

**Board of Trustees
University of Oregon**

Summer 2015 Survey and Evaluation

Consolidated

SECTION I: MEETINGS – GENERALLY

1. The board had _____ meetings in 2014-15.

Trustees overwhelmingly believed there were just enough meetings, especially given the circumstances of the last year.

2. For quarterly BOT meetings, I would prefer two long days over three not-as-long days.

Trustees overwhelmingly agreed that two days is preferable; a couple of trustees disagreed. We will plan meetings for two day periods going forward.

3. For quarterly BOT meetings, I would prefer that meetings are one less day during the week, and instead include a Saturday. I.e. rather than Wed-Fri or Thurs-Fri (see Q2), they would be Thurs-Sat or Fri-Sat.

Trustees overwhelmingly disagreed and would like to keep meetings on weekdays. Based on a suggestion, we will begin to more proactively alert trustees to events on campus that trustees could attend before/after meeting dates (e.g. Friday or Saturday concerts).

4. For quarterly BOT meetings, I would _____ meeting in Portland.

A plurality of trustees would very much like to have one meeting per year in Portland. A strong majority would either like to have one in Portland or are indifferent to the notion. A few trustees strongly urged against this. Given the feedback and considering travel demands, etc., we will seek to schedule one meeting per year in Portland. That meeting will be determined based on campus schedules and activities, issues before the BOT, etc.

5. I would like us to consider meetings at other UO locations, such as Bend/Pine Mountain or Charleston.

Responses were mixed, but there was no real desire to go anywhere other than Eugene or Portland.

6. I think committee meetings:

Trustees overwhelmingly support keeping committee meetings in conjunction with full BOT meetings.

7. While in town for BOT meetings, I would like to have individual meetings scheduled for me to dive further into particular areas of interest.

Most trustees would prefer to spend more time in group meetings with other trustees. We will endeavor to schedule individual meetings surrounding BOT dates for those who expressed interest, and extend those opportunities to others as well. We will not sacrifice BOT or group time to do this, however. We will also more actively pursue “off-cycle” meetings for specific topics.

8. The BOT should continue the small group discussions with various campus constituencies (e.g. the student, faculty or staff meetings).

The vast majority of trustees want to build in time to discuss these sessions at the meeting during which they occur, but a handful of trustees thought it would be better to wait until the next meeting after information can be consolidated and digested/further vetted. We will ensure that public notice of meetings includes a possible discussion of these sessions, and will include flexible time on the agenda.

- 8a. At these discussions, it would be helpful to have a staff person quietly observing to take notes, record questions and track follow-up items.

The vast majority of trustees thought this would be helpful. A few disagreed, noting that it could be distracting or evening threatening. For the next group meetings, we will test this and have a note-taker present in a very unobtrusive way. We will ask one trustee in each room to explain why the individual is there and to seek the group's permission. If there is overwhelming concern, the staff person will leave. All notes will be kept confidential in our office.

SECTION II: MEETINGS – FORMAT & MATERIALS

1. Please provide general feedback on presentations provided by the administrative units:

Overall, trustees believe these are helpful and that it is important for trustees to learn about key aspects of the university. However, there were several insightful comments that may lead to more productive and/or higher-quality presentations going forward:

- Appreciate learning more about the units and they are generally well done
- As we move forward, sessions should focus more on strategic issues and less on purely informative presentations.
- A key challenge is to balance education with generative discussion (another topic given public meetings)
- Perhaps follow unit presentations with a discussion about a specific issue within that unit that will make the information more pertinent and actionable
- Some topics (notably IT) are critical and complex, and difficult to address with just one or two presentations.
- Trustees should be expected to read material in advance (including PowerPoints) so that presentations can be limited to highlighting particular issues and time focused on answering questions and generating discussion.
- Some presentations are quite lengthy; they should be limited to a reasonable time.
- At times it feels like presentations are slick, sugar-coated and designed for good PR, rather than to actually inform and generate discussion about moving the UO forward.
- There has been a wide range in quality. Presenters need to be cognizant of the amount of information trustees receive, not read slides, and be clear about articulating important points.
- Multiple people noted that IT related presentations have not been useful.

2. Please provide general feedback on public comment:

There is a general sense among trustees that this is a useful and necessary part of board meetings, even though many are disrespectful in their presentations, and that it is important for the campus community to know they can be heard. Observations noted by trustees follow:

- *Trustees were split on whether to keep people to time more aggressively, or whether to allow greater flexibility.*
- *There is a strong sense that Chuck manages this well and in a diplomatic fashion, despite the blatant disregard for the protocols.*
- *It has noted that there is almost always at least one perspective shared during public comment that wouldn't have otherwise been considered.*
- *If there is a way to streamline and diminish the theatrical, inflammatory portions, that could be helpful.*
- *Much of the information provided is not useful, factual and/or helpful.*

3. I prefer board materials to be [electronic v. paper].

We will continue to provide hard copies at meetings to those who noted a preference for this. We will of course always provide handouts for anything that is changed after the original posting, including any items amended in committee meetings before submission to the full BOT.

4. To minimize pages in board materials, I would be OK if the full BOT packet simply referenced resolution exhibits, summaries, etc. in the committee packets.

Trustees were split on whether this would work, so we'll continue to seek other solutions to minimize paper and file sizes.

5. At full BOT meetings, we spend _____ time discussing seconded motions from committees.

A strong majority of trustees believe we spend the right amount of time discussing seconded motions from committees, with a few believing there was too much time spent and one trustee believing there was too little.

6. Please provide feedback on the tour portion of meetings. What has been useful or educational? Should we continue this practice? Is there anything you really want to see and haven't? Etc.

There was overwhelming agreement that tours and site visits are valuable and should be continued. Below are a few key points raised by trustees:

- *These have been excellent for the Board's education; it is good to be out and about on campus, and for trustees to be seen*
- *The tours should include the good, the bad and the ugly*

- Some noted that, while useful, they should not take time away from important strategic discussions during meetings. As the Board becomes more educated, more time should be spent on key issues and discussions, rather than tours.
 - Perhaps these tours can be done outside of quarterly meetings when trustees can visit.
- Suggestions on future tours:
 - It would be good to take tours and get exposure to more operational aspects of the university (e.g. food services, custodial, maintenance, deferred maintenance, etc.) as well as outreach programs and services (e.g. health center, Academic Extension, camps)
 - Tours should match up with issues and opportunities before the Board
 - Consider tours relating to the clusters or other academic areas of focus

7. Receiving materials one week in advance _____:

The overwhelming majority thought that one week in advance was good, as opposed to not being enough time. However, several people acknowledged (and we appreciate this very much) that more time might be useful, but in the interest of balancing how current information needs to be and the need to get everything and collate it, one week was enough.

SECTION III: MEETINGS - ARRANGEMENTS & LOGISTICS

1. Please provide feedback on the food at BOT meetings:

Generally speaking, people feel the food is good/fine. We did note to provide actual breakfast options, increase fruit and veggie options, and cease the boxed lunches.

2. Out of town trustees - please provide feedback on the lodging:

This is a moot question at this point as we were able to negotiate a per diem rate at the Inn at the 5th so you will be much closer and have more flexible transportation options (than the Hilton or VRI shuttles).

3. What did you think of having committee meetings in the ballroom as opposed to FAC 403?

While some trustees were indifferent, the group was largely split. People liked the formality of the ballroom and the additional space for the audience and media. Others prefer the more intimate atmosphere and comfort of 403. As it turns out, we will use both rooms in September since committees (ASAC and FFC) will meet simultaneously. We'll get more feedback after September to identify best options going forward, especially if people like that the meetings are simultaneous (which is largely what allows for two-day schedules).

4. Please provide feedback on the set-up (tables, mics, etc.)

Generally speaking trustees seemed fine-to-pleased with the set-up. However, we did take note (and agree) that trustees would like to continue making sure their backs are not to the audience. We also noted (and agree) that sound continues to be a problem, especially for those on the phone or who are hard of hearing and someone is speaking without a microphone. We will work to get more mics in the committee rooms.

5. Regarding the small group dinners:

Trustees were overwhelmingly positive about the small group dinners and want to continue doing them as they are. Some noted that it would be good to include spouses at an event at least once per year. We are working on doing this for December – a holiday party/reception of sorts.

6. Do you use your UO-issued Surface (be honest)?

No one uses their UO-issued Surface more than “rarely”, with most not using it at all. So, for those who said we could take it back, we will (and will repurpose it at the institution). We will also not issue devices going forward as a standard procedure, but will of course do so if a trustee needs a device to complete his/her work.

SECTION IV: THE BOARD

1. Please provide feedback for the following individuals with respect to their board leadership role. Constructive input can be about what they do well, and what could be improved.

1a. Chair Chuck Lillis:

Trustees were extremely positive about the Chair. They were complimentary of his demeanor and talent at running meetings, and were grateful for his knowledge, vision, passion, experience and leadership. Summarized points are below:

- *He’s great.*
- *Let’s make sure he does not get burnt out – how can we share more responsibility?*
- *It would be good – especially as issues arise close to or at a meeting – to clearly understand the Chair’s opinion on the matter*
- *It will be nice to have a more engaged and vocal (read: permanent) president going forward to help alleviate some of the responsibility falling to the Chair*
- *The Board is extremely fortunate to have his leadership at this time*
- *Trustees are appreciative of the amount of time Chuck puts into the job*
- *Chuck has a deep and broad-based knowledge and experience which prompts penetrating questions and inspires confidence*
- *There is some question and concern about how much information is not getting shared with other trustees and/or how many informal decisions are being made*

1b. Vice Chair Ginevra Ralph:

The general sense among trustees was that they had not had cause to develop an opinion about the vice chair's performance – not because of Ginevra, but because the role does not have as defined or as visible responsibilities. Summarized points are below:

- *Ginevra is thoughtful and asks insightful questions*
- *She is great*
- *She listens carefully to presenters and is engaged on a variety of topics*
- *She expresses strong opinions, which is viewed as positive, but some trustees expressed concern over weighing in with personal beliefs*

1c. ASAC Chair Mary Wilcox

Trustees were very positive about Mary and her leadership of the ASAC. Some common observations were:

- *Mary runs an effective meeting and does a good job preparing for the meetings*
- *Mary is very good at allowing everyone to speak, is respectful, and is welcoming if people want to offer changes and suggestions, etc.*
- *Mary is very capable and knowledgeable*
- *Mary should start to expect more out of her committee members, now that trustees are more experienced*

1d. FFC Chair Ross Kari

Trustees were very positive about Ross, especially is finance bona fides, and his leadership of the FFC. Some common observations were:

- *Ross does a very good job as chair and keeps meetings going and focused*
- *Ross could be a tremendous mentor for Jamie*
- *Ross is very capable and a real asset in his role*
- *Ross is very knowledgeable and has terrific expertise*
- *Ross should begin to push the UO to think outside the box and challenge the status quo when it comes to financial matters*

2. Please assess the board's collective knowledge and experience in the following fields. Note, this does not mean knowledge or experience with regard to UO-specific issues, but professional experience, outside knowledge, etc.

Board-CEO Relationships (management, development, etc.):

Generally, trustees felt the BOT has good collective knowledge in this area.

Enterprise Management (performance audits, business affairs, processes, etc.):

Generally, trustees felt the BOT has good collective knowledge in this area.

Financial Management (financial audits, budgets, investing, bonding, etc.):

Trustees felt the BOT has fairly good collective knowledge in this area, but several noted that we could use more.

Government Relations (federal affairs, state affairs, statutes, etc.):

Trustees generally felt the BOT has limited overall knowledge in this area and that it could use more given its importance.

Higher Education (faculty, trends, issues, history, nuances, etc.):

Generally, trustees acknowledge that is developing as they become more educated; most were in agreement that there is room for growth.

Legal Affairs (contracts, risk, litigation, employment matters, etc.):

Responses were mixed, ranging from “limited” to “excellent”. A lawyer – who shall remain nameless, reminds us that you can never have too many of them. I’m sure some would disagree.

Philanthropy (fundraising, stewardship, etc.):

Responses were very mixed from “limited” to “very knowledgeable”. Regardless of responses, there was a general agreement that the BOT could learn more about its role with respect to philanthropy to be as helpful as possible.

Physical Plant and Planning (construction, bidding, timing, planning, permitting, etc.):

Most trustees recognize that there is at least one trustee with very strong knowledge and experience in this area. The general sentiment was that – overall – the board rates fair to good in this.

Research (grants, federal funding, PPPs, commercialization, safety, etc.):

This is an area where all respondents agreed that there is more to learn and that the collective knowledge of trustees in this area could and/or should be better.

Strategic Planning and Execution (mission alignment, goal-setting, etc.):

A common theme was that the BOT probably has a depth of knowledge and experience in this area, but that it has not been tested or used – something which they hope changes.

SECTION V: MISCELLANEOUS

1. What can board staff (Angela and Amanda) do to better serve you? (Don't go easy just because Angela is collating these responses!)

Feedback was very positive. One trustee asked that staff send materials sooner.

2. Do you get too much communication from the UO? Too little? What can we do to improve this either direction?

Trustees were comfortable with the amount of communication they are receiving with limited requests to increase the information flow in advance of breaking (bad) news and perhaps some legal issues.

3. Are other university staff appropriately responsive to your inquiries and requests? Are there any points of confusion about staff roles we can better clarify?

Trustees believe that university staff are responsive, if not highly responsive. However, there was a common thread that – while responsive – information doesn't seem to be complete. Many questioned whether UO staff don't know the answers, or are afraid to answer. Several trustees asked for clarification about roles and responsibilities, which we will seek to provide soon. One trustee also cautioned that even a minor request from a trustee can become a major project for staff, so the BOT needs to be cognizant of what it's asking.

4. How do you feel the BOT's relationships with various senior administrators are? Please identify any particular individuals with whom you'd like more engagement, or any topics (if you don't know the portfolio owner) about which you'd like to know more.

Generally speaking, trustees believe that relationships are good and continuing to develop and believe that there is a lot of talent. However, this question prompted a variety of questions and issues that we need to look into going forward. They include:

- *Are senior leadership portfolios the right mix and size for effective management?*
- *Do senior staff members trust the board? Are they providing all of the information we want and need?*
- *Filling key positions (e.g. deans, VPRI) is an absolute top priority*
- *Some seem to be more interested in pushing agendas rather than having open discussions about what direction to take, risks, etc.*
- *Are certain senior administrators entrenched in the status quo?*
- *Sometimes these interactions and relationships seems unnecessarily formal.*

- 4a. Do you feel that senior staff appropriately engage with the BOT as it relates to attending meetings, preparing for meetings, etc.?

Overwhelmingly trustees responded "yes" to this question, with acknowledgement that there is always room to improve as everyone gets to know everyone else better over time. There was some discussion of meeting those who are not necessarily top administrators.

5. Please fill in the blanks with whatever comes to mind:

5a. In 2015-16, I would like to see the board _____.

These are not verbatim responses, but capture everything submitted:

- *Engage in proactive strategic planning with the new president (and staff) about priorities for the UO, how to apply urgency, and how to drive excellence*
- *Assist the president in identifying areas of priority, and areas of possible disinvestment*
- *Focus on faculty recruitment*
- *Focus on student costs and access*
- *Interact more with students*
- *Webcast the meetings*
- *Engage in more open discussions about priorities and strategies, recognizing issues that public meetings might cause*
- *Ensuring the UO improves internal and external communications*
- *Clarifying the university's broader strategy*
- *Improve faculty relationships and enhance the faculty's understanding of and engagement in philanthropy*
- *Continue to change the UO culture and challenge the status quo*
- *Streamlining administrative processes*

5b. In 2015-16, I personally would like to really engage with / focus on _____.

We have maintained a list of individual responses so that we can begin matching people up with specific projects, identifying topics for committee meetings, engaging people in off-cycle opportunities, etc. A list of topics – without attribution – is below:

- *Developing a strategic plan and model*
- *Student success issues*
- *Oversight of and improved relationships with athletics*
- *Connecting campus community members with the Board, and connecting BOT members with those who make up the broader campus community*
- *Development of a Portland plan*
- *Closer collaboration with the UOF to identify funding opportunities*
- *Strategic communications*
- *Tuition and student costs*
- *Business/enterprise management issues*

6. Other thoughts, questions, suggestions?

Below is a recap of questions (with answers where possible) and miscellaneous points added by trustees:

- *Can we add board members?*
[Depending on how one interprets the ORS, we could likely add 1 board member. It reads that the Governor appoints the 11-15 members of the BOT. Since the Governor does not appoint the president, an ex officio non-voting member, we arguably could have 15 members apart from the president. Note: This answer was not reviewed by GC.]
- *Can we look into public meetings laws and requirements that chill open conversation?*

[The short answer is yes, but this is a sensitive and complicated issue.]

- *What can we learn from other university boards?*
[A lot. Board staff engage with colleagues across the country and are focused on doing a lot of best practice research. It's all a hodge-podge, but very helpful.]
- *Consider a 1-2 day retreat*
- *Attendance expectations should be established for trustees*
- *Engage trustees and UOF trustees on special assignments to leverage talent*
- *Remember: "To give anything less than your best is to sacrifice the gift." –Pre*
- *Strengthening dean and department chair personnel is imperative*
- *Board materials should look like more well-rounded briefings with fuller information and context.*
- *We should not learn more about a subject from a R-G article than we do at the actual BOT meeting.*

**University of Oregon Board of Trustees
2017 Survey and Evaluation**

This information will be kept confidential and used to inform decisions by the chair and secretary as it relates to board operations and management. Your responses are considered internal advisory information for that purpose. Please also feel free to call if you want to expand on anything.

YOUR NAME, PLEASE:

SECTION I: MEETINGS – SCHEDULE

1. The board has _____ meetings.

- Too few
- Too many
- Just enough

All respondents said “just enough”

2. The committees have _____ meetings.

- Too few
- Too many
- Just enough

One trustee said too few, but all other respondents said just enough. Someone did acknowledge that while they think it’s just enough, there could perhaps be benefit for more depending on the topic and specific circumstances.

3. I think committee meetings:

- Should be off-cycle from board meetings
-When beneficial
- Should continue to be scheduled in conjunction with board meetings

One trustee said off-cycle when beneficial, but all respondents (including that one) said in conjunction with board meetings. One trustee added commentary that we need to endeavor to get all presentations into the pre-reading packets and that we need to ensure committees are not simultaneous so that trustees can attend/hear all meetings if desired.

4. While in town for BOT meetings, I would like to have individual meetings scheduled for me to dive further into particular areas of interest.

- Agree – pack more in with regard to my areas of interest and focus
- Disagree – I would rather spend more time in group meetings with other trustees

Most respondents said to pack in more individual meetings on particular areas of interest, but some said they disagree and would remain focused on group meetings.

5. The BOT should continue the small group discussions with various campus constituencies (e.g. the student, faculty or staff meetings).

- Yes, they are valuable.

- Yes, but let's try changing them up (for example, topic-specific groups)
- No, they are not as valuable as they once were.

No one said they were no longer valuable, but respondents were split about whether to keep them the same or change them up a bit. So we will experiment with more topic-specific groups. Comments provided included: need to share information received and report out; trying to get the OAs and Classified staff to mix up, and to have the OA trustee meet with classified staff and the classified trustee meet with OAs;

6. Assuming that meetings remain approximately 1-1.5 days total, I would prefer:

- To start bright and early on day 1 and end midday on day 2
- To start late morning on day 1 and end in the afternoon on day 2
- To start midday on day 1 and end at close of business on day 2
- No timeframe in particular

Trustees were pretty evenly split on this between options 1, 2 and 4 and many indicated flexibility or not a strong preference. We will continue to try and plan meetings that allow for enough time for the topics at hand, but maybe play around a little with start times, end times, etc.

SECTION II: MEETINGS – FORMAT & MATERIALS

1. Please help us assess the quality of materials and presentations.

1(a). Generally speaking, materials accompanying resolutions are:

- Lacking
- Sufficient
- Very useful

Trustees mostly responded as "very useful" with a few (3) responding as "sufficient". This is good news as the board office compiles much of these documents/summaries.

1(b). Generally speaking, materials associated with informational sessions are:

- Lacking
- Sufficient
- Very useful

This was more evenly split between "very useful" and "sufficient". Most noted that it varies highly with some offices better at it than others. We will continue to work with administrators on the quality and usefulness of their materials for informational presentations.

1(c). I have enough information heading into the board meeting:

- Agree
- Disagree, generally
- Disagree, specifically with regard to _____.

All respondents said “agree” with one person adding a note that they would like to get the audit report earlier. We will continue to work with OIA on this to ensure the report is as updated as possible but still completed on time.

1(d). The quarterly financial updates are sufficient and understandable.

- Agree Disagree

All but one respondent said “agree”; folks noted that these docs are usually helpful but more extensive narrative would be better; there is a desire for deeper dives by FFC.

1(e). PowerPoint presentations are (check all that apply):

- Always a good tool
- Wonderful, but only when the presenter isn’t reading the slides
- Great, but I always want to see the slides in advance to prepare
- Fine, but don’t feel compelled to use them
- Should be able to stand alone when read in my packet
- A terrific Microsoft product, but not for our purposes
- Usually pretty good at our meetings
- Usually not very well done at our meetings

The general takeaway here is that people like the use of slides and like to get them in advance, but do not like when people simply read them. There was also good feedback about how well they are structured (i.e., visibility, readability).

1(f). Anything else about materials you’d like to share?

Some general thoughts offered:

- Be sure people shed light on things that aren’t self-evident in the reading
- Continue to give us materials 1 week in advance; this is helpful
- Consider inviting non-UO people to talk about issues to get another perspective, and consider inviting various UO people who would have different perspectives on the same issue
- Committee reports are not really valuable since most of us go to all the meetings anyway

2. Please provide general feedback on public comment, taking into consideration relative value, enforcement of procedures, suggestions, etc.

Trustees generally believe that public comment is necessary for public engagement but that it is not terribly useful as many people who provide comment are mis-informed, addressing issues that are very specific or relational as opposed to governance matters or systemic issues. Several people acknowledge that it’s very frustrating when misinformation is offered and there is no counterpoint, but also recognize that this is not the goal of the session. Trustees were very appreciative of the way Chair Lillis manages public comment with diplomacy, tact, etc. Generally glad that he is not strict about the three minute time limit, but also grateful that most public commenters are respectful of it on their own. Some behavior is uncivilized, which is difficult and counter-productive.

3. At full BOT meetings, committee reports... (check all that apply)

- ...Should always be given.
- ...Should be given, but only about any resolutions coming from that committee or a critical topic as identified by the committee chair.
- ...Should never be done orally, but should be done in writing instead.
- ...Are unnecessary as we can attend committee meetings if interested

Trustees generally think it's only necessary to have a quick recap from a committee chair when there is a motion forwarded to the full board.

4. Please list any facilities or areas of campus that particularly interest you for a site visit/tour.

These summarize the recommendations and we will continue to work through these ideas:

- AAA
- Neuroscience
- J-School
- State of facilities, even if they aren't new or on the capital plan
- Chapman when completed
- Knight Campus when appropriate
- Older buildings to see condition, deferred maintenance
- New residence hall by Global Scholars
- Childcare centers
- Berwick Hall
- Co-gen facilities
- Price Science Commons
- Health center
- Oregon Hall and Pacific Hall after renovations
- Surplus property (is there any?)

SECTION III: MEETINGS - ARRANGEMENTS & LOGISTICS

1. Out of town trustees, please provide feedback on the lodging, including the shuttle:

Works fine
Fabulous
Very good

No feedback provided for this question

2. Please provide feedback on the set-up, but do so knowing that we are (i) getting better chairs for you to sit in all day and (ii) finally updating the mic technology in the ballroom!

Generally speaking people really like the ballroom and the set-up, but a few specific issues were raised:

Chairs in the ballroom are not meant to be sit in all day. Several trustees have to stand for back reasons. It's often too cold in the room.

Acoustics are not great.

Consider adding a screen to the east wall.

3. Regarding the small group dinners:

- They are valuable, but we should have fewer administrators/staff
- They are valuable, but we should have more variety of administrators/staff
- Let's discontinue them because I would rather have my evening free
- I'd rather have a big group dinner with everyone even if it means we cannot talk about substantive issues.
- I'd like a mix of dinners – some in small groups and sometimes with our whole group.

Most respondents would like a mix of dinners, some in small groups and sometimes with the whole group. We will endeavor to alternate between larger (social only) dinners and small group dinners (where in people can perhaps talk more freely without quorum restrictions)

4. Please provide feedback on the food at BOT meetings:

Most people are fine with the food and know we are moderately limited, but some suggestions included more vegetarian options and more healthy options (e.g., less pastries more fruit). Not sandwiches all the time please.

5. If new BOT jackets or shirts were made, I'd wear one.

- Agree, it would be a nice token of appreciation and show some unity.
- Disagree, it's not worth the money.
- Agree, but only if it was made by Columbia Sportswear (or Nike)

Not worth the money (overwhelmingly)

SECTION IV: THE BOARD

1. Please provide feedback for the board chair and vice chair.

Feedback was very positive. Comments included:

- *Truly excellent*
- *Thanks for signing on again for another 3 years*
- *Meetings are well run*
- *The chair doesn't get nearly enough credit and devotes a ton of time*
- *Terrific job by both*

2. Please provide feedback for your respective committee chair(s).

Very positive feedback. Comments included:

- *Excellent and engaged*
- *ASAC is becoming more focused which is hard*
- *More focused presentations will be useful particularly in ASAC*
- *Would be nice to have ASAC get a sense of the university committees (e.g. academic council, grad council, undergrad council) and what they do*

- 3. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being TERRIFIC! please assess the board's collective knowledge and experience in the following fields. Note, this does not mean knowledge or experience with regard to UO-specific issues, but professional experience, outside knowledge, etc.:**

Board-CEO Relationships (e.g., management, evaluation, development): 7.8
Enterprise Management (e.g., performance audits, business affairs, processes): 8
Financial Management (e.g., financial audits, budgets, investing, bonding): 7.8
Government Relations (e.g., federal affairs, state affairs, statutes): 7.4
Higher Education (e.g., faculty, trends, issues, history, nuances): 6.6 (but several noted this is growing as they learn more)
Legal Affairs (e.g., contracts, risk, litigation, employment matters): 7.4
Philanthropy (e.g., fundraising, stewardship): 8.1
Physical Plant & Planning (e.g., construction, bidding, timing, planning, permitting): 7.25
Research (e.g., grants, federal funding, commercialization, safety): 6
Strategic Planning *and* Execution (e.g., mission alignment, goal-setting): 7.5

- 4. What additional skills or training do you think the board needs (or needs to enhance)?**

- *Can we do a planning retreat?*
- *State funding*
- *Funding strategies in challenging times*
- *Trends in higher education*
- *Governance v. management – what types of questions to ask?*
- *Communicating with the campus*
- *How do major academic units operate administratively*
- *Getting someone else with financial background would be great*

SECTION V: COMMITTEES

- 1. Given the current committee structure (EAC, ASAC, FFC), are you happy with your committee assignment? If not, why?**

No responses

- 2. What do you think of the current committee structure? Think broadly in your response and consider things such as (but not limited to) subject areas, work load, division of labor, key board responsibilities, etc.**

The general sense is that the committee structure is fine, but some wonder if it's necessary considering most trustees go to all board meetings. We will explore what other universities have done relative to not having committees, or having different forms. There was particular acknowledgment that ASAC has a broad and less transactional committee which can be difficult.

3. Do you feel like committees have enough information about risk in relative areas of authority?

- Yes, we have an appropriate level of knowledge.
- Perhaps some members of the committee do, but I don't.
- No, I don't think we've focused on this enough.
- No, in fact I don't really have a sense of what risks might be in my committee's area.

Trustees were split but the majority of respondents believed we need more focus on this; we will begin to have Andre present 2x per year.

4. What suggestions to you have as topics for the board or its committees? What would you like to learn more about? What do you think the board doesn't discuss enough? Etc.

Suggested topics put here in no particular order:

- Financial risk
- UO strategic communications plan
- Capital campaign
- Legal challenges
- Strategic priorities (progress)
- Pine Mountain
- Humanities as an academic area in focus
- AAU peer metrics in various areas

SECTION VI: MISCELLANEOUS

1. What can board staff do to better serve you?

No responses.

2. Do you get too much communication from the UO? Too little? What can we do to improve this either direction?

Trustees were pleased with the level of communication.

3. Are other university staff appropriately responsive to your inquiries and requests? Are there any points of confusion about staff roles we can better clarify?

All respondents said yes.

4. How do you feel about the BOT's relationships with various senior administrators? Please identify any particular individuals with whom you'd like more engagement, or any topics (if you don't know the portfolio owner) about which you'd like to know more.

Trustees were generally pleased with the relationships with various administrators and look forward to engaging with the new provost. It's good to have administrators join the small group dinners on occasion to have more intimate conversations. People noted they enjoyed getting to know Conover.

4(a). Do you feel that senior staff appropriately engage with the BOT as it relates to attending meetings, preparing for meetings, etc.? Would you like to see more people attend the meetings? Would you like to hear from more people as part of the agenda?

Trustees indicated that they do not feel compelled to have senior administrators present if they are not participating because they worry whether the time is valuable. They do not have an expectation that people are there but do of course like to engage and hear from them.

5. In 2017-18, I would like to see the board:

- *Plan a retreat, but one where we can have private, candid conversation*
- *Detailed discussion about risk*
- *Another meeting in Portland*
- *Learn from other public universities*
- *Exhaust all options to solve financial problems*

6. In 2017-18, I personally would like to really engage with or focus on:

How are we progressing on student success, access, and academic quality? Updates regarding the demands of the Black Student Task Force. Efficiency and cost saving assessments.

7. Other thoughts, questions, suggestions?

Trustees were generally very pleased with what the board has achieved in a short amount of time, particularly with a new president and number of new staff/leaders. Financial instability is concerning, but understandable and something the board should continue to focus on. Several people indicated a desire for more team-building type events and opportunities.