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Minutes

Committee Members: Chair Paul Kelly, Allyn Ford, Rosemary Powers, Kirk Schueler, and David Yaden. Other Board members in attendance: Hannah Fisher.

Campus representatives present included: President Ed Ray (OSU); Provosts Brad Burda (OIT) and Jim Bean (UO); Liz Shelby (SOU), Vice President Mark Weiss (WOU), Lois Davis (PSU), and Joel Alexander (IFS).

OUS Staff: Chancellor George Pernsteiner, Sona Andrews, Bridget Burns, Jack Isselmann, Jay Kenton, Jan Lewis, Patricia Snopkowski, Marcia Stuart, and Charles Triplett.

Others: Jon Barbur and Leslie Lehmann.

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.

Meeting materials are available at:
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc110321-GPC.pdf
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 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**

Chair Kelly adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.