Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chair VanLuvanee at 9:47 a.m.

Board members present: Roger Bassett, Tom Imeson, Leslie Lehmann, Jim Lussier, Geri Richmond, Erin Watari, Bill Williams (connected via telephone at 10:10 a.m. and disconnected at 12:10 p.m.), Jim Willis, Tim Young and Don VanLuvanee

Absent: Phyllis Wustenberg (ill)

Discussion Items

Governance Models: Campus Autonomy and Centralization in OUS and Nationwide

Chancellor Cox reminded Board members of its recent retreats that were facilitated by Dr. Terrence MacTaggart, former chancellor of the Maine higher education system. In his final analysis, Dr. MacTaggart urged the Board to focus on three primary issues in the coming year, the first being a survey of alternative system models to find the most effective balance between centralization and campus autonomy. The other two areas for further study, suggested Dr. MacTaggart, included broadening the System for participation in Oregon’s economic and workforce development, and strengthening the linkage to K-12. Chancellor Cox explained that the final two areas would be examined by the Board in 2002.

Reviewing higher education systems models used in other states, Chancellor Cox explained that twenty-two states have consolidated governing boards similar to Oregon’s. Other systems are comprised of coordinating boards, which do not have governance authority. Planning agencies engage in a systematic study but don’t govern or coordinate. He highlighted the differences between these types of systems noting that the consolidating governing boards have budgetary authority and appoint the presidents and chancellor. Coordinating boards, he said, conduct statewide planning, including postsecondary education and community colleges; advise the Governor and the legislature regarding financial aid policies and scholarship policies; and conduct strategic planning in terms of work programs. Coordinating boards may also approve some programs, and some are engaged in developing a unified budget that could be used for all postsecondary education.
In some cases, planning agencies have replaced other systems. Using a recent restructuring in Florida as an example, Chancellor Cox explained that the Florida system was balancing between a planning agency and a coordinating commission. The agency advises the governor and the legislature, conducts statewide planning, and provides statewide studies. He stated that there are also some mixed models; seventeen states have individual institutional boards, twenty states have at least one multi-campus and thirteen have both.

Chancellor Cox discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the current system in Oregon. Strengths of governing boards are as follows:
- comprehensive authority;
- budget authority;
- accountability;
- fiduciary responsibility;
- program approval; and
- authority to hire executives.

The major weakness, he said, is that presidents’ powers may be circumscribed by the Board. In systems where they are constrained without the autonomy to act, presidents may not be as effective.

The Chancellor acknowledged that consolidated governing boards can be influenced politically, since board members are appointed by one political official and approved by another political entity. Tremendous depth and breadth of knowledge about a multitude of institutions is required by board members and there is some difficulty experienced in balancing the needs of the state with the needs of the institutions.

Regarding coordinating boards, Chancellor Cox explained that they have objectivity because they are not directly responsible for individual institutions, but are addressing issues from the state, community, or regent perspective. They have a broader scope of authority, including responsibility for community colleges and, in some cases, private institutions. The weakness of coordinating boards is that they have limited authority.

The Chancellor provided several case studies, including Maine, New Jersey, Washington, and Maryland. He concluded that all of these systems work to varying degrees and are determined based upon the history of the state. Also highlighted in the Chancellor’s presentation was the transition of Oregon Health and Science University to an affiliated institution, meaning that it has absolute program authority; control of all its assets and liabilities; sets its own tuition; establishes its own admission standards; and make its own personnel decisions.

The Chancellor observing that the Board, in its examination of alternative governance structures, should focus its attention on where the problems exist and what it is they are trying to fix. He expressed the need to clearly identify the problems, write clear expectations for how it will be different, and do a cost/benefit analysis, while keeping in mind the need to balance public university autonomy with public priorities. “Restructuring alone doesn’t do anything,” he said.
As a starting point, Chancellor Cox suggested that the Board look at the potential sources of revenue and basic state resources, including state appropriations, state lottery funds, the General Fund, state scholarship programs, dedicated tax funds and federal scholarships. He added that research universities are looking closely at technology transfers as a revenue source to pursue.

(Bill Williams joined via telephone at 10:00 a.m.)

Mr. VanLuvianee inferred from the presentation that, at the top level, the Board isn't doing anything that’s fundamentally wrong or different. Chancellor Cox agreed, noting that the other systems all work because of the history in their respective states in ways that wouldn't necessarily work in Oregon.

Mr. Imeson noted that changes have been made in the budget process by moving a certain amount of responsibility from the Board and the Chancellor’s Office to the specific institutions. He questioned whether the Board needs to do anything on the governing side that accommodates or reflects that change. Another issue, he said, related to the changes that are occurring in the state with regard to the perceived need for higher education. There has been a great deal of discussion, Mr. Imeson observed, about the need to adapt more quickly and be more responsive. He asked whether the Board needs to do anything from a governance perspective that responds to those kinds of changes. He also questioned whether the Board's statutory responsibility has changed, and felt that the issue of governance has not yet been tested.

Chancellor Cox acknowledged that the System has increasingly granted more programmatic authority to the campuses. However, he indicated that state lawmakers are asking what the System is doing about programmatic duplication, which leads into the needs to balance with public expectations as well. He suggested that the Board could specify which powers they will retain absolutely and which ones it should convey to the institutions.

Speaking in support of a review of authority and responsibility, Mr. Imeson said that the Board may find that it has responsibility for things that are outdated in terms of its role. He noted that, until it confronts the policy issue or the statutory issue, there is conflicting advice about the role of the Board. As a case in point, Chancellor Cox referred to the recent issue of tuition, which the Board has statutory authority to set, and yet the Board has devolved more authority and flexibility to the campuses. Lawmakers, while recognizing the authority granted the Board, were prepared to impose guidelines.

Mr. VanLuvianee said that he recognized the need for some changes, but suggested that the institutions be prepared to make adjustments as well. Mr. Imeson suggested that the institutions should be deeply involved in the discussion, and expressed the need to change the perception that the Board is an obstacle to progress.
Mr. Lussier suggested the Board start out by addressing the structure, pointing out that governance and structure are not the same thing. Structure, he observed, is what follows the decisions being made. Admitting that he becomes more intrigued by what doesn’t happen in governance rather than what does happen, he asked whether the Board has really decided where it wants to be ten years from now.

Ms. Lehmann agreed with Mr. Lussier that the Board needs to develop a vision. It should look at the key elements of governance authority and the various ways of allocating power between a simple authority and campus authority and decide, given the unique situation in Oregon, what should be retained and what could be altered to make it easier to achieve those goals. She pointed out that the smaller campuses might have different needs than the larger institutions, and referred to several examples in Chancellor Cox’s presentation where a governing board dealt differently with some institutions in the state than it did with others.

Chancellor Cox suggested the most efficient way of proceeding would be to work through the powers that are assigned, centrally versus delegated, and decide which ones to change. Ms. Lehmann agreed, but felt that the first step should be to determine how the Board perceives itself and identify those issues currently of high priority to the Board. As an example, she referred to the revenue issues related to tuition authority matched by a HOPE scholarship where money followed the student.

President Frohnmayer observed that the discussion goes back to the question of what exactly needs to be solved by changing the structure. Unless that is clearly articulated, nothing will change, and it will simply be an intellectual exercise not really addressing the issues. He felt that, within the core structure of the legal authority, there are three issues that the Board will face over the next year; the first being the issue of revenue and markets; the second being the issue of state support; and the third being, the issue of System decisions on situations that are beyond the financial capacity of any individual campus (e.g., deferred maintenance). President Frohnmayer concluded his comments by noting that none of these issues require a change in the statutes, but that clarity on all three issues would assist the System in future planning.

Mr. Willis agreed that the actions of the Board should be issue-driven but noted that the discussion about governance in higher education needs to take place in the context of the whole state and not just the System. “We may have to make tough decisions about student access to maintain quality, about our relationships with each other and other parts of the state, and about institutions. We need to identify those real issues and decide how to participate in moving this forward,” he said.

Chancellor Cox referred to a recent study by Davis and Hibbitts on the perception of Oregonians on whether they believe average is good enough. He explained that, while access is still perceived as a great concern, the trend for quality drives the discussion more than quantity.
Saying that the conversation focused on autonomy from the point of view of the institutions’ autonomy relative to the Board, President Zinser pointed out that there seemed to be a broader concern for relative independence from undue political influence for higher education as a whole, which relates to autonomy of the Board. She felt that the Board should consider the needs for services that the institutions may have that will differ from one institution to another based, in part, on size or perhaps on other factors.

President Creighton observed that the previous discussion represented a continuum that goes from the principle of governance to the governance of principles. He expressed the value of strategically projecting goals and how to achieve those goals and encouraged the Board to do so. He also cautioned against the consequence of secondary effects of decisions.

Mr. Bassett expressed concern over the risk of being distracted from the real work before the Board. “If we are focusing on a state General Fund commitment that is subject to erosion, then all collections of politics become isolated around a shrinking dollar amount. Rather than approaching this from where we’ve been, we should be looking forward to where we want to be,” he said.

Calling attention to the issue of searching for a new Chancellor, Mr. Young referred to HB 2015 that addresses new structures for higher education governance. He said that the Board should have a clear vision and direction before determining the criteria for choosing a new Chancellor for a potentially new System.

Dr. Richmond pointed out the need to prioritize the Board’s goals. Of concern to her, she said, is that too much planning can be a distraction from the real issues and the Board needs to clearly articulate some vision of where it wants to be in the future. Another issue is that of what exactly Oregonians want from higher education. She was skeptical of the argument that they increasingly want excellence, although heartened by the statistic.

By focusing so much on the limited resources, Mr. Lussier said that the Board may be passing up other opportunities. He suggested that there might be programs that can attract other resources. He argued that the issue isn’t about reimbursement, but is about getting out of an old system and into something new that generates new resources. He noted that enrollments are at an all-time high, and yet tuition has increased.

Mr. Imeson maintained that the Board has the authority and the responsibility for setting tuition. The question, he said, becomes what does the Board mean by that? “We need to determine whether we do it differently for graduates than for undergraduates, whether we target anything, and whether we say certain cell values are more important than others. Where do those responsibilities lie, and if we don’t set tuition, who does? Should the campuses set tuition? Where’s the public interest?”, he asked.
Mr. VanLuvanee noted that, while the Board has the authority to set tuition, it is not in the position of knowing what individual campuses need to do. He expressed concern that the finger is pointed at the Board whenever tuition is increased when, in fact, the Board made the changes based upon a recommendation by the institutions. He suggested that the institutions should analyze their own needs and provide those recommendations to the Board, rather than the Board getting buried in the line-item details.

Arguing that an important issue is whether the voters will demonstrate that they have a commitment to higher education, Mr. Young suggested a voter-approved endowment that the Board could pay into for a specified period of time as an education surcharge. Those monies could be applied to funding in part, or in full, the expenses for in-state high school graduates who want to attend an OUS institution. He felt that it would be a stable source of funding and would be politically acceptable because it would be addressing the Board’s constituency. Chancellor Cox noted that several of the gubernatorial candidates have discussed what Mr. Young proposed and are interested, adding that it could be a conversational opportunity for the Board to approach the candidates before November. Ms. Lehmann suggested developing something similar to a HOPE scholarship that would work in Oregon, adding that it could be an opportunity to create a source of revenue that would be independent of economic swings.

Addressing the concept of HOPE scholarships, Ms. Watari stated that the concept came before a committee during the last legislative session and was fiercely shot down. She said that the HOPE scholarship is academic based, thereby limiting access to students who really need the assistance.

Ms. Watari went on to say that the discussion about governance will likely continue and change, but urged the Board to first receive public input and then take action. She further stated that she felt the Chancellor’s search should be postponed since issues relating to governance have not yet been resolved.

Mr. VanLuvanee asked individuals who have further comments to forward those comments to Chancellor Cox or Vice Chancellor Vines. He challenged the Board to move forward and not get caught up in the details looking for perfection. It is more important, he said, to make progressive improvement and to stay engaged. Mr. Lussier suggested the Board take all of these suggestions and comments into consideration by making a list of specific issues that they need to address.

Dr. Richmond asked that the Board take action on at least one of the issues, perhaps tuition, by the February 2002 Board meeting. Following brief discussion, the Board agreed by consensus to discuss tuition at the Joint Committees meeting in February.
President Creighton presented his goals. He opined that EOU has transformed an institution from a small regional college to a respected university and, in doing so, has leaped over many different hurdles. He stated that he and his staff have spent time planning directions and having a vision, and that his goal is to continue to progress. Staff have been working to maintain, sustain, and promote the basic image of a selective undergraduate institution for Oregon.

EOU, he said, is trying to address the issue of growth. Staff have completed a facilities master plan with projected growth of 3,200 to 4,000 students. This year, the goal is to continue working on funding the Science Center, develop plans for the new library and develop plans for a new residence hall on campus to accommodate increased growth. Another goal, said President Creighton, will be to increase the endowment for the institution and to begin its first capital campaign.

Mr. Lussier asked for an update on the science project. President Creighton stated that they have been very successful in raising private funds, although the Oregonians for Lottery Awareness has filed an appeal that temporarily ties up the use of lottery dollars to fund the Science Center.

Mr. Bassett requested a status report on EOU’s relationship with the regional community colleges. One of the unique aspects of serving the students in EOU, said President Creighton, is the Eastern Oregon Collaborative Colleges Center (EOCCC), comprised of a consortium of three institutions: Blue Mountain Community College, Treasure Valley Community College, and Eastern Oregon University. By combining resources with each other, and through state support to provide services to an area equal in size to the state of Pennsylvania, the concept that drives it, explained Dr. Creighton, is service and not ownership. Indicating that it was one of his shortfalls for the year, President Creighton said that funding for that collaboration will end this year and the future of the program is in doubt.

President Creighton stated that, as a small institution, he believes it receives disproportionate benefits of being part of the System. With Board governance, the institution is protected in ways that it would not be if EOU were more independent. He asked that, in its decision making, the Board remember the small institutions and protect those institutions when addressing governance issues.

President Frohnmayer summarized his goals beginning with the goal of access. He stated that UO expects to exceed last year’s enrollment projections. Pointing to the
uncertain future of international student recruitment following September 11, President Frohnmayer said that international students are heavily recruited and expressed the importance to the educational program, the graduate programs and revenue. He expressed concern that some members of the U.S. Senate are talking about moratoria on visas, which would have a terrible ripple effect in the international community and would create what he considered to be a national problem.

President Frohnmayer went on to discuss the potential of tuition increases or costs into the next biennium. Another objective, he said, will be to adopt and implement a five-year plan that contains both numerical goals as well as flexibility to respond to changing conditions. He noted that the function of planning is a continuing process and embarking on a process of strategic direction will contain a blueprint by which they can expand their efforts or contract and focus them as budget considerations might dictate.

Another goal, explained President Frohnmayer, is to conclude a successful campaign celebrating the 125th anniversary of the University by raising $125 million. The president spoke about formalizing the presence of UO at the Cascades Campus in a collegial way. He argued that, were it not for the presence of EOU and UO, it would be far more difficult to justify the campus.

President Frohnmayer indicated that he hoped to engage in a constructive way the HB 2015 planning process to help identify more precisely the role of higher education. He asked that the Board restate the research mission, the liberal arts and science core of education at the institutions. He expressed concern regarding the future of research and research enterprise, which is central to the core of UO. He also expressed concern that graduate education is undervalued in terms of financial support. The president argued that the undervaluation of certain cell values is another important issue, particularly music, architecture, and journalism. Discussing faculty salaries, President Frohnmayer said that they are crucial to everyone and affect the marketability of faculty.

Addressing enrollment pressures, the president said that, while it is a sign of health in many respects, the challenges are twofold: 1) dealing with students, who for the first time are getting access, and 2) the capital construction implications, particularly with dormitories. He argued that there is a breaking point at which UO can’t go beyond without state or System support.

Mr. Lussier asked for a brief report on the Lundquist School of Business and its expansion. President Frohnmayer said that it started out with a suggestion of a remodel between $3-4 million. As the planning process went deeper, the classroom space issue became more apparent and the project size grew significantly to an estimated $40 million, which has been funded in part by a $12 million commitment of an entrepreneur. Currently, $36 million in private donations have been raised, and the president expressed desire for some state seismic money to allow for project completion. Groundbreaking is scheduled for March 1, 2002.
President Paul Risser—Oregon State University

President Risser stated that OSU is different from the other universities. He pointed out that OSU has its own Board of Advisors, about 400 faculty and staff throughout the state, and 120 different advisory boards. OSU's focus, he explained, is much broader than undergraduate education.

One of his goals, said Dr. Risser, is to continue to use OSU's network to make sure that the institution addresses the needs of the state. Some of OSU's highest priorities include high-tech industry and agricultural industry. He stated that undergraduates are important to those, noting that enrollment has grown more than 4,000 students in the last five years and that the grade point average for new students is the highest ever recorded in OSU.

He argued that their research programs have a much greater impact than just undergraduate education, saying that OSU's research program has a positive impact of $800 million on the state. President Risser went on to discuss the top-tier engineering program and the success of that program. He announced that, thanks both to the state and a private donor, construction will begin this fall on a $45 million high technology building that will bring together technology, business, and engineering in computer science.

The president reported that enrollment at the OSU Cascades campus is on track, noting that this is a modern concept of a 21st century learning community. Recognizing the special needs of the region, Dr. Risser said that diversity is something staff are looking at, and ways in which to enhance economic diversity. Referring again to the top-tier engineering program and its statewide importance, including at the Cascades campus, President Risser said OSU is tying its engineering with the Extension Service so that strength in engineering is not localized just to the Portland metropolitan area.

President Risser expressed the need to look at the University in a new way. One of those values would be the way OSU looks at its processes, structures, functions, programs. He stated that staff are in the process of combining two colleges into one, which will be referred to as Health and Human Sciences. He stated that would bring together the most powerful combinations of traditional disciplines, but also the newest from a research standpoint.

Mr. Willis asked how the organizational changes are proceeding. President Risser reported that staff has reviewed traditional structures, looking carefully at both program and academic program changes, but also at administrative support structures, to ascertain efficiencies.

(Bill Williams went off line at 12:10 p.m.)
Mr. Lussier asked how the advisory boards for the Cascades-Campus and the University have met his expectations. President Risser indicated that they have two advisory boards: one for the campus as a whole and one for Central Oregon, both which have been very effective. Mr. Young suggested, in the future reporting process on the redesign, that OSU incorporate different levels of specificity on what exactly the redesign means for the Board members to help them understand the concept of a 21st century university.

President Elisabeth Zinser—Southern Oregon University

President Zinser stated that she had six overriding goals for 2001-02. Being the newest president in the System, her first goal is to become better acquainted with the campus, the people of the campus, the people of Oregon and in particular, southern Oregon. She said that she has already spent a great deal of time meeting people and trying to enhance her understanding of the culture and the needs and the economy by spending time with faculty, staff, students, and the administration.

Another goal, she said, is to work on enrollment, of which she reported a more than 12 percent increase in freshmen and a 9 percent increase in transfers. She stated that the grade point average for new freshmen is 3.2, a number she hopes to continue to advance. Retention is also improving, reported Dr. Zinser.

Taking a fresh look at the campus mission, vision and values, Dr. Zinser invited the System Strategic Planning Committee to look at progress in that regard. She stated that SOU is aspiring to become a contemporary public liberal arts institution, with the emphasis on contemporary. She, along with staff, are now trying to define what that means and how SOU can become increasingly responsive to the region’s needs and demands.

SOU, she said, is focusing on the development of an honors program which she believes will help not only in recruitment, but in retention, as well as to enhance the opportunities for students to achieve a new level within the University. Discussions for a new Center for Teaching and Learning are underway.

Expanding and modernizing the library, said Dr. Zinser, is also being looked at, as an opportunity not just in the traditional sense of what libraries do, but as an environment in which SOU can build a first-class learning community for students, faculty, and staff. President Zinser continued that computer science is an area where SOU might have an opportunity to expand upon in collaboration with OIT. Further, she said that SOU is looking at how the fine and performing arts can be used as a focal point for developing its capabilities in terms of technology.

President Zinser discussed the goal of trying to assess, in a more strategic way, what the demands and needs of the region are, and looking at the possibility of some strategic alliances with other institutions around the state. She reiterated the consensus
of the importance of having discussions about ways in which the greater needs of Oregon can be enhanced by some very focused contribution of SOU in a strategic alliance with other institutions.

Mr. Lussier asked about the hardest transition into the new presidency and what things have been most problematic. President Zinser stated that any time a person is new in a leadership role, they have to spend a great deal of time getting acquainted and making contact while addressing pressing problems that need resolution. She said that she recognized the need to spend time in building trust for long-term relationships with colleagues that will look to the president for not only vision, but for a sense of stability and comfort, especially through difficult times. Continuing, Dr. Zinser indicated that she recognized the need to create a human connection between the president and the institution.

She expressed the need to continue looking at the RAM model from the point of view of how best to finance those cells in ways that encourages institutions, particularly those with a heavy focus on the liberal arts and sciences. She stated it would be helpful for the Board to encourage innovative thinking and, at the same time, pose some thoughts or possibilities where the Board might offer a temporary reprieve from some regulation in order to try something new.

Discussion with the Executive Committee on the Chancellor’s search

Position description for the Chancellor’s search

Mr. VanLuvanee announced the “official launching” of the Chancellor’s search, and that he asked Jim Willis to chair the Search Committee. Mr. Willis, he said, is a veteran of several presidential searches and is well qualified for the job.

According to the Internal Management Directive adopted by the Board in October 2001, the Search Committee will take on the task of searching for, screening, and recommending two to four finalists to Mr. VanLuvanee. The Board will then interview prospective candidates and vote to install the next Chancellor. With the help of the search firm identified by Chancellor Cox, Mr. VanLuvanee estimated that this work will be done by mid-May 2002.

He said that any member of the Board is welcome to attend any or all of the Search Committee meetings if they are prepared to abide by the same rules of confidentiality that apply to all Search Committee members.
Position announcement for Chancellor’s search

Mr. Willis stated that, having been involved with several presidential searches, this is an important and major undertaking. Members of the Search Committee, he said, include the Board’s Executive Committee: Mr. Lussier, Mr. Imeson, Ms. Lehmann, and Ms. Wustenberg. He expressed the need for the position announcement to be released directly while the process for defining criteria and other mechanics inside can happen afterwards.

Chancellor Cox said that he, along with Board leadership, have tried to be responsive to suggestions that they received both from Board members and from other interested individuals. He emphasized the importance of announcing the opening to allow the search firm to begin working. The search firm will further work with the Search Committee to define the position description more concisely, and articulating the expectations and qualifications beyond what is listed in the announcement.

While respecting Ms. Watari’s opinion, Chancellor Cox strongly urged the Board to move forward with the process for several reasons. He reported that, in conversations with gubernatorial candidates and with legislative leaders, both who are departing and who are returning, there has been no mention of changing the role of the Board such that it is no longer a governing board. This cannot be done, he reminded the Board, without changing statutes.

Continuing, Chancellor Cox observed that the Board will be going into one of the more challenging legislative sessions in 2003. He argued that entering a legislative session as an interim weakens one’s position. “The Board will be a governing Board until the legislature changes those statutes, if ever it ever does, and as such the Board will need a CEO,” he said. The Chancellor agreed with the need to be honest with the candidates and letting them know what challenges face them. He invited the Board to finalize the announcement so that the position can be advertised, noting that the word is already out in higher education circles and he has already received calls.

Mr. Willis stated that, at its meeting later in the day, the Search Committee will review schedules and begin planning. He encouraged members of the Board to participate in these discussions and observe the proceedings. He noted that he will use his discretion in terms of how much engagement might be possible as the search moves forward. And while individual candidate interviews are confidential discussions that will be conducted in executive session to allow the candidates to remain anonymous, all Board members would be invited to attend and participate.

OUS Director of Legal Services Ben Rawlins noted that the procedure for filling vacancies for the office of president would be similar to filling the vacancy of the Chancellor. One difference, he pointed out, is that a Search Committee for president makes recommendations to the Chancellor and, therefore, are not arguably or technically within the parameters of the Open Meetings law because they are not a
The Committee responsible with filling the vacancy for Chancellor comes from the Board and, in fact, does fall under the parameters of the Open Meetings law. However, he said, the same law provides the opportunity for individual sessions which discuss, among other things, the qualifications of candidates in closed session.

Mr. Lussier expressed concern that there be adequate interaction with the search firm and that, in the position description identification, directors have an opportunity to come together as a Board and make its final decision. Chancellor Cox assured that the search firm will seek opinions, as those will drive the Board to greater specificity about qualifications and expertise. “The last thing it wants is to be uncertain,” he observed.

Mr. Young asked that it be made clear in starting this process that the Board step back before getting begins deciding which candidate it wants, and to consider the long-term vision. He also reiterated Mr. Lussier’s concern about student and faculty representation to constituents. He noted that the successful candidate should not only have an understanding of OUS in relation to regional concerns, but also to national and international concerns.

Mr. Lussier addressed the previously stated concern of having student representation and faculty connections on the Search Committee. He further stated that the Board should consider Dr. Richmond’s role, and that it is not necessarily considered that of a faculty member. Previously recommending consideration of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate president and a student representative as members of the Search Committee, Mr. Lussier asked for a reexamination of the issue. Mr. Young agreed, stating that the most similar organization to IFS for statewide student representation is the Oregon Student Association Board. He suggested the Board consider asking the OSA to recommend a representative to the Board. Dr. Richmond echoed Mr. Lussier’s suggestion that the president of IFS be the faculty representative on the Search Committee.

Mr. Willis indicated that he felt that there is already a cross section of representation on the Search Committee. He said he would not be opposed if the Board decides to expand participation to include a student representative or a faculty representative who are not members of the Board, but he felt the varied perspectives are present in the current makeup of the Committee.

Noting that the Governor designated positions on the Board to be representational, Ms. Watari felt that a student Board member should be appointed on the Committee. Chancellor Cox clarified that the Board will make the final decision and is present for all the meetings. Dr. Richmond pointed out that only the Search Committee members will have a vote during the elimination process and the other Board members will only have a voice in the final vote. Chancellor Cox noted that the process would proceed in the same way as presidential searches, and that everything will be done by consensus.
Mr. Willis explained that the most important thing is the discussion of candidates and the process that brings the right candidates before the Board, once again encouraging all Board members to participate in that process. Mr. Imeson asked for clarification that, for the purposes of deciding a quorum for the Search Committee, the Executive Committee will be counted, but for everything else, all Board members are invited to be participants in the process and the discussion. Ms. Lehmann expressed confidence that the process would be fair and that good people will be attracted to the position. However, Ms. Lehmann said that she was concerned with the appearance of external legitimacy, so that stakeholders view the search as viable and that they have ownership in it.

Mr. VanLuvanee cautioned that the discussion itself is of concern because of the perception of unfairness. He reiterated his belief that the process has been fair and open. Mr. Imeson concurred, adding that absolutely ensuring all kinds of involvement becomes too extraneous to the progress of the process.

Reiterating her earlier request that she or Mr. Young serve on the Search Committee, Ms. Watari argued that allowing someone to be present at a meeting isn’t the same as inviting them to sit at the table. Mr. Young agreed and suggested amending the IMD to include a student representative on the Search Committee. He stated that, were he on the Committee as the student representative, he would take his responsibility in that role very seriously.

Mr. Young moved and Ms. Watari seconded the motion to amend the IMD concerning the Chancellor’s search to expand the membership of the Search Committee to include the IFS president and one student representative of the State Board of Higher Education. As a point of order, Mr. Rawlins said that the IMD does not specify who will be on the Search Committee but rather, it states that the president has that authority. Mr. VanLuvanee clarified that the recommendation is to change the IMD at a later date.

Mr. VanLuvanee noted that the recommendation should go before the Board, adding that he was not in favor of it. He said he had no problem with the recommendation, but asked that Board members give the matter serious consideration, saying that it opens the door to an infinite number of constituencies wishing to be represented. He noted that it is the responsibility of the Search Committee to make a recommendation to the full Board. The final decision to appoint the Chancellor lies with the full Board.

Mr. Lussier said that he wasn’t necessarily for or against the recommendation as long as adequate representation is guaranteed. He expressed concern regarding possible quorum issues noting that, if they add two more individuals to the Committee, the requirements for assembling a quorum become higher.

Mr. Imeson stated that he will vote against the recommendation, arguing philosophical problems with slotted positions. He pointed out that a faculty member who is the representative of the IFS many not necessarily represent all faculty, and preferred to
have more outreach on the part of the current Committee members. Agreeing with Mr. VanLuvianee, Mr. Imeson said that slotting the Committee would invite future problems.

Mr. Young felt that, while past student representatives may have created problems, he has contributed much to this process because of his perspective and felt that, with regard to opening up to different constituencies, they could demonstrate very strongly that these are the two most involved, or greatest stakeholders in this issue. He argued that student perception drives the financing, at least in part, of the System, and felt that having a student representative on the Committee would not only be a good move symbolically, but that it would have a positive ripple effect.

Responding to Mr. Young’s statement regarding prior student representatives, Mr. Imeson made it clear that he has no problem with students being on the Board, pointing out that the legislature made that decision. Further, he stated that he wouldn’t have an objection to the recommendation to the Board president that he modify the makeup of the Search Committee to include an additional member from the Board who is a student, but that he would not support recommending a student from outside the Board.

Mr. Bassett observed that, if the decision is not to approve Mr. Young’s motion, it signals a need to look at the IMD and the question of participation in a way that allows the Committee itself some flexibility in how it fashions.

Chancellor Cox suggested that someone call the question. Ms. Watari asked to make an amendment to the motion to exclude the recommendation for a representative from IFS and to only recommend the student representative. Mr. Young accepted the amendment. Mr. VanLuvianee pointed out that a decision would have to go to the full Board for approval, as the meeting was of the Committee of the Whole.

Given the assurances about participation and full availability in both general and open sessions as well as confidential sessions, Mr. Lussier asked what might be achieved by putting a student on the Committee. Mr. Young responded that it would the formalization of a voice with the responsibility of a vote. Dr. Richmond expressed confidence that the students on the Board would provide valuable input whether or not they have a vote and noted that the consideration of top candidates would be presented as a recommendation by consensus.

Upon a roll call vote, the following voted in favor of the amended motion to add a student Board member to the Search Committee. Those voting in favor: Directors Bassett, Imeson, Lehmann, Richmond, Watari, Young. Those opposed: Directors Lussier, Willis, VanLuvianee.
Recommendations on a Search Firm

Chancellor Cox reported that Korn/Ferry International was selected to conduct the Chancellor’s search. Ira Krinsky, principal on the west coast, will act as the lead on the search.

Mr. Lussier moved and Ms. Lehmann second the motion to recommend to the Board the position announcement, as submitted, be authorized.

Following up on a concern expressed by Mr. Bassett regarding succinct environmental descriptions for potential candidates, Chancellor Cox assured the Board that Dr. Krinsky will be working on the position description and statement of expectations and will involve interviewing members of the Board and other constituencies.

Vice Chancellor Vines reminded the Board that there was a motion on the floor. Those voting in favor: Directors Bassett, Imeson, Lehmann, Lussier, Richmond, VanLuvianee, Watari, Willis, Young. Those opposed: none.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.