



The Presidential Factors Committee (PFC) of the Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon (Board) met in the Ford Alumni Center on the UO Campus on March 4, 2015. Below is a summary of the committee discussions and actions. A recording of the committee meeting is available.

**Committee Attendance**

Ginevra Ralph, Chair	Present
Andrew Colas	Absent
Allyn Ford	Present
Susan Gary	Present
Ross Kari	Present

PFC Chair Ginevra Ralph called the meeting to order at 8:31 AM. Roll call was taken and a quorum verified. An audio recording of the committee is available.

**Presidential Compensation.** Chair Ralph introduced Stephen Pollack and Rick Yarger from Mercer, a firm hired to provide an analysis on presidential compensation. Mercer's presentation walked through its compensation analysis for presidential compensation benchmarking. Mercer explained where the University of Oregon has been historically with regard to relative compensation, discussed current higher education trends in performance-based compensation, differences between cash compensation and total remuneration, and the relative position of some private institutions. Trustees inquired about examples of relative pay structures, retention plans, and performance incentive opportunities. Trustees also inquired about the flexibility to adjust the compensation package from previous presidents in Oregon and about whether it is common for presidents to serve on outside boards. The data and presentation is in the posted materials.

**Presidential Review and Evaluation.** Chair Ralph moved to a discussion of presidential evaluation, drawing attention to the proposed process for the 2015 evaluation provided in the committee's materials. Ralph noted that a process for the interim president might be different than in future years. Board Chair Chuck Lillis noted that a primary benefit of presidential objectives is driving activity and behavior of leadership, and discussed that goal-setting is more complicated than simply making a list. The committee discussed evaluation issues such as appropriate collection of information regarding goal-setting, performance, who should the board solicit information from, and how does the board sift through information to find the most effective input. Lillis noted that the board needs to be willing to remain flexible with goals that are established as priorities might change. Chair Ralph explained that the committee can play a valuable role in monitoring progress toward goals on a regular basis, reminding the committee that the effort is about supporting the president and making the president successful. Trustee Susan Gary suggested that the evaluation process should also include forward-thinking inquiry; Trustee Ross Kari agreed that past evaluation and future goals go hand-in-hand. Kari also advised that goals remain focused and be limited to a handful. The committee talked about the proposed evaluation process for 2015. Gary suggested making certain elements of feedback required as opposed to discretionary. Trustee Helena Schlegel suggested using direct communication to students to encourage their participation in the open comment; Gary noted that this would work for faculty as well; and Trustee Kurt Willcox echoed the sentiment for classified staff. Willcox also echoed support for the notion of evaluation and goal-setting going together and clarified that the intent is to move forward according to the timeline noted in the proposed materials. Chair Ralph encouraged trustees to submit suggestions for the 2015 process (e.g. questions, priorities).

**Adjournment.** 9:28 AM.