The TRU governance decision must consider the dramatically reshaped higher education landscape here in Oregon:

1. **Higher Education Coordinating Commission.** The HECC will assume the statewide funding and academic strategies functions formerly provided by OUS.

2. **Shared Services Enterprise.** The SSE will assume many of the support functions formerly provided by OUS.

3. **Presidents’ Council.** A seven-member PC is anticipated to assume many of the political advocacy and strategic direction-setting formerly provided by OUS.

4. **Institutional Boards at UO, OSU, and PSU.** Regardless of the TRU governance outcome, with the passage of SB 270 at least 78% of the Oregon student body will be served outside a system.

5. **Oregon Education Investment Board.** With the advent of the OEIB, and its emphasis on regional compacts and P-20 pathways, the focus of collaboration will continue toward communities and vertical partnerships, regardless of governance structure.

Together, the first three developments replace much of the value-added functions previously performed by OUS. The fourth development (local boards for the three large universities) limits the potential benefits from inter-institution collaboration of a smaller system. The final development (OEIB) shifts the focus of collaboration to regions.

*Given these developments, the remaining function provided by OUS, institution-level governance, emerges as the primary objective of the TRU governance decision.*

With regard to institution-level governance, the Board’s authority allows it to choose between a centralized (i.e., system) and decentralized (i.e., institutional board) model. Therefore the Board must weigh the costs and benefits of (1) a central system of experts, working with a single volunteer board, to oversee campus-level management; versus (2) local boards comprised of volunteers, more intimately working with local leadership.

The Criteria for Consideration were developed to facilitate this cost-benefit analysis, and were drawn from work performed by AGB consultants, the TRU business plans, the business plan outlines, and other deliberations by the University Governance Work Group and due diligence with other state leaders.