



EASTERN OREGON
UNIVERSITY

Board of Trustees

Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees

February 12, 2015

11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Dixie Lund Boardroom, Inlow Hall

Eastern Oregon University

La Grande, Oregon

MINUTES

Trustees Present: Ray Brown, Richard Chaves, Roberta “Bobbie” Conner, Patricia (Todd) Hinton, Tom Insko, Jay Kenton (ex officio), Holly Kerfoot, Dixie Lund, Cheryl Martin, George Mendoza, Abel Mendoza, David Nelson, Elsie Praeger-Goller and Jer Pratton

University Staff Present: Chris Burford, Heather Cashell, Lara Moore, Xavier Romano, Tim Seydel and Sarah Witte

Guests: Carol Franks (University Council Chair), Ryan Hagemann (OUS Vice Chancellor), Bill Johnson (prospective board member), Carol Franks, John Knudson-Martin (Faculty Senate President) and Philip Sebastiani (ASEOU President)

1. Call to Order/Roll

General Counsel/Board Secretary, Chris Burford welcomed everyone to the inaugural meeting of the Board of Trustees for Eastern Oregon University and then called the roll. All board members were present and Chair Nelson noted a correction to Trustee Patricia Todd’s last name to Hinton. Secretary Burford called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. Then made announcements related to media, public comment, cell phones, live streaming, etc.

Secretary Burford noted that the board is designed to have fifteen members, of whom the Senate has confirmed fourteen. Bill Johnson, a candidate for the remaining seat, is a guest today. He has accepted the invitation for his name to be put forward to the Governor for nomination and will participate in discussions, however, he will not vote.

Secretary Burford explained that because this is the first meeting we do not have bylaws or officers. The first action of the board is to appoint a Chair. Trustee Bobbie Conner made a motion to for Senator David Nelson to act as Chair until the board has concluded the nomination process. Motion seconded by Trustee Jer Pratton; the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Nelson asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Trustee Tom Insko moved to approve the agenda and seconded by Trustee Conner; the motion carried unanimously.

2. Reports

a. Faculty Senate

Chair Nelson invited Professor John Knudson-Martin, Faculty Senate President to provide his report to the board. On behalf of the faculty, Professor Knudson-Martin welcomed the board and thanked the members for their willingness to support and serve this wonderful organization. He then quoted from the EOU constitution regarding shared governance highlighting that all legislative responsibilities shall be vested to two representative bodies, Faculty Senate (FS) and University Council (UC).

Shared governance is set up with committees that report to one of these two legislative groups. The FS or UC approve or disapprove the actions of the committees and then pass recommendations on to the Provost and the President. The committees that report to the FS deal with the organization of curriculum, academic standards for faculty and students, and faculty performance and evaluation. The FS works with president and provost on essential issues of EOU. He explained the commitment of the faculty to both students on campus and online. EOU students come from rural communities of modest means without a lot of experience in higher education, thus programs have been designed to serve them. He also noted that the university has struggled financially and many programs and courses have been slated for elimination or have been eliminated. This has been difficult for faculty. They have had to say goodbye to long time faculty members and are teaching out familiar programs. This is part of the fabric that makes up the morale and for the experience for the faculty. He also noted that this is mixed with the excitement of working with students. Many faculty are saddened by losses but very ready to move on to the next era of Eastern Oregon University. Professor Knudson-Martin closed his report by stating that Faculty Senate stands ready to partner with staff, the president and this board to build a future for EOU.

Chair Nelson thanked Professor Knudson-Martin for his report and noted that on behalf of the board he is excited about working closely with the faculty.

b. University Council

Chair Nelson invited Carol Franks, University Council Chair, to provide her report to the board. Ms. Franks welcomed the board to EOU. On behalf of University Council (UC), she appreciates the commitment of the board and looks forward to good change. Ms. Franks gave a brief history of EOU shared governance from the perspective of UC. She noted that in 2007-08 a new university constitution was adopted. Prior to the adoption of the new

constitution, the Assembly governed the university. She also gave an overview of the make-up of UC and how appointments are made, terms, and scope for voting. The UC is governed by its own set of bylaws (found in the board packet). Ms. Franks noted that there has been a lot of conversation about the new governance model and shared governance. Many policies that have come before UC have been adopted in a timely manner. Trustee Conner referenced the shared governance model chart and asked what the “Cabinet” is between UC and the President. Secretary Burford clarified that the cabinet is the executive committee who are the university leadership who directly advise the president.

Chair Nelson thanked Ms. Franks for her report and noted that the commitment from the board is to make shared governance work. Ms. Franks agreed that it is a very exciting time and that the outcome will be a better EOU.

c. Associated Students of Eastern Oregon University (ASEOU)

Chair Nelson invited Philip Sebastiani, ASEOU President, to give his report to the board. Mr. Sebastiani welcomed the board to EOU and noted that he is looking forward to the work that the board will be doing. He explained that his position as student body president is for one year. Additionally, he described that ASEOU is made up of eight student senators who are elected by popular vote in the spring. There are executive officer positions that are appointed by senate to work with various affairs on campus, i.e., diversity and equity, political, financial, and student affairs. A recent change within student government is to include participation from online students. Online students make up a large population at EOU, thus getting them involved in the conversations is important. ASEOU has worked to reform their student fee to get membership from online students to provide them with access to student services. There is a group of students in the Capitol lobbying for EOU now. They traveled to Salem in vans donated by Legacy Ford. Throughout the rest of the year, ASEOU will be looking at their governing documents to incorporate online senators and the board. Additionally, ASEOU has been at the table for conversations regarding changes on the campus, i.e., presidential search, bookstore, food service, tuition, child care center, and student involvement. Mr. Sebastiani closed his report by urging the board to consider the students when making decisions.

Trustee Conner noted that the governing documents for ASEOU are not included in the board materials. Secretary Burford committed to having the document in the binder for next time.

Trustee Dixie Lund affirmed that the primary focus of the board is the students of Eastern Oregon University. She commended Mr. Sebastiani for asking that of the board. Trustee Hinton noted the dedication of our student body and especially Mr. Sebastiani – today is his birthday.

President Kenton asked Mr. Sebastiani to explain the relationship with the Oregon Student Association (OSA) and how ASEOU interacts with OSA. Mr. Sebastiani explained that OSA provides trainings, develop leadership and provide insight to the political issues that could

impact students. EOU students are currently participating in an OSA rally in Salem where the message is reinvestment in higher education. This year he is the vice-chair of the OSA board of directors.

Chair Nelson thanked Mr. Sebastiani for his report and noted that the student lobbyists are very crucial at the legislature.

d. President

Chair Nelson invited Interim President Jay Kenton to provide his report. President Kenton explained that his report will be a little different this time as it is the inaugural meeting. He will, however, cover the issues and challenges that face EOU later in the meeting when he gives an overview of the report he gave to the State Board of Higher Education earlier this year. He began by explaining that he was going to read his report entitled “Wise to Resolve, Patient to Perform”. In his report, President Kenton highlighted the history of EOU, emancipation of EOU, and the advent of the local board of trustees, and the importance of EOU in the region to change lives, create and disseminate new knowledge and transform the economy. He stressed the responsibility of the board is to guide the operations, advocate on its behalf and ensure accountability to its constituents by offering quality programs and services. The first order of business for the board will be to hire a new president and help to perfect the direction for the institution. He thanked the members for agreeing to serve on the board and guaranteed that their work would be meaningful and much appreciated by those within the intuition as well as those who seek its services.

Chair Nelson thanked President Kenton for his remarks. Trustee Richard Chaves expressed his gratitude to President Kenton for his efforts as interim president. He praised him for the job he has done thus far and looks forward to the rest of his time at EOU. Chair Nelson noted that this is a historic time for EOU with some challenges, but more opportunity.

3. Consent Items – Nothing at this meeting.

4. Action Items

a. Consideration of the Proposed Bylaws

Chair Nelson introduced Chris Burford, Board Secretary, for a presentation of the proposed bylaws. Additionally, he asked Secretary Burford to explain his position. Secretary Burford explained that his position is an innovation, as is the board. His position is that of university general counsel and board secretary. He also noted that his experience has included being general counsel for a variety of governmental entities and working closely with governing boards.

Secretary Burford explained that, in a general sense, there are core concepts that are common to in these types of governing documents. At the same time, this is a period of transition, which makes everyone a little nervous. He has heard concerns from administration, faculty, and staff that the bylaws not alter the existing status quo between

each group, i.e., the prerogatives of the president and the roles of the various shared governance bodies. They recognize that there will be more direct leadership by this board than with OUS. Secretary Burford stated that there would be opportunities for both Faculty Senate and University Council to directly express concerns regarding the bylaws during the discussion. He also expressed that very little of the information in the bylaws is new.

The three largest universities, Oregon State University (OSU), Portland State University (PSU), and University of Oregon (OU) all adopted their bylaws in January 2014. Those were based on the bylaws and documents that governed the Oregon University System. There has been an attempt to take these models and apply them locally. The next step is going over the document in detail. The packet the board received includes the bylaws, board statements, and a proposed resolution on responsibilities of individual trustees. There are three other documents that are not included in the packet as they were just received this week. The documents have not been reviewed and still need to be tailored to the university. They include, most importantly, a statement on shared governance, thus, when concerns are heard about changes around shared governance it is important to remember that none of us have seen the whole document package yet.

Bylaws

Secretary Burford asked if there is anything in particular that stood out that caused concern. Trustee Conner asked if the presidents at the other universities are non-voting members? Secretary Burford confirmed that state law mandates this. He also pointed out that the redline version in the packet shows the changes that have been made to the document since the last version they saw. The changes are either to add legal detail or rearranging sentences. Trustee Insko noted a typo on page 6 of 10, Article 6, Number 3 (Officers of the University). He also mentioned the value of a board where continuity of vision and mission are concerned, thus the issue of all board members having a four year term creates complexity four years from now. If the board has the latitude, he suggested creating a stair stepping approach to appointments. Secretary Burford agreed that all of the terms sun setting at once is problematic. He and President Kenton will include this on the next board agenda to determine how to solve the issue. One idea would be to have some board members voluntarily serve two years instead of four. Trustee Insko also suggested that the term for the chair should be discussed, i.e., four years instead of two. This provides for more continuity, but there can also be downsides to that. Ryan Hagemann confirmed that the term lengths for the officers are not statutory. He noted that at Western Oregon University they struggled with the same issue and decided to keep the terms at two years, however, they changed the initial term of the chair to one year and kept the vice chair at two years. Trustee Jer Pratton asked for a recommendation from Secretary Burford and Ryan Hagemann on what direction they would recommend, however, he would be comfortable with a provisional passing of the bylaws that allows for each section to be thoroughly reviewed over the next several weeks. Secretary Burford noted that the bylaws could be amended at any time by a majority vote. As a side note, we may look at changing that in the future to make it more difficult to amend the bylaws, but for now it is okay. His hope for the meeting today was for the board to approve the bylaws and then depending on the level of concern and review of the later statements, recommend provisional

adoption at this time. Trustee Conner asked if it was typical to allow for amendment of bylaws at a special meeting rather than a regular meeting for university boards? Ryan Hagemann commented that regular, special, and emergency meetings are all public meetings, thus the board is authorized by law to act at any of them. He explained that this is more of a divide between what happens at a regular meeting, i.e., reports, consent agenda, etc., versus a special meeting. If you wanted a meeting just to amend bylaws then you still have that ability.

Secretary Burford passed along the concern of the Faculty Senate about Article 10 related to the scope of authority statement. Although, this is a concern of FS, it is, however, a correct statement under Oregon law and it is an appropriate statement because there are a number of documents that speak to this power and how it is used. Secretary Burford invited the Faculty Senate President to comment. Professor Knudson-Martin noted that the problem is that the packet is incomplete as the statement on shared governance is not included, but that will be prepared for the board's approval at a later date. Additionally, the fact that neither the Constitution nor shared governance is referenced in the bylaws created consternation. The section related to authority was concerning because of the process within shared governance, in which the FS and UC hear concerns from the committees that work on the business of the university, which is then passed on to the provost and president for their approval (that has been delegated from the board). He stated that his FS colleagues feel that it makes sense to approve bylaws and statements at this time; notwithstanding the statement on authority that seems to usurp shared governance. Although he doesn't believe that is the intention of the board or the bylaws, it is problematic because the statement of delegation of authority does not mention shared governance. Professor Knudson-Martin expressed agreement that provisional adoption of the documents is acceptable, with the understanding that there are other documents to come that will need to be looked at and amended so that they are satisfactory to the board, FS, and UC. The statements need to acknowledge the partnership and authority of all. Trustee Lund asked if there is a similar shared governance model at SOU and WOU? Professor Knudson-Martin asked if the shared governance document has been presented to WOU? Ryan Hagemann answered no to Professor Knudson-Martin's question. He explained that he was trying to get as many documents to the boards of the small institutions as possible to help give them a jump-start before the Chancellor's Office closed. The small institutions were given model documents for the boards to put their own stamp on. He also pointed out that the authority statement could be viewed as the board taking an action, on a robust statement on shared governance. President Kenton also noted that there are three aspects to consider: faculty, university council, and students. Professor Knudson-Martin encouraged the board to keep the partnership in mind.

Trustee Pratton moved that the board accept the bylaws and documents today as written on a provisional basis and within the next six months: 1) double check the wording and the meaning of the documents we have; and, 2) that all of the other inclusive documents that may not be present there today are added.

Trustee Ray Brown seconded the motion.

Chair Nelson confirmed with Professor Knudson-Martin that the motion was acceptable.

Trustee George Mendoza wanted to make sure that special emphasis is put into the shared leadership with faculty, staff, and students.

President Kenton asked for comments from Ms. Franks and Mr. Sebastiani before the vote. Both expressed their support for the motion, with a special note from Mr. Sebastiani that students are remembered as stakeholders.

Trustee Conner asked for clarification regarding revisions to the EOU Constitution to reflect the governance change after July 1, 2015. Secretary Burford stated that there would need to be technical amendments to remove the reference to OUS and incorporate the EOU Board. Professor Knudson-Martin added that there will likely be additional changes to streamline shared governance.

Trustee Conner called for the question. The motion was restated by Trustee Pratton as follows: Approve the existing documents on a provisional basis and that within the next six months: 1) the wording is accurate and in concert with other documents existing within Eastern Oregon University; and, 2) is also inclusive of the documents that need to be added.

Trustee Brown reaffirmed the second.

Secretary Burford asked for a point of clarification: does the motion apply to all of the documents or just the bylaws? Trustee Pratton clarified that the motion only applies to the bylaws.

Chair Nelson called for the vote. Motion carried unanimously.

Trustee Pratton asked for the board to develop a plan for how the bylaws will be reviewed over the next six months.

Chair Nelson called for a recess at 12:15 p.m. for lunch.

Chair Nelson reconvened the board at 12:36 p.m.

Board Statements: Secretary Burford introduced four more subsidiary documents to the bylaws: Statement #1-Public Meetings, Statement #2-Delegation of Authority, Statement #3-Board Committees, Statement #4-Performance of Official Business. Additionally, the last item is a proposed resolution. He is not proposing action be taken on the Resolution at this meeting because in the additional documents that the board has not seen yet, there is a statement on board ethics that covers this material and more. The resolution could be tabled pending review of the new documents. Regarding the statements, his

recommendation would be for outright approval of some and provisional approval of others. Although, because the board has already decided to provisionally adopt the bylaws, it may be that will be the case for the statements as well.

#1-Statement on Public Meetings: Secretary Burford gave an overview of the statement and reviewed redlines in the document. Questions were asked about the public comment process and order of meetings. Discussion ensued. Trustee Insko asked for clarification to Section 4.1 so that it is clear to whom the statement refers. Trustee Conner suggested an addition to Section 1.5 to include “For the Good of the Order” so that the board could routinely hear from students, faculty, and staff. She clarified that she is not referencing programmatic presentations, rather individual testimonials. Trustee Cheryl Martin suggested changing the addition to read Invited Participant. Trustee Conner agreed adding “s” to Participant and explained that should be the expectation of the board that each meeting ends with this type of presentation. The change was made. Secretary Burford noted the blue line change to Section 4.1 so that it now reads: “Persons making public comments shall not use the opportunity as a forum for negotiations or asking questions of individuals.”

#3 – Statement on Committees: Secretary Burford started by stating that the next action item is the proposed nomination for the committees. He noted that the board does not have actual authority to make decisions for the university until July 1, 2015; however, there is a lot of work that can be done in preparation for the transition. This will allow for committees to be staffed providing an opportunity for monthly meetings to get some work done in advance of July 1. He then gave an overview of the redline changes to the statement, calling special attention to removing the audit function from the executive committee and putting it in the finance and administration committee. Secretary Burford noted that committee meetings are public meetings and are subject to public meeting notification. Additionally, there will be active discussion about how the board committees’ link up with the university shared governance committees. Secretary Burford asked for confirmation from Professor Knudson-Martin that the statement on committees is sufficient at this point. He responded that it is sufficient.

Dr. Bill Johnson asked to strike the Audit in the Executive and Audit Committee in the first paragraph of Section 1.0. He then asked for discussion regarding the scope of the executive committee. Secretary Burford stated that there could be concerns that a committee like this can end up usurping the roles of the rest of the board. There are some options for avoiding that situation: 1) do not have the committee at all, understanding that the board officers could still discuss matters that impact the board, but because their collective number does not constitute a quorum, public notice would not be required; and, 2) assign specific topics to this committee, those that seem inherently executive. Ryan Hagemann gave background that OUS dissolved the executive committee because the board can meet over the phone if necessary. A practice that he utilizes at the state board is for the committee chairs meet before the board meeting to walk through the agenda to work through logistics. He noted that if the committee chairs were the executive committee then

it would constitute a public meeting. WOU decided not to have a “mini-board” rather give specific responsibility for governance to a trusteeship committee instead. President Kenton proposed that the board eliminate paragraph 2.0. and replace the executive committee function as a governance committee. This committee would deal with the nomination of new board members, term issues, the evaluation process, and other issues related to governance. Trustee Conner agreed that it makes sense (given the size of the board) that there is a governance committee and no executive committee. Trustee Chaves is supportive of the notion stating that this committee would not be decision making, rather it would be developing things for the board to adopt. Ryan Hagemann provided strategic planning as an example of how a governance committee would draft a plan prior to the full board seeing the document. Chair Nelson noted that evaluation of the president is an important function of this committee. Trustee Conner stated that self-evaluation and evaluation of the president fits well with a governance committee. Also, given amount of business that will need to be conducted at the June meeting, she recommended advancing as much today as possible.

Trustee Chaves moved that the board accept board statement #3 excluding the executive committee section with request that Secretary Burford develop a section for governance committee for board consideration.

Trustee Insko seconded the motion.

Trustee Abel Mendoza suggested that the board consider the number of committee members. Is six the right number? Should it be four?

Trustee Pratton is not opposed to making changes to the executive committee or adopting a governance committee, however, the new president could see a need for either or both of the committees. The board should be sure not to strap itself to something that we may not want in the future.

Chair Nelson suggested putting the statements in the same language that was accepted for the bylaws, i.e., provisional adoption as presented with six months to review.

Trustee Chaves agreed to amend his motion as Chair Nelson has stated. The motion was amended to make the adoption provisional.

Trustee Insko seconded the motion with amendment.

Secretary Burford asked for point of clarification on the motion. Is the motion to provisionally adopt the statement as presented or with the section two on the executive committee excluded?

Trustee Chaves restated the motion as follows: provisionally accept Board Statement #3 deleting section two regarding the executive committee and requesting action from

Secretary Burford to develop a section for a governance committee with the same timeline as bylaws (6 months).

Trustee Insko seconded the motion as restated by Trustee Chaves.

Trustee Conner called for the question. Chair Nelson called the vote. Motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Burford then asked if the board was prepared to make a similar motion about the first statement on public meetings. Trustee Conner so moved that the statement be accepted on a provisional basis with the same timeline as the bylaws for board statement #1.

Trustee George Mendoza seconded the motion. Motion carries unanimously.

#4 – Statement on Performance of Official Business: Secretary Burford gave a brief overview of the statement.

Trustee Insko moved to accept board statement #4 as written. Trustee Chaves seconded the motion. Motion carries unanimously.

#2 – Statement on Delegation: Secretary Burford gave an overview of the statement. He explained this statement is about the relationship between the board and the president. This is the statement for which concern was expressed in the absence of a statement on shared governance. After some discussion, Trustee Brown moved for provisional approval with terms that mirror that of the provisional approval of the bylaws. Specifically, noting the incoming statement on shared governance and the EOU Constitution. Trustee Lund seconded the motion. Motion carries unanimously.

Secretary Burford stated that the proposed resolution will not be covered at this meeting.

b. Nominations for Officers and Committee Members

President Kenton presented his proposal for officers and committee members and made the following motion:

Chair of the Board – David Nelson

Vice-Chair of the Board – Roberta “Bobbie” Conner

Trustee Pratton seconded the motion. After discussion the board decided to move forward with the vote as a group. President Kenton and Chair Nelson nominated the following:

Finance and Administration Committee – Richard Chaves (Chair), Tom Insko, Holly Kerfoot, Abel Mendoza, Ray Brown, Jay Kenton (President), and a new member to be appointed. The staff support will be Lara Moore, Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Academic and Student Affairs Committee – George Mendoza (Chair), Pat Hinton, Dixie Lund, Elsie Praeger-Goller, Cheryl Martin, Jay Kenton (President). The staff support will be Sarah Witte, Provost, and Xavier Romano, Vice President for Student Services.

President Kenton amended the original motion to include the officers and committee members.

Trustee Pratton reaffirmed the second to the amended motion. Motion carries unanimously.

c. Meeting Calendar

Secretary Burford noted that under section 1.4 of the Statement on Public Meetings there is a requirement for an annual meeting calendar. He recommends that the board adopt a calendar through June 30, 2016. The final Oregon State Board of Higher Education meeting is scheduled to be at EOU on June 5th. An EOU Board of Trustees meeting will be held on June 4th with a joint board dinner that evening. Chair Nelson and Trustee Insko noted that they both have conflicts with June 4th. Presidential candidates will be on campus in late April and early May. Board members are asked to participate in as much of the on campus visits as possible. After discussion, and noting the following: the first and the last weeks of the month are not ideal; the first and last days of the week will not work; first week of the term can be challenging; avoid the second Friday of the month; have meetings when students are available (possibly weekends) the board meetings will be scheduled for the months of June, October, January, and April with a retreat in July or August. The board members will be polled for specific meeting dates. Additionally, Trustee Lund suggested that the October meeting coincide with Homecoming (Oct. 17); however, she noted that it could be challenging for university staff due to the number of activities taking place on campus that week. Trustee Holly Kerfoot mentioned that board members should try to be on campus for graduation and Trustee Martin suggested offering a campus tour for board members in June.

5. Discussion Items

a. Legislative Update

Chair Nelson invited Tim Seydel, Vice President for University Advancement, to give the legislative update. VP Seydel reported that there could be a change in our Governor, as he has been asked to resign. A press conference could occur at 3 p.m. If the Governor resigns, Secretary of State Kate Brown would become the governor until 2016.

VP Seydel is currently tracking bills pertaining to higher education in the legislature and responding either as an individual campus, the Technical and Regional Universities (TRUs) or all seven universities. ASEOU is in the Capitol today lobbying the legislators. The structure for government relations includes meeting with the Legislative Affairs Council (LAC). LAC meets weekly with the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) staff and the TRUs. Additionally, the TRUs have collaboratively shared the expenses of a lobby firm. VP

Seydel has been in Salem for meetings in December, January, and February and will be back on March 3rd. He reported that the legislative priorities are Public Universities Support Fund, Shared Services funding, Oregon Opportunity Grant, Sports Action Lottery, and funding for capital projects. He also noted that they are working on repurposing language for what was previously the Regional Services Institute to what is now the Center for Rural Studies; repurposing \$2 million in bonds from the last session for needs on campus; a special pathways pilot project and connecting with other schools talking about career and technical education.

Overall the feedback in Salem about EOU is very positive. President Kenton reported that the capital requests include \$3 million to demolish Hunt Hall. He noted that we had hoped for funding for a Learning Commons to house our computer center and online education classrooms, but that did not make the list that the HECC put forward to the Governor. There are conversations about sports facilities (field house), however, our soft enrollment has weakened our argument for new capital improvements and we are not in a position to take on additional debt. He also mentioned the Mill Creek project and the Grand Staircase as other possible projects. EOU has hired grant writers to obtain funding for turf for the football field, resurface the track, stadium lighting, and repair the tennis courts. President Kenton noted that EOU shares the facilities with the high school, thus making the case stronger. Additionally, he is working to repurpose the \$2 million that was to be used for planning the Learning Commons, however, we have now found that the bonds cannot be used for purposes of planning. We have asked the HECC and OSBHE to repurpose the bonds so the \$2 million can be used for network enhancement to build or buy a childcare center, and improve ADA access on campus. A Request for Information (RFI) was done in December to the childcare providers in the area. The Kid's Club responded. Over the years, there have been three studies on childcare and all three indicated that there is a need. The students, faculty and staff will use the facility. The Child Education Center will be utilized by the College of Education to provide opportunities for students to fulfill their internship hours. President Kenton believes that this sends a positive message to La Grande, that EOU is open for business. He is confident that the repurposing will be approved in the next week or two.

Discussion ensued regarding the relationship between the EOU Foundation and the board. VP Seydel explained that the board will be engaged at the legislative level and we are fortunate to have foundation members already on the EOU Board of Trustees. He also suggested the possibility of the foundation giving a regular report to the board. Additionally, he agreed to send out legislative reports to the board members via email.

Discussion ensued regarding the progress with shared services funding in the legislature. VP Seydel reported that there is a legislative support and VP Moore noted that there has been progress in getting support from the large institutions, although, they do have a desire to receive a share of the funding.

b. OUS Board Meeting and EOU Board Conditions Updates

Chair Nelson invited President Kenton to present the report he made to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) on the EOU Board Conditions update. President Kenton gave an overview of the presentation he made to the OSBHE in January. He noted the board conditions that were set for EOU and Southern Oregon University (SOU) and the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges facing EOU and the region. He is working to make EOU a catalyst for change in the region. Serving the growing Latino population is a priority. EOU has started to hire bilingual employees and create dual language partnerships. Additionally, EOU must offer a program mix that meets the needs of the region, i.e., forestry, agriculture, and healthcare. President Kenton noted that one of the largest threats is outcome-based funding and that the state is no longer funding students from Idaho and Washington. These changes would result in the pricing model changing along with recruitment strategies. EOU has experienced declining enrollment and retention. President Kenton is working to increase enrollment and retention by reaching out to large school districts to create a pipeline of students; offering applied bachelor degrees; and rebuilding key administrative functions, i.e., web master and career center. In an effort to increase revenues, tuition is currently being reviewed to potentially include differential tuition at the program level for upper division students. Fee remissions have also been increased. The Eastern Promise program has benefited EOU and the community colleges. There is some concern from Treasure Valley Community College (TVCC) and Blue Mountain Community College (BMCC) that Eastern Promise students might start to leap-frog the community colleges, however, overall the partnerships developed through Eastern Promise have been good. President Kenton reported that applications for the fall are up. We are also recruiting in Micronesia and have sought approval from the Saudi government so that students from Saudi Arabia can attend EOU using their government funding.

President Kenton reported that the current fund balance is -0.5 percent. Additional fee remissions have been offered to help EOU be more competitive with net pricing. He also referenced the Draft Repositioning Plan that was released in the fall. His hope is that the plan gave some hope and opportunities for the future.

Trustee Pratton thanked President Kenton for his work and said that he is the right person at the right time for EOU. Chair Nelson agreed and looks forward to the future.

c. Presidential Search

Chair Nelson reported that OUS hired the search firm, Witt Kieffer for the EOU and WOU presidential searches. The consultants visited EOU and met with campus stakeholders to develop a profile and have been actively seeking candidates since December. He stressed the importance of confidentiality during the process. There are currently 33 applicants and 15 nominations. The search committee will begin reviewing candidates in March and there will be on campus interviews in late April and early May. Chair Nelson expressed his confidence that EOU will attract qualified candidates. The presidential search profile can be found at www.eou.edu/presidential-search.

6. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Cashell
Executive Assistant to the President

DRAFT