Trustee Anderson called the meeting to order at 8:45 am. She reviewed the Ad Hoc committee’s charge and offered a brief overview of materials that the committee has read and reviewed in preparation for the first two meetings.

Trustee Anderson introduced Dr. Robert Woodbury, consultant with the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). Dr. Woodbury offered a brief overview of his experience and background. He has served as chancellor of the University of Maine system, as a university president, and as a member of two boards of trustees. He described his work in more than 25 states as a participant in presidential evaluations. He discussed the extensive research and modeling undertaken by AGB in the area of presidential evaluation and described how AGB has led the way in framing best practices on the subject.

Dr. Woodbury offered an overview of models that he believed are considered the standard within public higher education. In addition, he framed his comments around documents published by AGB, including a booklet entitled “Annual Presidential Performance Reviews,” which addresses considerations to be made in conducting annual presidential evaluations. He reported that the annual review should be a Board function, which is typically framed around the president’s goals statement and self-assessment. The Board Chair and/or a committee of the Board of Trustees typically conducts the annual evaluation. He emphasized the importance of frank interaction during the process, and highlighted the importance of confidentiality to encourage frank and open discussion between the Board members and the president.

Dr. Woodbury also discussed recommended procedures for a comprehensive evaluation, which should take place every five to seven years, depending up on the contract cycle of the president. He referred to an AGB resource entitled “Presidential and Board Assessment in Higher Education: Purposes, Policies, and Strategies.” He presented a list of recommendations for a comprehensive presidential evaluation. He indicated that such evaluations should include input from such constituents as faculty, staff, students, alumni, community members, foundation board members, and at times elected officials or state education officials.

Dr. Woodbury explained that the primary purpose of such evaluations is to improve presidential performance.
Trustee Anderson asked a question concerning confidentiality vs. transparency in the process of presidential evaluation. Dr. Woodbury indicated that confidentiality promotes candor whereas transparency can inhibit frank discussion and actually work against the purposes to be served in the performance evaluation.

Involvement of shared governance must be considered in the presidential evaluation process. Dr. Woodbury referred to an AAUP position paper on shared governance which addresses the unique roles served by each constituent group within the institution. He noted that shared governance does not follow either a corporate model or a democratic model. Trustee Anderson also referred to a recent article published in the Trusteeship journal addressing shared governance.

Trustee Anderson presented and reviewed a written summary on the policies and practices at seven universities within Ohio on presidential evaluation – namely, Bowling Green, Cleveland State, Kent State, Miami, University of Cincinnati, Wright State, and Youngstown State.

Student Trustee Kelly distributed a packet of materials that she had solicited from the leaders of five constituent groups on campus – namely, the faculty senate, graduate student senate, undergraduate senate, administrative senate, and classified senate. She had asked the presidents of each group to offer their thoughts and impressions concerning their group’s role in the presidential evaluation process. Student Trustee Kelly offered her view of the importance of having input from various groups on campus that are impacted by the decisions made by the president. She felt strongly that the constitutions should be permitted and encouraged to continue to submit feedback as a part of the presidential evaluation process. She asked that the committee members read the materials and offer feedback at the next committee meeting. Trustee Anderson thanked Student Trustee Kelly for her work, and encouraged the committee members to read and consider the materials that were submitted.

Trustee Anderson proposed that, as chair of the committee, she would be willing to develop a draft policy that would consider the materials that have been gathered and reviewed by the committee. The committee members all agreed that this would be a good next step. The committee members decided to hold their next meeting on January 3rd at the Ohio University Pickerington Center from 10 am to 1:00 pm. At that time, they hope to come to a consensus on a policy and report to be submitted to the full Board of Trustees for consideration at its February 8th meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am.