



OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

## Public Meeting Notice

November 25, 2015

TO: Southern Oregon University Board of Trustees, Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee

FROM: Sabrina Prud'homme, University Board Secretary

RE: Notice of Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

The Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee of the Southern Oregon University Board of Trustees will hold a regular meeting on the date and at the location set forth below.

Topics of the meeting will include a review of Request for Quotes for selecting an executive search firm, to be held in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f). A discussion of next steps will follow.

The meeting will occur as follows:

Friday, December 4, 2015

2:00 pm to 4:00 pm (or until business concludes)

Hannon Library, DeBoer Boardroom, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room #303

The Hannon Library is located at 1290 Ashland Street, on the campus of Southern Oregon University. **If special accommodations are required, please contact Kathy Park at (541) 552-8055 at least 72 hours in advance.**



**Board of Trustees  
Presidential Search Ad-hoc Committee Meeting  
December 04, 2015**



**Board of Trustees  
Presidential Search Ad-hoc Committee**

**Friday, December 04, 2015  
2:00 – 4:00 p.m. (or until business concludes)  
DeBoer Room, Hannon Library**

**AGENDA**

Persons wishing to participate during the public comment period shall sign up at the meeting.  
Please note: times are approximate and items may be taken out of order.

- |           |          |   |   |
|-----------|----------|---|---|
|           | <b>1</b> | <b>Call to Order and Preliminary Business</b>   | Chair Hennion                               |
|           | 1.1      | Welcome and opening remarks   |   |
|           | 1.2      | Agenda review   |   |
|           | 1.3      | Roll call   | Sabrina Prud'homme,<br>SOU, Board Secretary |
|           | 1.4      | Consent Agenda: Approval of Minutes from<br>November 11, 2015 Meeting   | Chair Hennion                               |
|           | <b>2</b> | <b>Public Comment</b>   |   |
| ~110 min. | <b>3</b> | <b>Review of Request for Quotes for Selecting<br/>an Executive Search Firm [Executive<br/>Session Pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(f)]</b> | Chair Hennion                               |
| ~ 10 min. | <b>4</b> | <b>Discussion of Next Steps</b>   | Chair Hennion                               |
|           | <b>5</b> | <b>Adjourn</b>  | Chair Hennion                               |

# Call to Order and Preliminary Business



**Board of Trustees  
Presidential Search Ad Hoc Committee**

**Wednesday, November 11, 2015  
4:00 – 6:00 p.m. (or until business concludes)  
DeBoer Room, Hannon Library**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Call to Order and Preliminary Business**

Chair Lyn Hennion called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

**Roll Call**

The following committee members were present: Trustees Lyn Hennion, Sheri Bodager, Dennis Slattery and ASSOU President Torii Uyehara. Trustee Paul Nicholson participated by teleconference. Board Chair, Bill Thorndike and Vice Chair, April Sevcik also were present.

Others in attendance included: Jason Catz, General Counsel; Sabrina Prud'homme, Board Secretary; Ryan Brown, Head of Community and Media Relations; John Stevenson, IT User Support Manager; Don Hill, Classroom and Media Services Manager; Janet Fratella, Vice President for Development; Lisa Garcia-Hanson, Associate Vice President for Enrollment and Retention; Kathy Park, Executive Assistant; David Coburn, OSA; Jay Zheng, The Siskiyou; Kylan deVries, SOU; and Roxane Beigel-Coryell, SOU. Dr. Tom Courtice, Managing Principal at the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) and Craig Morris, Vice President for Finance and Administration, participated by teleconference.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Discussion of Process for Developing Search Criteria for Future SOU President**

Chair Hennion opened the meeting with a reading from “A Complete Guide to Presidential Search for Universities and Colleges,” published by AGB, and stressed how crucial it was to get the selection right. She asked for ideas on how best to develop a list of search criteria to use as a starting point at the January retreat. Trustee Slattery recommended identifying the major stakeholders and then have listening sessions or focus groups with them. The focus groups would work as teams and get input from the stakeholders on what they would like to see in a president. This would ensure their input in the process early and often. The committee identified the following stakeholders: students, faculty, staff, administrators, parents, alumni and business communities.

Ms. Uyehara recommended holding listening sessions at a variety of times for students and recommended identifying different facets of campus by divisions or leadership groups to engage students.

Trustee Slattery believed that all faculty members would want to be involved in the process. He suggested discussing the issue at Advisory Committee for Faculty Senate and recommended Marjorie Trueblood-Gamble's involvement and assistance with coordinating groups to ensure diverse input.

Board Chair Thorndike recommended asking each group two questions: What is the SOU story from their perspective? And, what are the attributes and criteria they want in a leader to move SOU forward? He cited an opportunity to get a richer story about SOU, which would create a better opportunity for the "marriage arrangers" to find the right person for the position. Chair Hennion agreed and expressed concern about individuals who may monopolize time such that all interested parties couldn't express themselves.

Chair Hennion suggested Trustee Steinman help to get input from the staff. Ms. Fratella indicated the alumni association could help and she would also ask that the SOU Foundation Board have an opportunity to offer their comments. To gain parent input, Lisa Garcia-Hanson offered SOU's January preview event as a method to connect with prospective parents. Using SOU's Facebook page and recommendations from the Provost's office were suggested for gaining input from the parents of current students.

Chair Hennion believed the committee should develop some basic ideas, gather input from stakeholders and go to the trustee retreat in January to vet the information. Trustee Nicholson believed it wise to get input from stakeholders but was concerned that attempts to be open and inclusive may make it difficult to meet the January timeline. He suggested that opportunities run parallel to the work of the committee, board and search firm.

Mr. Catz recommended the search firm help craft the selection criteria at the January retreat, noting that January 8 is not the end of the process but really the beginning and there will be continued opportunity for input. There may be feedback to gather from stakeholders between now and January 8 and the committee can coalesce that with what the search firm brings to the table. The trustees can come from the retreat with an idea of what the job posting looks like but can continue to gather information on desired qualities and attributes as the search process moves forward.

Chair Hennion said they cannot please everybody, but the important thing is to give everyone the opportunity to provide opinions and listen to the voices. A discussion ensued on ways to obtain input from stakeholders including: email; Facebook; listening sessions; and survey tools. The board's collective email address can receive certain written feedback and a small ad hoc group can vet and condense the input.

Chair Hennion mentioned the previous survey and suggested doing another one like it.

Ms. Uyehara added that students may not respond to email messages and asked if there were other methods of reaching students outside of SOU. Ms. Prud'homme informed the committee that a past board survey contacted only "@sou.edu" email addresses. However, it could be programmed to include all recipients who receive the clickable link. Mr. Catz saw no legal issues as long as all the responses were maintained internally.

Chair Hennion wanted the survey drafted soon. She hoped to have a few opportunities to meet with some of the stakeholder groups before the term break and distribute the survey.

"The Complete Guide to Presidential Search for Universities and Colleges" presented four ways to look at the desired qualities in a president: academic, manager, fundraiser or community connector. Trustee Nicholson suggested focusing the responses to somehow rate those areas in order of importance. Chair Hennion and Trustee Slattery concurred.

Dr. Courtice said the first stage of the search, if done correctly, is understanding what the stakeholders want. He thought the committee should get stakeholder input on three areas: points of pride of SOU; attributes and qualities a new president should bring; and the challenges the new president will face. Collecting this information leads to a better search outcome. He noted the importance of these considerations at the outset noting the only aspect more important is deciding who will serve as the next president.

Board Chair Thorndike informed the group that Dr. Chris Maples, the President at OIT, volunteered to serve on the search committee, if it pleases the board and committee. He noted the unique opportunity because Dr. Maples has been at OIT for seven years and is one of the longer-serving presidents at Oregon public universities. He was the presidential representative on the EOU and WOU searches, loves SOU, and considers OIT and SOU to be sister universities. Given this offer, Board Chair Thorndike thought the committee should consider how to maximize Dr. Maples' assistance.

Chair Hennion said they have talked about adding other people to the search committee and she thought Dr. Maples would be an excellent choice. The committee members will also need to talk about adding other members on the broader search committee.

### **Review of Request for Proposals for Selecting an Executive Search Firm**

After disclosing that AGB also is a search firm, Dr. Courtice contributed ideas on the best way run the RFQ process. SOU can go to the marketplace with an open request and invite firms to respond how they will assist SOU with a search. There may be some specific guidelines that must be followed but, by leaving it open, SOU would get the best responses that would include details on the firm's process; its practices by way of helping SOU develop the search profile based on attributes, challenges and points of pride; how they would generate a pool of strong candidates; and the diversity the pool would reflect. A good search firm should be able to provide a complete overview in 10-14 pages. The committee could narrow the group down to three or so, and have them come to SOU to

meet with the search committee. He believed good search firms would offer counsel on how the search committee could be formulated and how it could respond to the board on one hand and stakeholders on the other. Search firms' responses would contain a lot of the information that would be at the heart of what we are seeking.

Responding to Chair Hennion's question about the differences in more and less traditional firms, Dr. Courtice said some specialize in higher education leadership searches, some are more corporate in nature in the process of producing shorter lists of candidates, and some will produce longer lists and require more work for the search committee. However, even traditional higher education search firms can bring in non-traditional candidates.

Mr. Catz and Mr. Morris stated the RFQ was broad in nature by design and discussed its specific provisions. The responses to the issues on pages 5 and 6 will be used to narrow down those who become finalists. They asked the committee to review the draft to ensure it invites the approach that has been discussed, captures the spirit of what they want with the search firm, and meets their needs. Mr. Catz recommended adding the new president's anticipated start date of July 1, 2016 and a requirement that the search firm provide support at the January retreat. The December 2016 end date in the RFQ was to allow extra time in case the first search fails. Dr. Courtice said that a good firm will not be bound by an end date but rather by a successful outcome. Mr. Catz would like the committee to endorse releasing the RFQ so staff can carry it forward.

Board Chair Thorndike asked what they should look for in the responses from search firms regarding the location and size of SOU and how they would customize the search for SOU. Dr. Courtice responded that SOU will need a firm that is familiar with the geographical region and that would conduct a nation-wide search to ensure a good match.

The scope of work requires the search firm to generate a pool of candidates through advertisements and other industry accepted means. Dr. Courtice said non-traditional means are included in the term "industry accepted means." The tendency to depend on advertising should be minimized; the more creative, personal and intensive the reach, the more effective candidate-generation will be.

Ms. Prud'homme covered the proposed timeline for posting the RFQ and reviewing responses: issue the RFQ on November 13; close it on December 2; review responses on December 4; interview finalists on December 15, 16 or 17; notify firms on December 18. Mr. Catz could then finalize the contract over the holidays.

A discussion was held on the various committees involved in the whole process: this search committee, the committee overlooking the RFQ process, and the broader committee responsible for conducting the actual search. Board Chair Thorndike thought the ad hoc committee could serve as the core group, with additional members added as needed, and out of the retreat will come movement toward the actual search committee.

Chair Hennion thought it was a good idea to get input from students over winter break and to have listening sessions or town hall meetings after the search firm is on board. Dr. Courtice thought the search firm can help with the listening sessions and at the retreat to develop a profile. He felt the retreat is a great place to have the board provide its insight on what it wants.

Board Chair Thorndike pointed out the unique opportunity the board has in creating the process it wants to follow in this search. The Oregon University System (OUS) policies transferred to SOU can be modified but only by the board and in accordance with SOU policy. Mr. Catz discussed the responsibilities of the Board Chair in working with the search committee, interviewing finalists, and referring select firms to the full board for a further interview. An agenda item for the January retreat may be the composition of the search committee.

Mr. Morris said OUS set aside \$100K for SOU's presidential search. For the two combined recent OUS searches, the contract was \$150K; so, \$75K for search and \$25K for travel was thought to be reasonable. A shortfall would require finding from a different source. Dr. Courtice thought \$100K was well within the scope of a successful search.

The trustees agreed with Trustee Bodager's comment that innovative search strategies should be included in one of the questions in the RFQ. The committee members concurred with Chair Hennion's suggestion that Mr. Catz and Mr. Morris review, revise and post the RFQ, then send a copy to the committee members. Mr. Catz and Mr. Morris said SOU can also do outreach to search firms.

Board Chair Thorndike spoke of the committee's unique resource in Trustee Nicholson and asked if he had any comments to add to the RFQ, based on his experience as the Director of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival. Trustee Nicholson thought it was important to get a clear sense of the relationship between SOU, the community, and other leading institutions in the valley. Dr. Courtice added that if SOU does not guide the search firms too much, more creativity may result from them on why they think the Rogue Valley is a great area. Board Chair Thorndike agreed with Dr. Courtice's comment and thought the firms should sell themselves to the search committee.

### **Discussion of Next Steps**

Trustee Nicholson thought the search firm needed significant stakeholder input at the January retreat. Chair Hennion responded that they will have substantial input by then but that significant input would also come later. She asked Trustees Slattery and Steinman, Ms. Uyehara, Ms. Prud'homme and Ms. Fratella to work together to develop a simple survey, using some of the comments made earlier. Ms. Uyehara expressed her desire to work directly with Ms. Prud'homme on the language for the survey.

Chair Hennion envisioned issuing the survey in the near term, presenting responses at the retreat, then holding listening sessions after the retreat. Trustee Nicholson was concerned about that timeline. He liked the idea of getting initial surveys out right away, focusing on points of pride, challenges and attributes desired. He thought it would be especially useful to the search firm if there was a way of having people identify their affiliation with the university. Discussion followed on what the survey would look like.

Ms. Prud'homme clarified the tasks for creating the survey. There will be: a single message and survey; collaboration on the message to ensure it meets audiences' needs; committee members will review a draft; and the survey would be distributed following any changes. Notices can be sent to the public at the appropriate time.

Mr. Morris thought the survey was a great idea and that the committee should make it clear to campus that it is the start of gathering feedback, not the end of it, and that there will be more opportunities to provide input. By distributing the survey right before winter break, he was concerned people would be upset if they thought the board was acting while campus is closed. Chair Hennion would like the same notice to go out to all groups.

At the next meeting, the committee members will review RFQ submissions. The next meeting will be on December 4 from 2:00-4:00 pm, or until their work is complete. Trustee Nicholson recommended adding as agenda items key issues that need to be discussed with the Board Chair and the search firm, such as confidentiality, who the spokesperson is on that issue, any compliance issues, how they go about decision-making, and how open the search will be. Chair Hennion agreed those issues need to be addressed but the board needs to make those decisions.

Ms. Fratella advised that the SOU Foundation Board meets next on December 3rd and offered to include a 20-minute block of time for a discussion about the presidential search. Trustee Sevcik normally attends these meetings and Chair Hennion will also attend to lead the discussion on the presidential search. Trustee Slattery will attend in an unofficial capacity.

Lisa Garcia-Hanson expressed that she was excited to hear the committees' comments and recommended including administrators in the groups to be consulted.

Chair Hennion closed the meeting with a suggestion that, as the presidential search committee expands, they formulate ideas of good additions to the committee. Committee members should not ask those individuals, as that is the role of the Board Chair, but should send suggestions to the Board Secretary. Mr. Catz will send the trustees the procedures they will be following during the presidential search.

## **Adjourn**

Chair Hennion adjourned the meeting at 5:50 pm.

# Public Comment

# **Review of RFQ Responses for Selecting an Executive Search Firm**

# Discussion of Next Steps

**Adjourn**