this year. One of the biggest projects dealt with the national transportation center, which will be administered here at PSU to study issues around transportation in Oregon and the Northwest. Federal dollars must be matched by non-federal dollars. All institutions will likely be looking for those matching dollars. Transportation industries will also be contributed funding as they have an interest in such matters.

- H. These topics reflect PSU objectives to grow research, interact with community, and provide opportunities for local and state students to academic programs.
- I. Key components at PSU are faculty facilities and funding. State funding is declining. Fifteen percent of PSU's total budget comes from state funding. The faculty is concerned about education in general, 34% comes from the state, which is down from 45% a few years ago. In response, tuition has gone up as has enrollment. Shrinking budgets make it difficult to engage in strategic planning and implementation of plans. A few years ago 425 of 500 faculty members were tenured and tenure track. PSU has been experiencing a decline in full-time tenured and tenure track and a decline in part-time faculty. About 50% of people who teach are fixed term and the remainder are tenure track. PSU has always taken advantage of the Portland location to draw on the knowledge and experience of people in the community to teach courses and this is expanding to traditional (as opposed to community and/or industry-related) disciplines as well. Most buildings now have retail in them which offsets lease payments. Physical facilities are expanding, but only part of this expansion has been through traditional capital construction and state funding. It used to be that you didn't have to buy your own buildings using student-generated dollars.

## **II. Dr. Duncan Carter, President of Faculty Senate, PSU**

- A. Introduction by Scott Burns: Duncan is former IFS and was from the English Department before becoming Associate Dean and then presiding officer of the PSU faculty senate. Duncan has done innovating things like finding out what is on the minds of the faculty members.
- B. Duncan was concerned that the big and complex faculty senate spent too much time dealing with committee motions. The major issues people were concerned about were not even being addressed. Duncan sent an email survey to faculty members asking them what they thought the major three to five issues facing PSU were. He was surprised to get an 18% response rate. After prioritizing their rankings, he felt he had a faculty senate agenda for the year. It gives Duncan clout when talking with the administration, because he is representing the faculty interests.
- C. Topics:
  - 1. Faculty salaries: Salaries have been flat for last three years, despite being in negotiations, while cost of living is going up.
  - 2. Ratio of tenure-track to fixed-term faculty: Many see this dip in tenured faculty as an attack on tenured faculty.
  - 3. Growth related issues (general growth as a problem and class sizes):
  - 4. Lack of classroom, office space
  - 5. Lack of support, infrastructure, climate for research
  - 6. Integrating adjuncts/fixed-term faculty/research faculty
  - 7. Financing higher ed in the face of shrinking state support
  - 8. Mismatch between aid and tuition; lack of scholarships
  - 9. University Studies
  - 10. Workload; Need a realistic look at faculty expectations
  - 11. Faculty morale
  - 12. Need regular reviews of deans, administrators

- D. Summary: radical growth and flat or declining salaries reduces morale. The first thing the senate looked at was salaries, but because it is a negotiation time, they looked at the bigger issue of budget. They planned to look into long-term strategies regarding faculty salaries at a later point.
- E. PSU has two faculty agendas. They have one they usually use and then one with a discussion item up front and administrative reports at the end. Previously, it felt like administrators talked for the first half of the meeting and by that time half of the faculty members had left. There is always a risk of faculty senate degenerating into a toy government, like that of a high school. However, it is important that the faculty issues really be addressed.
- F. The PSU growth strategy was sabotaged when funding was tied to 2001-2002 enrollment levels.

### **III. Debbie Murdoch, Governmental Relations Specialist, PSU**

- A. Introduction: Debbie is a dynamo and is involved with the state legislature. She enjoys what she does and enjoys faculty. She is loved across campus and in the legislature. Scott invited her to find out what is happening since we just finished the legislative session.
- B. Topics: what happened during the 2005 legislative session (perception and realities)
- C. Debbie found the 2003 session the most difficult of her life. She has been part of the sessions and the system since 1979. The 2003 session was hard for Debbie and PSU because they didn't get what they asked for and were caught up in a system with no respect. Debbie made a commitment to change and wanted the system to change. She was pleased to see the change that came with Chancellor Pernsteiner. The perception is we did so well this session. The perception of the legislators is that they provided a good budget for higher education, helped students, made major investments in capital construction and funded faculty salaries. Higher education did get one of the best budgets of any Oregon state agency. The higher education budget stills falls short of need and essential budget level which will lead to a reduction in services and cuts. Fixed costs are increasing beyond the rise in the higher education budget. Campus service programs got cut. The tuition mitigation was a zero-fund game. Tuition needs to be affordable and we didn't get anything for that, because it is essentially a replacement for tuition dollars. It is expensive to freeze tuition, doesn't get you anything and ties your hands. There was a \$1M dollar package for faculty salary retention and recruitment. The legislature made improvements in our budget, but it was playing catch up from previously under funded years. The big winner of the system was capital construction (which is not fungible). Deferred maintenance also received funding. There was a bill for struggling high school students to help them move on to college where they may perform better because they are ready.
- D. What are we doing now? We are getting ready to go to the emergency board with capital construction plans for the next three biennia. We are hesitant to get capital construction funds that require commitment of donors without first having that commitment. Enrollment growth is a major priority, because it is tied to access. We need to put forth a strong message regarding funding enrollment growth. This is our commitment to the taxpayers; we need to make education accessible to Oregonians. We need to put forth a consistent message regarding faculty salaries. Legislators want to help us, but they shouldn't have to determine whether one university's message is more important than

another. We need to talk to legislators when they come on our campus. There needs to be a give and take and an understanding of faculty roles and responsibilities and how you fulfill your commitment to the state and to your institution. Faculty members come to Debbie all the time, but we need to expand the pool of usual suspects in order to get full representation. We need to find creative ways to deal with the government relations specialists on our campus and determine what they can do for us. We need to grow the pot for everyone and not leave any individual university in a really bad position.

**IV. Representative Linda Flores, Clackamas County, (member of House Education Committee)**

- A. Topics: What we accomplished in the last session, what you are aware of and may be good news (or may not be), but it is a dose of reality and integration of education (K-20)
- B. Oregon is not unique when compared to other states. The focus has not been on higher education so much as on K-12, but she sees the importance of making that connection. The university system should be the driver for the 8-12 reform that we need in Oregon. We funded K-12 education at a significant increase. There was a stable schools plan which would have allotted 51% of personal income tax revenue to K-12. It would have provided some stability and adequacy to K-12 funding. The governor's plan was provided late in the session and was focused on 61% of the general fund budget. We looked at legislation dealing with high growth school districts in terms of making funding available for them, but neither of them passed, so they will look at this topic in the interim. The community college budgets was up over the government's recommended budget. The universities had a capital construction budget that was substantially funded. The OUS saw an increase in the general fund budget and tuition hikes will hopefully be held at 3% or less. The OUS capital constructions were given a record amount for campus construction and maintenance. The OUS has been in the dog house since 1999 which is not unlike other state agencies. The system got crosswise and is now trying to repair the breach and move forward, not letting politics come into play. Oregon opportunity grants were funded at a substantial level. A recent report indicated that a student's expenses are \$12,000 which means they will be left with more than \$15,000 public debt. This group [IFS] makes things happen, including the OTM which will make transferring easier around the state of Oregon. We're glad to see some of the repair done, since credits weren't transferring. High school students now have funding to take classes for college credit. Standards for graduation, such as initial and advanced mastery were examined. There was a bill to invest in a more reliable testing system by the Department of Education. Flores heard from hundreds of people that goals are not being met. Graduation requirements for high school students were increased to include more math and English. The goal would be to better prepare high school students and avoid remediation once they get to colleges. This has to do with the level at which they are tested in high school. Earlier testing would allow for remediation in high school rather than in the universities
- C. You can't solve a problem until you acknowledge it exists, with same kind of thinking that created it, or by doing nothing. Since education works in a progression, higher education should lead the reform. We need to be clear about our standards and embed them in the high school curriculum. Higher education needs to speak with one voice about what students need to be prepared for college. Speaking with folks in higher

education, it was surprising to hear that how money is spent is more important than the total amount invested. We need to look at how money is used rather than the total amount available. This is a question that needs some scrutiny. We need to step back and identify other factors than saying it is all about money. We continue to do the same thing expecting a number of different results, and we're not seeing different results. Education funding levels are influenced by the recession which the entire country faced. One expert in the field indicated that higher education as an economic engine cannot keep up with required revenue and income tax can't do so either. We're not hopeless, but it forces us to reexamine how we do business. Flores is convening a work group with members of house and senate and both parties to bring in experts from an education conference in Denver (not just business or education, but also the legislature) to make things come together and to get the needed votes to drive policy forward. This group is meeting this month and will hopefully get off the ground after the first of the year. The group is well funded and this funding is required to make change happen in higher education in Oregon.

- D. Question: what are your perceptions of what is broken or we're not doing business right. Answer: I don't have a specific answer for the university system. Regarding K-20 it is an allocation of resources issue. We need to explore this and explore the answers. Flores is trying to get benchmarks and data together during the interim. The committee will go to one of the college campuses and have a discussion with their perceptions as well. What Flores does know is that it is not working right.
- E. Doescher feels the work gets done at the faculty level and we need the support and assistance of our administrators. Faculty members are not being supported.
- F. Question: Is there a question of academic quality apart from access issues and is there a relationship between quality and access as part of the same issue or part of a zero sum game. Answer: it may be some of all of the above. With regard to academic quality, we saw a presentation dealing with course redesign at the Center for Academic Transformation. Ideas included using technology, focus on enrollment at lower levels and teaching institutions how to redesign, create sharable information and collaboration and dissemination of results. We need to stay away from turf and protecting individual institutions. Restatement of question: Is there a perception that academic quality has suffered at OUS over the past few years. Answer: Flores doesn't feel this has been a topic of discussion. However, teacher preparation programs are not well regarded and this is a statewide problem.
- G. Question: If your group finds one of the big problems with higher education in Oregon is that in efforts to increase access with shrinking budgets that we have reduced quality, will we consider reducing access to increase quality or is pressure for access so great that it wouldn't matter? Answer: Flores is not willing to say we have to win at access. She is hopeful to continue to find things to do so that we don't have to go there.
- H. Observation: Quality seems to be the last budget item that gets funded when that seems backwards. Maybe we reverse the process to the faculty/student interaction and process and attempt to put that as a budget item first and put all the rest after. Response: that is a good idea, but because there has not been that type of investment for years, there was a lot of need
- I. Question: What is the empirical evidence for the observation that our teacher preparation programs are inferior? Answer: Flores reached this conclusion based on things she heard at the meeting in Denver with 11 other states chosen for their education environment. She

heard from individuals who had done investigation into each of the states represented at the conference. She didn't have a chance to talk to them in depth, but plans to follow up.

- J. Theme: we can't solve problems by throwing money at them. Johnson agrees with that, but the reason you'll hear about money from people in the trenches is that we feel like we're bleeding to death. Some of us feel like we're in the emergency room and in that kind of situation you do throw medicine at the problem. Johnson realizes there is no secret pot of money, but our commitment to education at every level over the past 25 years had declined year by year. We do not blame legislators, but the need is very real. Response: those around the political table for the last 25 years see that there has not been change over the last 25 years. There is never enough, which is why they are looking into the stability plan.
- K. Doescher: From the legislator's perspective, the most important thing we can do is to provide a quality of Oregon for the citizen's of Oregon. However, our resources have been eroded over the years. We also have a conflict in the research agenda, because administrators want us to seek grants and faculty put more energy into research because that is what is being rewarded. Research and teaching should be compatible, but they are currently in conflict. Response: Flores says we have to do something to change the dynamic. We need to avoid politicizing the issue. Good policy goes by the by because of politics. People sent to Salem to craft and enact policy should do it because it is good for Oregon, not because it is good for their campaign. The citizens won't vote for tax increases until the legislators earn the respect of the legislators.
- L. Burns: with enrollments going up and funding going down, the impression is that the quality in the classroom is also going down. We have been looking at measures that indicate that. As classes get huge, we just don't have the time to give to students. Scott feels the quality has eroded.
- M. Joel reminds us that when making claims about a reduction in quality, we need to interpret this more as change than a reduction in quality.
- N. Legislators like hearing from constituents, but do not like angry people ramming ideas down their throats. Form cards and form letters are an inappropriate way to get the attention of the legislators.
- O. [Floresteam@aol.com](mailto:Floresteam@aol.com), please email and say thank you

**V. Don Blair, Board Member, OUS (CFO, Nike, Beaverton)**

- A. Reflections from the board, on the retreat, etc.
- B. Coming directly from the retreat, Don offers some comments. He joined the board a year ago with the major restructuring and the board got the message that major changes were going to take place. He has learned a lot about higher education over the last year. First, there is an assumption and belief that higher education is vital for the state (individuals and body of the state having an educated citizenry). Second, the state of Oregon has done an astounding job delivering a high quality education product with one hand tied behind our back (low funding situation). The low funding is not unique to Oregon. We have low funded salaries, but the value the system has generated is remarkable. We are prisoners of our own success. We ask for more money and can't point to our failure as justification for it. This can't continue for much longer. With the cost trajectory we're on, we will not be able to continue. There are non-financial measures that suggest a dramatic need for change. Statistics show our faculty is under attack in terms of losing faculty to other

markets as well as increasing retirements. The population is increasingly ethnic minorities of a lower economic demographic. Financially, operationally, and demographically we are not on a track that can be sustained. Third, we can't draw lines out much further based on trends. There were ground rules for the retreat. For example, one ground rule was to avoid assumptions that we'll get more money from the legislature. If so, we won't do the work required to identify areas in need of change. Another ground rule was a high sense of urgency. A third ground rule is that we can't be all things to all people (strategy of what we will and won't/can't do). The last ground rule was to focus on change and what we need to do differently, but to remember all the good things involved in Oregon higher education.

- C. Model reflected this complex process. The outcomes we're aiming for are difficult to define and quantify relative to industry. There is a dashboard of gauges and we have to decide between them. The board decided to define broad categories of outcomes and scenarios that would maximize one of our outcome areas.
- D. Outcomes
  1. Educated citizenry in Oregon: economic, civic and political support for the state
  2. Provide opportunities for Oregonians: we don't want a 100% imported educated citizenry, we want opportunities for our children
  3. Quality: most difficult to identify indicators
  4. Financial and civic/cultural, other benefits that come from institution independent of its graduates. This includes economic activities (services it buys), knowledge creation, and spin off to cultural and civic events.
- E. They broke into small groups and worked on scenarios that maximized one outcome at the expense of the other three and then reflected on what they liked and didn't like about the others. They intend to use the debate to identify discussion areas for the next meeting. They will distill down to a few opportunities and narrow them down to executable options by February. He feels it was a successful retreat recognizing where they are at in the process. The tradeoff between access and quality got some attention. Models between consumer and producer model also came up as a theoretical construct.
- F. Question: what outcomes were predicted or surprises? Answer: A pleasant surprise was that underneath the language there was more common ground than was expected. For example, in the consumer driven model some people might say that looks like vouchers, but people were able to get beyond the language. The best part was having board members, presidents, faculty members and students which allowed for a diversity of points of view and be constructive. Personally, we have a tremendous opportunity in Oregon to turn what appears to be our weakness into a strength in terms of our small size. As a small state we have an entrepreneurial streak.
- G. Question: how can faculty help? Answer: we need your support and your engagement, since you know much more about how this works. The breadth of constituencies and outcomes makes it difficult to get a good degree of engagement and some sort of cohesion. Figuring out how to do that effectively is the problem.
- H. Questions: what are some of the changes on the table that we may be less willing to hear? Answer: change is going to be required. We're going to have to improve our flexibility, be more nimble and be more tailored (not the CA machine cranking out so many students). OUS subsidizes other state agencies and we may not be able to continue to do that. We may need to be more flexible in terms of how we teach. There are other models

such as technology models or looking at who can teach. To break the tradeoff between quality and access we'll need to be more flexible about how we're operating. Governor has spoken to better integration with community colleges, distance learning or operating more like private corporations, but the board hasn't agreed to any specific possibilities.

- I. Question: why isn't sacrificing access ever considered? Answer: access is politically popular. Access is visible and measurable to the populace at large and quality is less so. If you have to feed more mouths, you can water the soup which is more palatable than not giving any soup to some people. We can't water the soup endlessly; we need to break the paradigm. We need to produce soup more efficiently or find someone to buy more soup. Likewise, the board is not willing to go beyond a certain level of quality either. At some point, no matter how cheap the product is, it is not worth having, no matter how many people have access to it. We need to start with a baseline level of quality that we can defend.

#### **VI. Mark Endlsey, Office of the Chancellor, Director of Proficiency-based Admission Standards System**

- A. PASS began in 1993 in response to early high school legislation that moved toward a proficiency based system with CIM and CAM. The system was concerned with whether that would promote quality. The system was primarily grant funded. PASS evolved a system of standards and an assessment process to determine whether students are on track for college. It is the definition of college preparation in Oregon. Timeline was not possible, so this moved to an optional system. Today, it is not a requirement. Some districts have implemented it in its entirety and others have ignored it. There is a policy framework with articulation of expectations. We also have an assessment system that allows us to figure out where students are. There is no widespread way to know what students have done or to get full compliance in terms of assessment. They had some comprehensive data for students and found students were getting into the university system, but were falling short on the requirements. For instance, they were at 10<sup>th</sup> grade skill level. Since then, we do not have a complete set of data. The emerging policy question is how to gather that information and use it. We need to tell students they are underperforming and align students with resources to improve. There are limitations in the infrastructure. There is a national push toward proficiency based systems and thinking in terms of achievement, not seat time. Underlying principles include the assumption in national research that every high school graduate should be prepared to move on to secondary education. Another underlying principle is that even in technical/professional areas, the academic preparation and university level preparation is starting to become indistinguishable. In other words, if you don't meet the basic skills, you also won't become a plumber or a mechanic. It is important to have faculty involvement in the subcommittee that is examining these issues.
- B. The other important subcommittee will ultimately allow transfer back and forth among and between all postsecondary institutions in Oregon. Of all transcript data that comes in for students, little is useful since it is manual entry. The goal is to create a database that makes the data accessible in terms of student coursework and proficiency. Faculty need to be involved in discussions regarding the most useful ways to take full advantage of the data that will be available, because it will be much richer than in the past.

- C. The last subcommittee is least developed conceptually. A tentative recommendation for direction is a comparison with the quality education model of K-12. It took in business and education leaders in the state that looked at what a quality education would look like and how it would need to be funded. This didn't convince the legislature to provide that level of funding. The quality education model keeps the heat on the legislature of what quality looks like and what it takes to maintain that type of quality. It makes a better case for more funding and makes it clearer to the public and others what the funding is paying for. When quality drops below a certain level, we will understand why.
- D. The last area they need faculty help with is in moderation panels. Faculty members anchor the standard setting process and calibration of collection of student work rather than continuing to increase the standards. Faculty can provide the reality check of what standards are really needed to prepare students for college. This group meets twice a year the last weekend in January and end of May (possibly third to last week). They want to make sure they are getting the right folks. Primarily faculty members teaching in general education or university studies have been involved.

## **VII. Chancellor George Pernsteiner, OUS**

- A. Topics: what is happening in Chancellor's office and what happened at the board retreat
- B. Chancellor's office received the retirement of SOU President. The board now recommends a search. The Chancellor's office and Kirby Dyess visited SOU to talk to students, faculty, and others to determine what the local folks think is needed in a new president. The goal will be to have someone selected by the end of the spring term to make for a seamless transition.
- C. Alignment is a key area for the board as we move into the next legislative cycle. The governor is still wedded to a pre-K-20 educational enterprise. His proposed budget would be 110% of current budget. In the meeting with the presidents regarding funding packages, there were 16 projects and no more than three has ever been funded at once. The Chancellor will be working harder with presidents to identify the additional budget needs so that they are better prepared to interject additional budgets next time the topic comes up.
- D. Another group through teacher education Deans is working on what we would have to do to meet a change the board might put in for increased requirements in math or foreign languages for 2009 graduates of the twelfth grade. If we are going to meet new standards, programs need to be implemented right now. What programs would we need and what type of state investment would we need. The presidents were asked for additional budget requests that they might need to put forward.
- E. Presidents are looking at a variety of things both financial and procedural in nature in terms of statutes. For instance, we'd like the interest earnings on tuition to come to us rather than the state general fund. We're looking at changes in the relationship with the attorney general. We're looking at ways to save money on our debt but are currently restricted from state law by doing. We're looking at the commercialization of intellectual property. When state builds its budget it takes into account pay increases for employees with all state agencies, except for faculty. They have only looked at COLA, never for step increases and only occasionally for merit and other increases. The three prong attack is to get it in the essential budget build up. If not, they'll aim for funding as an additional

budget item. This has always been the decision of the state budgeting office. This is a significant pool of money.

- F. The board just concluded a retreat. The board is wrestling with real problems. Susan Weeks showed in September that if we serve only the same proportion of high school graduates as we're currently doing, over the next 20 years, our enrollment would have to grow by 50% or 43,000 students. By 2012, 1/3 of the K-12 students in public system will be of Latino origin. By 2014, 20% of the incoming class for our universities (if we keep same proportions) would be of Latino origin. The challenge is that those students currently don't go to college at the same rate as the general population. Will we see a decline? If we are unable to engage those students and see a decline, what does that mean for our economy and society over the last 20-25 years? We can see impacts of that in some areas of the state. For instance, fewer students in Eastern Oregon are going to college compared to the proportion in the parent's day in age. This is a warning sign that the board is concerned about. This was all in the September discussion.
- G. Looked at three funding options: If state provided same funds at same rate of growth over last decade (which doesn't account for inflation or enrollment growth). Growth of 5% each biennium based on Governor's recent budget (which still doesn't take into account inflation or enrollment growth). In either funding option, we're not as well funded by the state as we have been in the past. This is not a formula for success. This was the background of the board's recent discussion about what do we want to be, what do we want to do and how do we want to do it. They haven't made any forced discussions. There are a lot of things on the table in terms of pedagogy, price, access, aid, structure and in relation to the state. We have been part of the state system for a variety of state services (insurance, benefits and retirement). Our work allows us to work longer in life than other state agencies; we're healthier. So our costs for medical and actuarial costs for pension are lower than other state employees. We pay the same and this buys down the rate. There is a discussion about the importance of fully funded health care, since so few other agencies have that. In 1978 our benefit costs were 29% of salary costs. Today, nationwide, the rate is 30%. Our rate this year for all of our employees will be 48%. The 18% difference is more than 100M (about 125M). We get 350M from state every year and we pay a 30% tax back to the state. We need that level of benefit. The question is what could we do with 100M dollars if we went to market with our health care or pension. We could go to market on salaries and serve another 10,000 students or improve the student to faculty ratio and get back to where we were 10 years ago. The board is wrestling with what is our core mission and what makes the most sense for us long term? Will we be more attractive for retaining faculty if we go to market on salaries and benefits? It is not a choice the rest of the state will want us to make. We are still low in total compensation.
- H. The board needs to look at the relationship between quality, access, and price (and enrollment). They know they can't have it.

### **Saturday, December 03, 2005**

Meeting came to order 8:32am.

#### **VIII. Academic Quality Report Redux**

- A. There was a conference call meeting with the Provosts and members of the IFS. They had very negative comments about the report concerning the validity of the data. There

were two major problems. First of all, the OUS comparators were determined based on size, structure, mission, etc. The process of determining “true comparators” in the report was based on one particular parameter only. The second concern was that the data in the report did not pull out subsets of the institution (particular colleges or professional schools). Had this gone public, the Provosts would have responded by calling it a poor piece of research that reflected poorly on the creators. The report has gone to the Board and the Provosts electronically. The State Board’s metric for quality used at their retreat is consistent with the four categories listed in the report. Bob came away from the retreat understanding the Board has two goals – establishing policy that will produce long-range goals (for 2025) and to develop tactics for achieving those goals including a sales pitch to the legislature. The Board wants faculty to be involved so that they are one of the shareholders and because they recognize that faculty are the one’s working most closely with the main missions of the universities. Bob suggests two possible modifications to the document – removing part three and the appendixes; or removing the “true comparator” section from part three. We have made some very real gains by the document and by the process it was distributed. The Chancellor and Susan Weeks first got the document and didn’t want it to continue forward in that form. One consequence of this was that the IFS gained release time for the representative to JBAC and release time adding up to 0.5 FTE for other IFS senators (one-eighth release for each of four IFS senators). Another consequence is that Susan Weeks will be doing a longitudinal study of the OUS comparators and quality measures. Steve Teiche responded the first objection indicating that there isn’t anything misleading about part three. He suggests it is clear that there is a correlation between the parameter measured and other data such as graduation rates. He suggested the term “true comparator” is one thing he would change. The Chancellor’s office is currently engaged in a reexamination of comparator groups. In 2003 OUS came up with a revised list of comparators that they never released and Steve suggested that OUS may be reluctant to produce a list of reasonable comparators. Paul suggests including only the data that cannot be argued with – the data comparison with current comparator groups. Steve pointed out that the previous identification of comparators had a very political component and there is no reason to expect that this new process will be any different. Maureen and Bob both mentioned that this is a good reason for IFS to continue to be involved. Several people suggested that the Provosts’ concerns could be addressed by focusing more on our current comparators and demonstrating that comparative quality has slipped with respect to those groups. Lee suggested that the Provost’s concern was more focused on methodology and that if we focus more on that, the report will be harder to argue with. Larry suggested that one reason the administrators are nervous is that it will not have a positive affect on the legislature’s attitude toward OUS. Maureen mentioned the Oregonian recently wrote a report expressing concern about class size and quality faculty. In that report the Board was the only voice indicated that discussed quality. Steve suggested that no data that gives an unfavorable view of OUS institutions will be well-received by the Provosts or the Presidents and that this shouldn’t affect our independent analysis. Bob mentioned that during the Board’s retreat, even though there were four categories that subgroups were encouraged to consider, the one topic that everyone came back with was “quality”. The message is getting out. Scott suggested the IFS role now should be to keep pressure on to ensure longitudinal comparisons are done. Kathy indicated the legislature would be

looking at cost vs. quality and that both Washington and California have low cost (to students) and higher quality. She expressed concern that this isn't addressed in the document. Bob mentioned that Senate Bill 342 mandates learning outcomes in GenEd being uniform across the state. If done right, this could be done in such a way that quality is maintained. This bill also mandates reporting the results to the legislature. Paul expressed frustration that the solution not be "do more studies". Bob shared some documents that were distributed at the Board meeting ("What does college teach" and "Does Meritocracy work" from the Atlantic Monthly November 2005 and "Improving Learning and Reducing Costs – Models for Online Learning" from Educause Review 2003), one of which demonstrated how some schools have used technology to collapse many smaller classes into a single large class. He pointed out that Boards make decisions based on the information they are given. Jeff pointed out that the Provosts and IFS are both working to improve quality, so it doesn't make sense to sit on opposite sides of this issue. Scott told of a discussion he had with the OSU President who indicated that it seems to be time to do "less for less", further indication that quality is becoming a primary concern. Kathy reemphasized that tuition rates will still be a primary concern of Oregonians in general and that the document should reflect this as well; the concern is not just quality, but cost vs. quality. Bob indicated that one solution being discussed is to increase tuition, but also increase fee remission for economically disadvantaged students. Lee noted that Oregon residents pay more for tuition, room, and board in Oregon than they do in California or Washington. Steve Teich reiterated his concern that the new comparator selection would be subjected to the same political pressures as in the past. He also indicated that "access" will be an enormous hurdle to overcome if that is necessary to increase quality. He suggested revising the report to change part three so that they include more than one parameter (perhaps including mission and size, for instance), but not to eliminate it. Joel suggested an approach of capping access at larger schools and not at smaller schools – that since the schools are different a single solution for all schools may not be appropriate. Bob indicated that the Board had also had this discussion. Jeanne noted that the issue of quality has been heavily discussed at UofO, particularly due to the efforts of Nathan Tublitz who has taken a very aggressive approach to the issue with the UofO administration. She suggests that regardless of what the IFS does, active efforts to sound the alert over quality will continue at the UofO; the current efforts have been contrarian, but effective. Bob reiterated that Susan Weeks has mentioned that a similar report had been done in the past and not released. Paul Doescher made a motion to include within part 3 and appendixes the existing comparator information, but to eliminate the "true comparator" section. This motion was seconded by Scott Burns. Lee said that she wants the message someone reading the report to walk away with is that OUS has tremendous faculty and potential and needs the resources to live up to that potential. She is concerned that the message is lost in statistics. Steve Teich disagreed and spoke against the motion indicating that without part three, there is no urgent message that will be taken away from the document. Larry suggested that the time-trend data, once obtained, will be something that resonates more strongly with the public. Mina proposed a friendly amendment "To include a statement that IFS would like to participate and encourage the Chancellor's office to include a time study of OUS comparitors". Kathy seconded the motion. Joel then called the question. The motion carried with Steve Teich the lone "nay" vote.

## **B. Background Check Policy**

Bob asked what has been happening with regard to this on campuses.

WOU will have some background check policy by next year.

OIT's Provost went on record opposing background checks for faculty.

It is a topic of discussion at SOU due to an incident in which an RA was discovered to be a registered sex offender.

Mina noted that there has been some preliminary talk at OSU, but that nothing official has occurred.

No new policy has been put into place or discussed at the other schools, though OHSU routinely does such checks on all of their students.

## **C. Progress on the OTM**

It has passed the all faculty senates, but at some schools (such as OSU and EOU) it has led to no additional policies or implementation. OIT offers the AAOT and has used that as a guide for OTM courses. At UO, Peter Gilkey has been leading the efforts at implementation. Bob reminded everyone that this is part of SB342 and it would be a good idea to have it implemented quickly.

## **D. Meetings Schedule for 2006**

February 3-4: UO

April 7-8: OHSU

June 2-3: EOU

October 6-7: SOU

December: PSU (Date to be determined)

## **E. IFS Initiatives for 2006**

1. IPRC – Institutional Research group is where the quality work will continue. Scott agreed to be part of that.
2. Joint Boards Working Groups (Alignment, Budget, Structure of K-20): There are IFS senators on each of these three groups, but not much has happened recently, but indications are OUS people are behind on the K-20 discussion, so the Oregon Department of Education is taking the lead in framing the discussion. There are discussions going on concerning who will be the “reporters” for various aspects of SB342, JBAC or the More/Better/Faster group. Part of the alignment will include required learning outcomes and a common method for dealing with AP credit. Lee indicated there has been a problem at SOU with “honors courses” at high schools that are directly reported onto SOU transcripts. Lee Ayers volunteered to be an IFS representative on the K-20 group. Jeff Johnson volunteered to be a representative on the Alignment group. Joel Alexander expressed some interest in working with the Budget group.
3. The AEED and MBF groups from the State Board are also continuing work. In particular Bob discussed the tax-credit plan AEED has been developing for research leading to economic development. Maureen noted that Solvieg had expressed interest in AEED at the Klamath Falls meeting. Jeanne also expressed some interest in working with the AEED group.

## **F. Conversation with Legislators**

1. This came out of the June meeting @ Eastern by Representative Greg Smith. Sara Witt was to spearhead this, but she is no longer an IFS representative. The assignment was to mimic the Oregon Business Council to decide what the points were to be made

to legislators and set up meal meetings with legislators. The idea was to contact legislators who had institutions in their districts and include legislators on committees and subcommittees dealing with education. We need to come to consensus of about 3-5 major points, identify a list of legislators and organize the meetings.

- i. Scott Burns the topic of quality being one of the major topics we bring to legislators since Flores said she hadn't heard academic quality being discussed in legislative circles
- ii. Kathy Lasater added that many legislators have little experience with higher education, so those in districts with higher education institutions should be contacted.
- iii. Bob Turner picked up on Jeanne's comment regarding effective student participation. We need to bring out the anecdote in the story and bring out the emotion rather than intellectualizing topics.
- iv. Important points: academic quality, helping legislators understand what faculty do, find out what links various legislators have to the university in your area and relink them back to their specific areas to expose them to exciting stuff that is going on, what we contribute and what is the meaning we contribute (rather than just what we do).
- v. This item will be put on the February agenda. Each IFS representative should bring this recommendation to our faculty senates. At the February meeting, IFS representatives will provide an update.

#### **G. Campus Reports**

1. PSU – 10 year reaccreditation visit and the innovative approach of putting it all on the Web. Template is available and can continue to be updated. PSU still does not have its contract and the university requested mediation. Lindsay DesRoche returns as Finance Vice President.
2. OIT – OIT is in self study year and is preparing for the spring 2007 reaccreditation visit. OIT has had a poor website for years. With the new publications director there has been a push to get an improved website. The website went live and there are many errors. This happened while the ITS director resigned and has not been replaced and the publications director is also no longer with OIT. The public relations director is also gone due to retirement. Not rehiring the ITS director, PR and government relations is due to a false freeze in light of budget cuts. The new center for health relations is also still up to be funded uniquely. It has come to the board a few times, but none of the creative financing has yet been approved. Some of the creative financing includes higher tuition rates for the new medical students.
3. OSU – One of the big upcoming concerns is a big budget shortfall. OSU will be rebasing their budget and their President says they will be doing less with less. Fall enrollments are up, but section enrollments are down.
4. WOU – The Provost had a really good idea in a freshmen academy that draws them into the college environment and strengths writing and library skills up front. The program came on very quickly and was not carefully reviewed by faculty. Now students are confused and have questions and faculty members are unable to respond. Divisions have been requested to cut courses which has been tougher on some areas than others. The campus budget is in really bad shape and may even go into the red. WOU is in self-study in preparation for upcoming reaccreditation. There was a hiring

- frenzy in the summer, but now there are hiring freezes. These new positions may be affecting the budget. WOU is in contract negotiations, but discussions have stalled. Faculty requested mediation, but administration has not responded. There is an enrollment problem and a retention issue. The enrollment issue has influenced tuition increases.
5. SOU – SOU - Enrollment is approximately down 3% this year; however, our applications are up compared to last year at this time. We now have a Portland Area recruiter/representative since it was the area with the most significant decline. Our President is retiring. We are in the final hiring stages for VP Student Affairs, Directors of Financial aid and Director of Marketing and Public Relations and Associate Vice President of Human Resources. There is continued work on general education and putting together strands that will be implemented across the board (Synthesis & Application courses). The Academic Division has to cut \$800K this year and each School is having to stretch to make this possible. We are also still in negotiations with AP:SOU. Second round of strategic initiatives beginning in January designed to bring in students and support visions and mission of departments. Senate continues work on faculty roles and responsibilities for tenure and promotion. Merging of Faculty Administrators into administrators continues to be defined.
  6. PSU – President Ed Ray stopped in and thanked faculty members and IFS for their hard work.
  7. UO – Diversity: UO just finished the second half of a draft diversity plan. They have engaged in a Provost search and expect a decision soon. UO is experiencing major turnover in administration. The Westmoreland sale is a big topic in terms of the displaced students and many other issues including diversity and child care. There is a big discussion regarding Department of Defense funding and a forum will take place regarding where funding comes from and how that fits into long term goals of the institution. UO is beyond the halfway point in their largest 6M campaign. UO is headed into an accreditation exercise and is beginning to work on this.
  8. OHSU – The President is retiring and a search firm has been hired to begin the process of seeking a replacement. Faculty will be involved in some way. OHSU is relieved that the state support for the School of Nursing has been maintained. They were relieved not to have to increase student tuition. The aerial tram has not happened yet, but they are still waiting. The Provost has called for an assessment panel to look at university wide assessment of output and educational quality. There is an ongoing tension between the teaching learning mission of the university and research. Faculty issues differ from other campuses. There is no union and there is little tenure. Kathy would like to provide more information about the OHSU consortium for education since it involves all of the other campuses. They turn away a large number of students, largely because they do not have enough faculty members to teach nursing students.

**IX. Thanks and gift to Bob Turner, outgoing IFS President**

**X. Installation of New Officers, welcome Scott Burns**

**XI. Adjourn**

