1. Call to Order (Paul Kelly)

2. Approval of February and March 2011 minutes

3. Discussion of Institutional Boards (Longanecker/McGuiness)
   During April’s meeting, the Committee will have the opportunity to hear from David Longanecker, from the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, and Aims McGuiness, from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. They will be providing helpful national and international perspective to the State Board’s ongoing review and discussion on the topic of institutional boards. These speakers are renowned international experts on the subject of higher education governance and will provide meaningful context to these important discussions.

4. Presidential Performance (Paul Kelly/George Pernsteiner) [if time allows]
   The Committee requested, at its March meeting, that the presidential evaluation criteria be mapped in matrix form with the various areas of emphasis derived from Board goals, from the performance compact with the state, and with Board policy guidance with respect to diversity and affordability. This matrix is being brought forward for review and possible approval.

5. Adjournment
DAVID A. LONGANECKER
Dr. David A. Longanecker is the president of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education in Boulder, Colorado.

Previously he served for six years as the assistant secretary for postsecondary education at the U.S. Department of Education, developing and implementing national policy and programs that provided more than $40 billion annually in student aid and $1 billion to institutions. Prior to that, he was the state higher education executive officer (SHEEO) in Colorado and Minnesota.

He was also the principal analyst for higher education for the Congressional Budget Office. Dr. Longanecker has served on numerous boards and commissions and has written extensively on a range of higher education issues.

His primary interests in higher education are: access and equity; promoting student and institutional performance; finance; the efficient use of educational technologies; and internationalizing American higher education. He holds an Ed.D. from Stanford University, an M.A. in student personnel work from the George Washington University, and a B.A. in sociology from Washington State University.

AIMS C. MCGUINNESS, JR.
Dr. Aims McGuinness is a senior associate with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), a private nonprofit policy center in Boulder, Colorado. At NCHEMS, he specializes in state governance and coordination of higher education; strategic planning and restructuring higher education systems; roles and responsibilities of public institutional and multi-campus system governing boards; and international comparison of education reform. Prior to joining NCHEMS in 1993, he was director of higher education policy at the Education Commission of the States (ECS). Before joining ECS in 1975, he served as a congressional staff member and was executive assistant to the Chancellor of the University of Maine System.

Over the past twenty years, McGuinness has advised many of the states that have conducted major studies of their higher education
systems and undertaken higher education reforms. Major projects (all conducted through NCHEMS) in the past five years were in Alabama, California, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington State, and West Virginia. Issues addressed in these projects concerned developing a “public agenda” for the future of higher education, changing relationships between the state and higher education, state policies to address issues raised by the national report card on higher education, Measuring Up 2000/2002/2004/2006, and reform of community and technical college systems.

Dr. McGuinness earned his undergraduate degree in political science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MBA from The George Washington University, and a Ph.D. in social science from the Maxwell School, Syracuse University.
**BACKGROUND**

At its March meeting, the Governance and Policy Committee requested that the presidential evaluation criteria be mapped in matrix form with the various areas of emphasis derived from Board goals, from the performance compact with the state, and with Board policy guidance with respect to diversity and affordability. Employer satisfaction and graduate satisfaction would not be mapped because the surveys needed to assess those matters will not be completed before the 2011-12 evaluation cycle.

Below is a draft matrix for consideration by the committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Emphasis</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Financial Management</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Degrees/Shortage</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees/Shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Mission Alignment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (Geog/Demog)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employer Satisfaction: On Hold
Graduate Satisfaction: On Hold
OSBHE Governance & Policy Committee

February 17, 2011
Portland State University

Minutes

Committee Members present: Chair Paul Kelly and Directors Matt Donegan, Allyn Ford, Rosemary Powers, and Kirk Schueler. Additional Board members present: Director Hannah Fisher.

Campus Representatives: Presidents Chris Maples (OIT) and Ed Ray (OSU); Provosts Jim Bean (UO), Brad Burda (OIT); Vice Presidents Mark Weiss (WOU) and Mary Ann Zemke (OIT); and Michael Fung (PSU) and Phil Lesch (PSU).


1. Call to Order

Chair Paul Kelly called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Approval of January 2011 Minutes

Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the January 2011 minutes.

Action: Director Rosemary Powers made a motion to approve minutes. All members voted in favor.

3. Status of Legislative Proposals

Jack Isselmann offered an update on legislative proposals related to OUS. A hearing on Senate Bill 242 is scheduled in the Senate Education Committee. Both OHSU and community colleges are united in support of the governance changes included in SB 242. The OUS Governance Committee’s proposal is also reflected in House Bill 2118, which will likely be heard in March.

In addition to the higher education governance bills, – SB 242 and HB 2118 – Isselmann touched on several other related bills: SB 115 (interest on bonds), HB 3338 (general obligation bond), SB 9 (student financial aid), and SB 559 (UO).
4. **Tuition Process Language**

   Bridget Burns led the Committee in a discussion of a proposed amendment to the “tuition-setting processes” document approved in November 2010. The Oregon Student Association requested that the campus tuition-setting committees – required in the approved process – be made up of at least 50 percent students.

   **Action:** Director Rosemary Powers made a motion to adopt proposed amendment. All members voted in favor.

5. **Final Performance Compact Measures**

   Chancellor Pernsteiner walked the Committee members through the final list of performance metrics illustrated in the performance compact between the Board and state. He advised that next steps are to align campus performance reporting and develop campus targets that feed the System goals identified in the compact. Pernsteiner noted that the compact measures may evolve over time. In particular, the knowledge creation and innovation enhancement metric is expected to change in the future.

6. **Performance Evaluation Categories**

   Chancellor Pernsteiner described the proposed 2011-12 presidential performance evaluation categories with the Committee and led a discussion on recommended changes. The categories are: leadership, financial management, enrollment, degrees, degrees in shortage areas, research, and representing the System/advocacy. Director Powers and Chair Kelly suggested that “diversity” be included as a separate category. Director Schueler suggested that mission alignment be incorporated into the evaluations. Chancellor Pernsteiner agreed and said he would forward the proposed categories with the Committee’s comments to President’s Council for additional feedback before bringing it back to the next Governance meeting.

7. **Adjournment**

   With no further business proposed, Chair Kelly adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

---

1 Meeting materials are available at http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc110217-GPC.pdf
1. **Call to Order**

Chair Paul Kelly called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

2. **Status of Legislative Proposals**

Jack Isselmann updated the Committee on the progress of Senate Bill 242, which incorporates the Board’s governance proposal. It was introduced in the Senate Committee on Education and Workforce Development and has received two hearings. Throughout the process, the bill has undergone a number of amendments. It has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee and will likely receive a hearing near the end of that Committee’s work. The bill will definitely be amended further before moving to the floor of both chambers for a vote.

3. **Performance Evaluation Categories**

Chancellor Pernsteiner introduced the updated performance evaluation categories document and reminded members of the development history. In February 2011, staff proposed a change to the criteria and process for the evaluation of presidents and the Chancellor. Following its initial Committee review, the proposal was sent to presidents for their review and comment. The updated version presented today reflects that feedback and is being introduced for further consideration and approval by the Committee.

Several Committee members supported the idea of using a matrix to highlight the relationship between the proposed categories and Board goals such as diversity and affordability. Other

---

2 Meeting materials are available at:  
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc110321-GPC.pdf
suggestions to improve the evaluation process included developing a placeholder for program quality and expanding the research and scholarship category to include “creative activity.”

Chancellor Pernsteiner agreed to develop a matrix and bring it back to the Committee at a future meeting.

**Action:** Director Schuler made a motion to adopt the seven categories: leadership, financial management, enrollment, degrees awarded, degrees in workforce shortage areas, research/scholarship/creative activity, and representing the university/System advocacy/collaboration for use in presidential/Chancellor performance evaluations in 2011-12 and into the future. All members voted in favor.

4. **Introductory Discussion of Institutional Boards**

   Chancellor Pernsteiner opened the introductory discussion by noting that the Committee had agreed to consider proposals for institutional boards if their adoption better supported achievement of the Board’s statewide goals. Several Committee members suggested approaching the discussion with a broad focus that allowed a holistic review of Oregon’s higher education governance model. Chair Kelly noted that the Governor’s proposed education investment board and the coordinating commission embodied in SB 242 would likely influence future discussions on institutional boards. He suggested that a realistic goal of the initial discussion is a contextual look at other states and their approaches to governance. Following the initial comments, the Chancellor introduced Jon Barbur, an independent contractor hired to conduct research on institutional boards.

   Mr. Barbur described the variety of governance models employed throughout the United States. He described characteristics of system governance, institutional governing models, and hybrid models of shared governance between the state and institution. Committee members expressed interest in models with varying authority among institutions (e.g., larger vs. smaller universities). Discussion also included how the selection and appointment of board members would be made and the range of possibilities regarding the size of boards. Attention was drawn to the distinction between governing, managing, and advocacy. A number of Committee members noted the perceived connection between institutional boards and fundraising.

   Chancellor Pernsteiner thanked Mr. Barbur for his report and offered to forward Committee members’ questions to Mr. Barbur for additional discussion at a future meeting. He reminded members that the coordinating commission in SB242 and the Governor’s proposed investment board would likely remain a backdrop of future discussions. Following the discussion, it was agreed that Chancellor Pernsteiner would ask presidents for their analysis on institutional boards.

5. **Adjournment**

   With no further business proposed, Chair Kelly adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.