Committee Chair Sandra Anderson called the meeting to order at 10:10 am. Others participating in the meeting were Trustee Dewire, Student Trustees Gerthoffer and Kelly, and Interim Board Secretary Davis.

Trustee Anderson reviewed the process by which the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation was developed including analysis of collected information and data and consideration of advice received from consultation with Dr. Bob Woodbury, AGB consultant. Areas reviewed included:

- Review of Board Role and Authority (in the Presidential Evaluation Process)
- History of Presidential Evaluation Process and Existing Policies and Practices
- Policies and Practices of other Institutions
- AGB Recommendations and Illustrative Policies
- Input from Constituent Groups

Upon completion of the review, and after incorporating several suggestions for additions and clarifications in the draft Report, all Ad Hoc Committee members agreed that the Report was an accurate and comprehensive reflection of the committee’s work and process.

The ad hoc committee members then focused on the Proposed Board Policy for Annual and Comprehensive Presidential Performance Reviews. Trustee Dewire suggested that language in the first section be clarified to indicate that the purpose of the presidential performance review is to enable the president to strengthen his or her performance in meeting goals and serving the mission of the university. The committee agreed to make this clarification.

Discussion focused on the proposed wording concerning how often a comprehensive review should be conducted. Trustee Dewire suggested that the policy reflect that the comprehensive review be conducted in the year prior to the end of the contract or earlier as the board in its discretion may determine is needed. There was consensus on this suggestion.
Discussion also focused upon the degree of external involvement in the annual review. Student Trustee Kelly suggested that the ad hoc committee consider ways to involve interested constituent groups, particularly students, in the review process. Committee Chair Anderson indicated that, under the language of the proposed policy, the board has the discretion to solicit the informed views of others within and outside of the institution in fulfilling their review responsibilities. In addition, the proposed policy expressly states that the annual and comprehensive reviews are in addition to regular and ongoing communication that should take place between the president, the board, university constituencies and other stakeholders in support of Ohio University’s mission. Trustee Anderson pointed out that the proposed policy actually expands the involvement of external constituents in the comprehensive reviews even more so than has been the case in recent years. Trustee Anderson stated that the proposed policy is more open and inclusive than that of any other university in Ohio and any of our peer institutions, and that communication is important with stakeholders, including students and faculty, on many subjects other than presidential review. For this reason, the board has already expanded its efforts to meet directly with students, faculty and deans in connection with every board meeting.

In response to Trustee Kelly’s suggestion, the committee agreed to add language to the proposed policy with respect to the annual review – namely, that the executive committee is encouraged to consult with other trustees, including the student trustees, to obtain information that will assist in the annual review.

The committee discussed the different purposes of the annual and comprehensive reviews, and the recommendations of the AGB and Dr. Woodbury about those differences – for example, soliciting the views of only certain stakeholders in the annual review is not fair to excluded stakeholders, whereas soliciting the views of all stakeholders during every annual review is no different from conducting a continuous comprehensive review, which Dr. Woodbury warned would be impractical and disruptive to the university’s best interest in serving its mission.

Committee members addressed the point in time that the annual and comprehensive reviews should be initiated. Trustee Dewire suggested that the presidential review process should state no later than March 1 of each year, and the other members agreed to make this change. The question was raised as to the impact of the evaluation to be conducted for President McDavis this year; however, it was decided that the two issues should be considered separately by the board.

The committee members all agreed that a consensus exists relative to the content and recommended modifications made to the proposed policy. Trustee Anderson agreed to consult with the Office of Legal Affairs to make any changes necessary to comply with Ohio law and then to circulate the revised Report and proposed policy by January 10 for final committee comment before submission to the full Board for consideration at the February 8th Board meeting.

Submitted,