



## **Retreat of the Board of Trustees**

**Friday, January 8, 2016**

**12:00 - 5:00 p.m. (or until business concludes)**

**Higher Education Center, Medford Campus**

### **Minutes**

#### **Call to Order and Preliminary Business**

Chair Thorndike called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. He welcomed attendees to SOU's Medford campus, reiterated the importance of the process for selecting the next president of SOU, and praised the work of the Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee, which selected Parker Executive Search (Parker) to lead the search. Chair Thorndike thanked Jeanne Stallman, Leslie Burk, and Don Hill for their assistance in planning the retreat in Medford.

The following trustees were present: Bill Thorndike, April Sevcik, Les AuCoin, Filiberto Bencomo, Sheri Bodager, Lyn Hennion, Paul Nicholson, Teresa Sayre, Judy Shih, Dennis Slattery, Joanna Steinman, Steve Vincent and Shea Washington. Trustee Jeremy Nootenboom joined by teleconference.

Others meeting guests included: Sabrina Prud'homme, Board Secretary; Jason Catz, General Counsel; Janet Fratella, Vice President for Development; Marjorie Trueblood-Gamble, Director of Diversity and Inclusion; Craig Morris, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. Susan Walsh, Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs; Julie Raefield, Chief of Staff; Ryan Brown, Head of Community and Media Relations; Torii Uyehara, ASSOU President; Don Hill, Classroom and Media Services Manager; John Stevenson, IT User Support Manager; Kathy Park, Executive Assistant; Larry Shrewsbury, SOU; and David Coburn, OSA.

#### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **Review of Feedback from Listening Session and Survey; Discussion of Future Sessions**

Trustee Sevcik summarized feedback from the SOU Foundation Board meeting that she and Trustee Hennion attended. A variety of comments were noted from the foundation trustees. Joe Cox, a former SOU president, said the SOU Board and

search committee were going to work around the clock; he suggested looking for a person with the right chemistry and temperament to make it work. Other trustees' comments referenced team building, connecting with constituencies, ability to raise money, a passion for education, talent for business, candidates with diverse backgrounds, inclusiveness, a strong backbone, having a "thick skin" and finding a "rising star." It was further noted that SOU needs to look deeply into candidates' backgrounds to ensure they have solid track records. Trustee Hennion added feedback she heard about the importance of individual qualifications and academic requirements. The comments she shared mirrored those the board and Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee discussed previously: a candidate who is inclusive, thoughtful, respectful, considerate and kind. The foundation board wants the very best for the university and noted the wonderful things President Saigo has done in the short amount of time he has been at SOU and looking forward was encouraged.

Sabrina Prud'homme provided feedback from the survey that was sent during the first week of December to all students, faculty and staff who had SOU email accounts. The timing was not ideal as the time was close to the end of the semester. However, the survey was open the whole month, closing on December 31. Ms. Prud'homme discussed most frequently occurring themes found in responses. The 211 who completed the survey were divided almost equally between students, faculty and staff. After an in-depth review of answers to each of the survey questions, much discussion ensued among trustees.

Torii Uyehara mentioned the high level of interest among the students in getting more engaged, especially with the board. She said the board has reached out to her in a great way and she needed to communicate that more to students. She affirmed the results of the survey were reflective of the student body.

Trustee AuCoin expressed concern about the repeated mention of the schism between employees and administration and asked what the trustees needed to know about that issue. Ms. Prud'homme mentioned that the survey was administered during faculty negotiations, which may have impacted the answers. Mr. Morris said it could also be a by-product of the faculty's vote of "no confidence" two years ago and acknowledged that there is still some healing that needs to take place. The new president will need to bring the entire institution together as a team. Trustee Slattery concurred, adding that the issues are long in their formation and it will take a while to work them all out. Trustee Steinman added that the seemingly-nonstop negotiations for classified staff make them feel as if they are not valued. Sometimes people do not take advantage of the opportunities to really know what is going on around campus and may feel negatively about what the administration is doing without understanding what is going on. The new president will need to reach out and be genuine in the efforts to bring people together.

Concluding the item, the trustees' responses also were discussed and were similar to those of the other campus constituencies. Subtle differences included the addition of: identifying and exploiting SOU's unique competitive advantage; growth in enrollment and for SOU in general; putting SOU "on the map" and restoring its glory; and enhancing the status of SOU in the academic world and in the region.

Chair Thorndike introduced the members of Parker, Laurie Wilder, Porsha Williams and Erin Raines. Ms. Wilder provided background information on the firm and its areas of practice. Ms. Wilder is the President of the firm, Ms. Williams is the Vice President of Higher Education and Ms. Raines is a firm associate. Ms. Wilder expressed that the firm is thrilled that SOU is doing this search from a developmental stage and has not already made major decisions.

### **Review of Policies and Appointment of Search Coordinator**

Chair Thorndike described that previous presidents were [appointed] under the Oregon University System. The universities have inherited some practices, policies and government regulations on how to conduct a presidential search.

Jason Catz thought it was best to conduct a search, then develop policies for the next search and apply lessons learned. Much of his discussion was regarding the Executive Searches, Appointments, and Management policy inherited from the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE), specifically, Section E, on selecting and appointing an institution president. He noted that the board retains the sole responsibility for the selection and appointment of the institution president; the board chair has been delegated authority to initiate the search; and a search committee will assist with identifying, recruiting and evaluating candidates.

Trustee Nicholson asked why the Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee was regarded as a public body but the Presidential Search Committee is not. Mr. Catz explained that if the whole board were reviewing all the applications gathered by Parker, then there would be a quorum of the board, the board would be doing the university's work and it would be accomplished in a public meeting. The ad hoc committee was comprised of board members and was doing the university's work. However, the Presidential Search Committee is operating by virtue of delegated authority and does not constitute a public body.

Mr. Catz next discussed the search committee composition as required by ORS 352.096. It must include representatives of the university community and one president of another Oregon public university. According to the OSBHE policy, a current board member will serve as the chair of the committee. The search committee cannot include a quorum of any other committee of the board. For this

reason, Mr. Catz recommended ending the ad hoc committee if multiple members of that committee were going to serve on the Presidential Search Committee.

The OSBHE policy contemplates a non-voting, ex officio appointee to the search committee, a senior employee of the chancellor's office, to serve as the coordinator of the search and drive much of the work to come out of the committee. The policy also requires the appointment of a campus-based search coordinator as the administrative point of contact; in one of SOU's previous searches, Treasa Sprague filled that role. There is latitude in how these two positions are filled and they can be filled by the same person or by two different people.

After the search committee identifies candidates, it recommends an unranked group of finalists to the chair. The chair is tasked with interviewing the finalists and can narrow the field of finalists after discussing it with the search committee. The chair is authorized to rank the candidates to the board. The board then interviews the finalists in executive session and, hopefully, makes a decision and the chair negotiates the terms and conditions of employment with the candidate. Given time constraints, Mr. Catz said it would be appropriate for the board to list the first and second choice and give the chair authority to negotiate a contract with either, in case the first choice falls through.

The board must provide the Governor or her designee the name of the selected candidate. Ms. Prud'homme confirmed with the Governor's policy advisor that a telephone call with the selected candidate would suffice as the required consultation. Trustee AuCoin said he spoke to Governor Brown and her view is that she respects the devolution of responsibility to the governing boards. He believes she will support whatever decision the board makes.

Trustee Hennion moved that, be it understood, all references to "Chancellor" appearing in the Oregon State Board of Higher Education board policy on Executive Searches and Management are interpreted as "Board Chair" for the purposes of Southern Oregon University's Board of Trustees' presidential search. Also in accordance with the Oregon State Board of Higher Education board policy on Executive Searches, Appointments and Management, she further moved that the Board Chair appoint Sabrina Prud'homme as the Coordinator of SOU's 2016 Presidential Search. As an employee of the Office of the Board of Trustees, as the Board Secretary, Sabrina Prud'homme will serve as a coordinator and a non-voting, ex officio member of the committee.

Trustee Nicholson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Chair Thorndike clarified that this appointment is combining the two positions required by the OSBHE policy. The expectation is this will be a heavy lift, adding to Ms.

Prud'homme's duties and the board may need to allocate resources or budget support to assist her. Given Treasa Sprague's prior experience with presidential searches, Craig Morris offered her support to Ms. Prud'homme during the search.

### **Development of Presidential Search Committee Composition**

Ms. Wilder then led Parker's presentation noting that listening sessions are critical to the success of the search. Parker wants to include every constituency group, will ask questions, then listen. The search firm will bring information to the search committee and ultimately to the board. She stressed the point that Parker's goal is to produce the most detailed, broadest, diverse pool of candidates possible, not select SOU's next president.

Trustee Steinman noted there are two types of staff: classified and unclassified. The listening sessions should include representatives from both groups.

Ms. Wilder strongly believes board members need to be a part of the search committee composition because the board makes the final decision. She recommended the smallest composition possible without excluding appropriate constituency groups. A search committee in excess of 18-25 people loses the ability to move, get a consensus and spend time together, and divisions become more common. She recommended including faculty, staff, students, community members (alumni or community residents) and an Oregon public university president.

Trustee Shih questioned the groups the two faculty and staff trustees represent and how that impacts the search committee composition. Ms. Wilder said those trustees bring the perspective of the group they are a member of but they also have to act in accordance with what is good for the board and university. However, the number of faculty and staff representatives on the search committee should not be decreased even if one of those trustees is on the committee.

Trustee AuCoin added that the administration needed to be represented adequately but not to the exclusion of the unclassified staff. Trustee Nicholson questioned the appropriateness for members of the president's cabinet to serve on the search committee when they will ultimately be choosing their own boss. Ms. Wilder said that is often the practice in higher education and it is good to have the cabinet's insight. Answering a question about the creation of a separate, ad hoc, advisory committee, Ms. Wilder advised against creating such a committee in addition to the search committee.

Responding to Trustee Hennion's question about whether the number of community members should be increased, Ms. Wilder said that would not be necessary because the board members are viewed as community members and a balance needs to be maintained between the constituency groups represented on the committee.

Trustee Nootenboom commented that he thought it was important to have more student representation. He thought three students would be appropriate, one undergraduate who will be at SOU for a while, one experienced undergraduate and one graduate. Ms. Uyehara agreed with Trustee Nootenboom's suggestion. However, if the board selected two students, she suggested having a student who has been on campus long enough to understand the campus and community culture and another student who will be around for another two years. She offered her assistance in identifying possible student representatives for consideration.

Chair Thorndike talked about two groups with whom SOU has had a long history: Osher Lifelong Learning Institute and Jefferson Public Radio. He asked about the best way to involve them in the search. Ms. Wilder said the listening sessions will reach certain pockets of people and the search committee will need to ensure all are included when developing the groups to include in the sessions. In assembling the search committee, the board also needs to be politically astute. She recommended identifying who the key people are then determine how to make them a part of the committee. Highly regarded and trustworthy should be the primary qualities so that when people see the name, they need to think the person was a good choice.

Chair Thorndike's hope was to leave the retreat with the trustee members of the committee determined. He wanted to have the other interest groups provide a list of candidates for the board to consider and appoint at the January 22 meeting.

Trustee AuCoin mentioned that he has been involved in two presidential searches at his alma mater. One failed and one succeeded. In the one that failed, when they chose from constituent groups, each of the representatives of the groups were designated "hitters" for those groups, rather than acting as a collective body wearing a single institutional hat. He thought this was an important consideration in selecting individuals to serve on the committee. Ms. Wilder agreed with this sentiment. Trustee Slattery clarified the role of the faculty and staff members who are serving on the board noting that he and Trustee Steinman were selected because of their status as faculty and staff, respectively. However, they are not representatives of those groups and their loyalty is to the board.

Speaking as the acting human resources director, Mr. Morris said that when a search committee is formed for any position on campus, they would first identify the search committee composition but would not put it out to the campus for a vote on how the people would be selected. Instead, the search chair and hiring authority would sit down and select the people to fill the slots on the search committee. His recommendation would be that the trustees follow this approach, select a chair for the search committee, and the chair would work with the group organized by the

board to select other members based on what they bring to the table to complement the search. SOU requires diverse representation among the search committee members and Ms. Wilder also stressed the importance of that.

Chair Thorndike advised the group that Dr. Chris Maples, the president at OIT, volunteered to serve on the search committee. He was the presidential representative on the EOU and WOU searches. Dr. Maples is a long-serving president of an Oregon institution. Chair Thorndike thought Dr. Maples would be a tremendous resource for the committee. Trustee Vincent concurred.

Complimenting her work as the chair of the ad hoc committee, Trustee Nicholson moved that Trustee Hennion serve as the chair of the Presidential Search Committee. Trustee Sevcik seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The board then discussed which other trustees should serve on the search committee. The trustees' consensus was that Trustee Nicholson should serve as the vice chair and Trustees Slattery, Sayre and Washington should serve as committee members. Chair Thorndike took the consensus under due advisement and after additional discussion appointed those trustees to serve on the committee.

Trustee AuCoin moved to sunset the Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee. Trustee Sevcik seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Trustee Hennion then recognized Torii Uyehara as the student member of the Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee, complimented her commitment and contributions, and looks forward to Ms. Uyehara's continuing work during the search process.

Chair Thorndike gave Dr. Walsh an opportunity to offer her perspective on how she would envision creating the most unity around this work going forward. Dr. Walsh said the key for the faculty who serve on the committee is they represent a good cross section of the faculty and they need to engender a lot of trust and support from a breadth of the faculty. Dr. Walsh offered her help in any way needed.

Trustee AuCoin reiterated the point made on other occasions regarding the continued effort to integrate the agendas of the SOU Foundation Board and the governing board, hoping one of the search committee members would be from the SOU Foundation Board. Janet Fratella agreed with Trustee AuCoin's comments. Chair Thorndike added that they should review the MOU between the entities in light of the new governing structure to determine if it needs to be revised. Ms. Fratella said the MOU is reviewed annually by the Foundation Board and it was amended last June, with Mr. Catz's assistance.

Trustee Hennion requested clarification on the appointment process, to make it as expeditious as possible. A form was circulated during the meeting to solicit ideas for committee members from trustees and administration. Trustee Hennion will coordinate with Chair Thorndike and the search committee to come up with the right mix. Mr. Catz opined that would be appropriate as long as the newly appointed committee did not meet with Chair Thorndike about the committee composition.

Trustee Slattery pointed out that external group representation could be maximized if they chose a member who was both a community member and an alumnus. Trustee Hennion would like to see an at-large community member who does not necessarily have any connection to SOU but has experience in the area and has been on other search committees.

Trustee Sevcik moved that the SOU Board of Trustees authorize the creation of a Presidential Search Committee to engage in organizing and executing all relevant and applicable aspects of the search for and recruitment of candidates for the position of SOU's next president. The Presidential Search Committee shall exist until a new president is hired for Southern Oregon University or until the board determines there is no longer a need for the committee. The duration of the committee shall not exceed a period of one year from the date of its authorization, unless reauthorized by the board.

She further moved that, in consultation with the SOU Board of Trustees, the board chair shall appoint the following new members to the search committee at the next regular meeting of the board. Composition will be in accordance with all relevant policies and reflect the following structure: four to five SOU trustees; three faculty members; two SOU students; two SOU staff members; one to two at-large community members; and one president of another public university in Oregon. Trustee Sevcik added that the board Chair has already appointed the SOU trustee members of the committee and a board member to serve as the chair of the committee. The committee will be staffed by the Search Coordinator.

In discussion of the motion before voting, Trustee Nicholson expressed concern over being so proscriptive in terms of the numbers for each represented group. Trustee Sevcik said the committee composition could be amended later and Chair Thorndike added that including the numbers now lets interested parties know what the board thinks the numbers of representatives from each group should be.

There being no further discussion, Trustee AuCoin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.



## **Development of Leadership and Institutional Profile**

Ms. Wilder advised the board that the search firm will develop the job description, based on input from the board and listening sessions. Shortly thereafter, the search committee will need to publish an institutional profile (job description). In developing the profile, the committee needs to distinguish between required and preferred qualifications, as having too many required qualifications can quickly eliminate some good candidates. She said the job description is more of an announcement tool than a recruiting tool.

The firm identified characteristics that are commonly sought, which reflect those mentioned in SOU's survey. The trustees then described what they want to see in the next president: among other qualifications, someone who understands the role of the board, wants to be a colleague of the board and wants to work together; a leader who will make SOU a responsive academy; someone who understands the state's new rules on resource allocation and can be responsive to the demographic changes; and a problem solver.

In response to questions from Trustee Washington, Ms. Wilder said SOU board's sets the direction on what type of candidates—traditional versus non-traditional—should be recruited. She recommends keeping options open. She added that non-traditional candidates can be from the corporate sector but also from outside the typical trajectory in higher education (e.g., law school dean, vice president of economic development or a dean of business). The search firm sells the position at the “30,000 foot level,” not at the nuts and bolts level. Having a new board needs to be sold as an opportunity.

Trustee Hennion reminded the board that they will receive several applications as soon as the position is announced and that many will be eliminated. The search firm needs to recruit aggressively and find people who are looking for the best next step for themselves and it is the firm's job to sell SOU. Ms. Wilder added that SOU needs someone with a vision, who will be successful and not leave after two years. As candidates are brought in, Trustee Bodager wondered about the alignment between the board's understanding and direction for SOU versus that of the faculty and students. She does not think SOU is in a place as an organization where clarity exists on that. When candidates come in and speak to different constituents, they may hear different directions. Ms. Wilder said that would be okay and that candidates would understand.

Trustee Sayre said that some of the desired traits need to be further defined. For example, a candidate can have a vision but it might not fit the institution. She would add problem solver to the list.

Trustee Steinman described the change fatigue that exists on campus. New

leadership with new ideas comes in and people get excited and then the leadership is gone. And the cycle repeats. There is a tension between needing to move forward—as an institution—with a new vision and not veering wildly before the administration is on board. She thought SOU needed a leader who can bring people along and build consensus but still make hard decisions. SOU needs to trust that person, to know that the institution is being led responsibly and in the right direction.

Trustee AuCoin shared his belief that developing a strategic vision is the number one job for the board and the new president. He asked how they would prepare a mission statement for recruiting a new president when that individual will be working with the board to create that strategic mission statement. Ms. Wilder explained that is why the institution profile is generic in nature. SOU needs someone who wants to talk about what SOU's future should look like, striking a balance between someone who says "This is the way we should do it" versus "I will need two years to understand the institution before moving the needle." It is all about chemistry, style and fit. She has to rely on the search committee to be the voice to let the search firm know who will work and who is not the right fit.

Chair Thorndike asked Ms. Wilder for her opinion on involving a psychologist to assist with interviews. Not dismissing their value, she said candidates do not like it in higher education. Those reports can be public records and we do not want to add another hurdle to the search process.

Trustee Hennion stressed the need to make sure the board knows what it is looking for in the next president because she feels they will get what they ask for. She then asked if there was agreement on whether SOU was a regional public liberal arts university and whether this was the time to have a discussion on that issue. The consensus was that the board does not need to decide that point, that they are looking for the person who will help find that answer.

### **General Discussion Regarding Search Process and Considerations**

The trustees and the Parker representatives discussed open and closed searches. In open searches, Ms. Wilder said there is a lot of feedback from the constituencies but it limits the pool of candidates because sitting university presidents probably would not apply. SOU would still get good candidates but some would be excluded. Open searches are used most often by institutions similar in size to SOU. Ms. Wilder recommended bringing four candidates to campus for final interviews.

Ms. Wilder said closed searches usually generate a broader pool of candidates because their identity is never publicly exposed. The candidates meet with the search committee then the board; they never publicly visit the campus. There is no

opportunity for campus feedback and oftentimes there is no campus buy-in. This can make the transition harder for the new president. Closed searches are usually used by large Association of American Universities public research institutions.

After a discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of both open and closed searches, Trustee Nicholson moved that the search committee move forward with an open search. Trustee Washington seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Projected Timeline and Search Activities/Milestones**

Parker will launch the search with listening sessions with the constituency groups. Ms. Wilder strongly encouraged trustees, as the ultimate decision makers, to sit in on the listening sessions because it sends a message about the board. Trustee Vincent recommended giving Ms. Prud'homme a list of constituent groups or individuals the trustees thought should be included in the listening sessions.

After the listening sessions are held, Parker will develop a draft position description quickly, as the position cannot be advertised until the description is formalized. Advertisements are primarily for announcement purposes and to meet human resources requirements but are not where candidates will be developed.

Identifying and recruiting candidates is where the majority of the search occurs and takes place with multiple steps--one is campus nominations, another piece is Parker's original research. Ms. Wilder challenged the trustees to consider candidates with career paths other than being provosts and to consider a diverse pool of candidates. She listed some of the challenges facing the search: the market is saturated; there is a war for talent in higher education; location is always a plus or a minus; and jobs for trailing spouses or partners.

Chair Thorndike pointed out it is very likely that congressmen or senators will visit the new president a couple of times each year. He guessed this would not be true for a lot of presidents of small universities in other states. Ms. Wilder thought being able to have this type of impact would be very appealing to some candidates.

Ms. Wilder reviewed milestones and process. She said committee members will be updated throughout the process through a secure website and will have access to all candidate information. A good pool would be 10-15 applicants that the committee really needed to discuss and narrow to 8-10. She recommended the first round of interviews be confidential but that will be up to the search committee. Then the committee will decide who they want to bring to campus. Those candidates will be brought to campus quickly so we do not lose a good candidate. Trustee Nicholson stressed that, as a board, they do expect to meet with the finalists. Ms. Wilder

confirmed that was the intended process—that the board would review campus feedback and interview all four candidates at the end of the week of the campus visits. Mr. Catz added that this is also required by OSBHE policy.

Ms. Wilder strongly recommended against selecting a candidate then negotiating with him or her because the board would have lost all leverage. The search firm would have already discussed the parameters of compensation with the four finalists before they come to SOU for interviews.

Ms. Wilder addressed some of the milestones and the timeline for conducting the search. Following the listening sessions, the recruitment phase would be from February to mid-April. The search committee will be engaged with the search firm during that time period; for example, the firm will provide messages it wants sent to the broader constituency groups for recommendations and nominations. The committee will receive all candidate material in late April, along with the search firm's recommendation on the top 10-15 candidates. The initial interviews would be in the early part of May. The on-campus interviews of the four finalists would be in mid-May, at which time a decision should be made. The expectation is the selected candidate could start on July 1.

Responding to Chair Thorndike's question about handling committee members who want to do their own reference checking, Ms. Wilder said they will request the committee members to not conduct their own checks because it will violate the search firm's promise of confidentiality to the candidates. If there are issues of concern publicly, they will be discovered during the search firm's vetting process and included in the materials provided to the committee. There is a concern with committee members Googling a candidate, discovering information that cannot be used in making a hiring decision (e.g., race or sexual orientation) and letting that come in as a decision-making factor.

Ms. Wilder told the non-search committee trustees that they need to trust the committee to do its job. Although the full board should be engaged during the search process, it cannot become the search committee. Responding to Trustee Washington's question about the Parker resources that will be dedicated to SOU's search, Ms. Wilder said the three members present will be highly engaged, in addition to a technology manager and the firm's research team.

Ms. Wilder discussed the compensation that will be offered to the next president. She understood it is in the range with Oregon's other regional universities but is lower than other Oregon institutions that have recently conducted presidential searches. She strongly believed it has to be at the same level. She encouraged the board to include the topic on its agenda for the next board meeting, to shape up what the package will look like and what is the maximum that can be paid. It is

critical for the search firm to know the maximum amount of compensation so they do not recruit someone the university cannot afford. Trustee Nicholson mentioned the presidential compensation at EOU and WOU last year; adding the 3 percent for cost of living increases brings the amount to what he thought was the floor for SOU's compensation and that it might need to be higher than that. Based on discussions he had with Mr. Morris, SOU could afford compensation in that range but they must be very aware of the repercussions if the amount were higher. Ms. Wilder stressed the need to set the compensation range at the outset, to avoid the appearance that the selected candidate requested an increase in salary. She recommended a salary range that would not put SOU at the high end nor at the very low end.

She concluded the meeting by advising the board against falling in love with a candidate and ignoring the candidate's background. That is often the biggest mistake boards make. It is critical to look at the totality of the background, take it into consideration and listen to the feedback received.

Noting there will be several communications that need to be sent to campus throughout the search process, Ms. Prud'homme obtained the board's concurrence on having the chair of the search committee and the chair of the board sign off on communications for expediency.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further discussion, Chair Thorndike adjourned the meeting at 4:56 p.m.

Date: February 18, 2016

Respectfully submitted by,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sabrina Prud'homme". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Sabrina Prud'homme  
University Board Secretary