UMATILLA SCHOOL BOARD. THE FULL TEXT OF RESOLUTION 1 IS PART OF ONLINE BOARD BOOK. NOT PRINTED BECAUSE OF AMMOUNT OF PAPER REQUIRED. -EEO

2026 OSBA BYLAWS BALLOT MEASURE

OSBA Governance Changes

A summary for member boards: what would change, why, and what comes next

To OSBA member boards,

In 2026, OSBA's Board Governance Committee led a review of how the association is governed. On September 19, 2026, the OSBA Board of Directors adopted a resolution to amend the OSBA Bylaws and referred it to you, our members, for a vote during the 2026 election cycle.

This summary explains what the amendments would change, why, and what would stay the same. The bylaws set the overall framework. Many supporting details would be worked out afterward through Board policy and operating procedures, with input from the people most affected. Each section lists those open details and who will decide them.

Each member board will vote on the amended bylaws as a single ballot measure. Approval requires two-thirds of returned ballots. The full text of the Board's resolution is included in the voting packet.

We encourage every member board to read the "At a Glance" page and discuss it before voting.

OSBA Board Governance Committee

At a Glance

The ballot measure contains four central changes, plus several smaller technical updates described later in this summary.

THE FOUR CENTRAL CHANGES

1

Ex-officio advisor seats. Would end the standing list of named,non-voting advisors on the Board. The Board could still invite advisors when needed.

2

Caucuses. Caucuses would advise the executive director instead of the Board. The executive director would establish caucuses using criteria the Board sets in policy. Today, adding or removing a caucus requires a member vote to amend the bylaws.

3

Caucus Council. Would create a new Caucus Council, with one representative from each caucus, to advise the Board. The two caucus seats on the Board would become two seats filled by the Board on the Council's recommendation. The Council would also have new pathways to additional leadership.

4

Legislative Policy Committee (LPC). Board members would choose whether to serve on the LPC instead of being required to. The Caucus Council would also have LPC seats (number determined in policy).

WHAT IS NOT CHANGING

Board size. The Board would keep up to 25 voting directors: up to 22 elected by region, plus 2 recommended by the Caucus Council.

Caucus seats during the transition. The two established caucuses would keep their Board seats until the new Caucus Council directors are appointed, or until the end of 2027, whichever comes first.

Caucus voice in governance. Caucuses would continue to have a path to leadership through the two Caucus Council seats and committee seats.

Board oversight of funding. The Board would continue to set caucus funding through the annual budget.

Why these changes

Members told us that the Board's size, unclear roles, and confusion between governance and advocacy are the biggest barriers to an effective Board. These changes are a first, measured step. The Governance Committee will review their impact after one year before recommending anything further, including any change to Board size.

Background

How the review was done

As part of OSBA's regular governance review cycle, the Board engaged Coraggio Group in 2026 to assess OSBA's governance structure. The assessment gathered input from:

188 survey respondents, 12 stakeholder interviews, and 7 focus groups, representing the Board, staff, member districts of every size, the caucuses, and the PRIDE Advisory Committee

A review of school board association bylaws in more than 30 states

Coraggio Group reported its findings in June 2026. The Governance Committee then held a design retreat on August 3, recommended bylaws amendments on August 24, and the Board adopted and took action to refer them to the membership on September 19.

Guiding principles

Four principles, set at the start of the review, shaped which changes moved forward:

Efficiency

Design structures that make purposeful use of staff resources and board member time. Every committee, caucus, and process should add clear value.

Effectiveness

Ensure governance structures enable the board to fulfill its core responsibilities: strategic oversight, policy governance, fiduciary accountability, and organizational leadership.

Engagement

Ensure boards as entities have genuine opportunities to participate and inform decisions without creating administrative burden or unnecessary complexity.

Representation

Balance representation between boards as fundamental units and districts serving larger student populations, ensuring all member voices carry appropriate weight while maintaining geographic practicality.

What we heard

- Board size was named by every member group as the greatest opportunity to improve efficiency, and **69%** of Board and staff respondents named it as a structure that should be re-evaluated.
- Confusion between governance and advocacy was the most-cited barrier to Board effectiveness (**29%** of all respondents), followed by unclear roles (**26%**).
- Board and staff rated the Board's understanding of OSBA's Board work **2.6 out of 5**, though they rated orientation **3.9**.
- The non-voting ex-officio seats were rated the least active and least impactful Board roles. **39%** of Board and staff respondents flagged them.
- Both caucuses and the advisory committee received below-target effectiveness ratings. Members of each group flagged their own group's structure for re-evaluation: **69%** of advisory committee respondents, **63%** of Rural Caucus respondents, and **56%** of Members of Color Caucus respondents flagged their own body's structure for re-evaluation.

The Four Central Changes

1. Ex-officio advisor seats

TODAY

Up to 25 voting directors: 22 elected by region, plus one from the Oregon School Board Members of Color Caucus and one from the Oregon Rural School Board Members Caucus. The bylaws cap the Board at 25 voting persons (Sec. 3.3).

Five named, non-voting ex-officio advisors: an NSBA director elected from Oregon; the executive director of the Coalition of Oregon School Administrators; the chair-elect of the Oregon Association of Education Service Districts; the board president of the Oregon Community College Association; and the chair of the State Board of Education.

WHAT WOULD CHANGE

The named list of ex-officio advisors would be removed.

The Board could designate non-voting ex-officio advisors as needed (Sec. 3.5.4).

WHY

The ex-officio role and its relationship to the Board were never clearly defined. These seats were rated the least active and least impactful Board roles, and 39% of Board and staff respondents flagged them. Peer state associations seat 14 to 19 voting directors; OSBA seats up to 25.

2. Caucuses would advise the executive director

TODAY

Two caucuses are named in the bylaws: the Oregon School Board Members of Color Caucus and the Oregon Rural School Board Members Caucus.

Each holds a guaranteed Board seat and LPC seat and advises the Board directly.

A caucus can be created or eliminated only by a bylaws amendment approved by members.

The PRIDE Advisory Committee is not named in the bylaws. It advises the Board and has no guaranteed Board or LPC seat.

WHAT WOULD CHANGE

The executive director would establish caucuses that support OSBA's vision, mission, and goals, following criteria the Board adopts in policy.

Caucuses would advise the executive director instead of the Board. The Caucuses would no longer be approved by the membership.

The two current caucuses would no longer be named in the bylaws. The expectation is that they would be re-established under the new framework, but that would happen through policy, not through this ballot measure.

The PRIDE Advisory Committee is not addressed in the bylaws, so this measure has no immediate effect on its status. Any change would come through Board policy.

Staff support would be defined in caucus operating procedures and an executive director framework rather than in the bylaws.

The Board would continue to evaluate the executive director, providing accountability for groups that report to that position.

WHY

Today the two caucuses and the advisory committee have different budgets, seats, authority, and resources. A single framework would give every caucus the same pathway and the same rules.

Reporting to the executive director would connect caucuses more directly to OSBA staff and day-to-day operations, providing greater flexibility in how they conduct their work while supporting effective coordination and implementation.

STILL TO BE DECIDED

- Criteria and safeguards for establishing a caucus, grounds for dissolving one, and an appeal to the Board if a caucus request is denied or is dissolved (OSBA Policy Committee)
- How caucus leaders are selected, how long they serve, and how leadership rotates (caucus operating procedures)
- What staff provide to caucuses and how staff take part in their meetings (caucus operating procedures and executive director framework)
- How Oregon public meetings law applies to caucus meetings (OSBA Policy Committee, with legal review)

3. A new Caucus Council, and caucus seats on the Board

TODAY

Each of the two caucuses designates one voting director to the Board and Legislative Policy Committee.

Each caucus manages its own budget.

Adding a caucus adds a seat on both the Board and the LPC.

WHAT WOULD CHANGE

A new Caucus Council, advisory to the Board, composed of one Board-approved representative from each caucus, (Sec. 4.4.4).

The Council would recommend two people for the Board to appoint as full voting directors (Secs. 3.5, 3.5.3). These replace the two current caucus seats.

The Council would have the option to recommend a Finance Committee member, LPC members, and members to other Board committees. Recommendations would be subject to the approval of the Board.

The Council would adopt operating procedures (Sec. 4.4.2), keep minutes, report at Board meetings, follow public meetings law (Sec. 4.5), and file a year-end report (Sec. 4.4.6).

The Board would set the Council's budget (Sec. 4.4.5), as it sets caucus budgets today.

New caucuses would join the Council without adding Board seats.

Filling seats and the transition

Officer overlap. If the president or immediate past president is a Caucus Council director, the Council would select an additional director for that term (Sec. 3.5.3).

Start date. The new structure would take effect July 1, 2027, to allow time to develop the supporting policies and procedures

Transition. The two current caucus directors would keep their seats until the Board appoints the two Council directors, or until the end of 2027, whichever comes first.

WHY

One Council would give every caucus, current and future, the same pathways to leadership. The Council structure allows new caucuses to be added without expanding the Board or revising the bylaws each time a caucus is created. This provides greater flexibility while addressing member concerns about Board size.

STILL TO BE DECIDED

- The Council's operating procedures, including how it selects candidates for its two Board seats (OSBA Policy Committee)
- How Caucus Council budget is distributed to individual Caucuses (Caucus Council)

4. Legislative Policy Committee (LPC)

TODAY

Members: all voting Board members, elected regional representatives (Sec. 4.1.3(c)–(e)), the President as an ex-officio voting member, and one designee from each caucus.

Board policy (Policy 2100) requires every director to serve on the LPC.

The bylaws set two-year terms for LPC seats, with terms starting in January 1 of even-numbered years.

WHAT WOULD CHANGE

Members: Board members who choose to serve; the president (ex officio, voting); all Executive Committee members (required to serve); elected regional representatives; and members recommended by the Caucus Council (Sec. 4.1.3(b)).

Two-year terms starting January 1 of even-numbered years, with members being limited to up to five consecutive terms, then eligible again after a two-year break (Sec. 4.1.3(f)).

WHY

Requiring every director to serve on the LPC blurred the line between governance and advocacy, the barrier to effectiveness respondents named most often. Voluntary service would place directors on the LPC who are ready and have capacity for the advocacy role. Term limits would create predictable rotation and new leadership pathways. Seating Council designees would keep caucus representation on the LPC through one consistent process.

STILL TO BE DECIDED

- How directors indicate interest in LPC service, and how seats are filled (OSBA Policy Committee)
- How many Caucus Council designees serve on the LPC (Board and Caucus Council)
- How current members, and directors who join mid-cycle, move into the new term cycle (OSBA Policy Committee)

Other Changes on the Same Ballot

These technical updates are part of the same ballot measure. Items already covered above are noted, not repeated.

CHANGE	WHAT IT DOES
Resolution deadline (2.5)	Moves the deadline for submitting resolutions to the Board from September 30 to September 15.
Region declaration (2.6.2)	Clarifies that if a member has a main administrative office in more than one region, the member must declare which region it intends to vote and shall only vote in that region.
Regional review (2.7)	Formal review of OSBA's regions would happen at least every five years instead of every three.
Annual meeting (2.8)	Keeps the annual members' meeting but drops the requirement that it be in person in November. OSBA would still report on its activities and finances at least once a year.
Quorum and approval (2.13, 2.14)	Blank ballots and abstentions would count toward quorum but would not count as "no" votes.
Board vacancies (3.6)	Clarifies that the Board would be able to fill any vacant director seat by appointment, except an extra seat created under Sec. 3.5.1(e) when the president or immediate past president is no longer from that region.
Contiguous regions (3.6)	Ends the option of appointing a director from a neighboring region. Directors would have to come from the region they represent.
Finance Committee term limits (4.1.2)	Members starting on or after January 1, 2027, would be able to serve five consecutive two-year terms, then return after a two-year break. Current members would not be affected.
Officer reelection (5.4)	Clarifies that an officer (other than the past president) whose Board seat is up for election would have to be reelected by their region to remain an officer.
Also on the ballot	Caucus director transition (3.5.3) and Finance Committee Council designee (4.1.2): see Change 3. LPC terms (4.1.3(f)): see Change 4.

Improvements Already Underway (No Vote Needed)

These improvements fall within the Board's and staff's existing authority. Several are already in progress.

AREA	WHAT IS CHANGING
Onboarding	Written role descriptions at recruitment, mentoring for new directors, and a check-in at six to eight months.
Board and LPC expectations	Written attendance and engagement expectations and a way to track them, applying equally to regional and Caucus Council directors.
Regional director role	Clarifies that regional directors are a point of contact for member boards, not their delegates, and owe their primary duty to the association as a whole as its fiduciaries.
Governance training	Ongoing training on Board, staff, and officer roles, fiduciary duty, and officer eligibility.
Member communication	Clear ownership of member communication, a regular governance digest and legislative updates, and roadshows redesigned for two-way dialogue.
Meetings	In-person sessions for complex decisions and more emphasis on preparation before meetings.

Timeline

June 2026	Coraggio Group delivered governance review report
August 3, 2026	Governance Committee design retreat
August 24, 2026	Governance Committee recommended bylaws amendments
September 19, 2026	Board adopted resolution and referred it to members
2026 election cycle	Member vote Oct. 15 – Dec. 15
January 1, 2027	New Finance Committee term limits apply to incoming members
July 1, 2027	New caucus and Caucus Council structure takes effect
By December 31, 2027	Caucus Council directors seated on the Board
One year after implementation	Governance Committee reviews impact