

**University of Oregon Board of Trustees
2020 Survey and Evaluation
CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE REPORT**

Italicized blue font represents consolidated responses.

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

All respondents said “just enough” though one split and said “too few” also

3. I think committee meetings:

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

All respondents thought they should continue to be in conjunction

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

Trustees had differing opinions, so rather than divert group time to individual meetings, we will follow-up with individuals about adding time for 1:1 or small group options.

5. The BOT should continue the small group lunch discussions with various campus constituencies (think: student, faculty or staff lunches).

- 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.

All agreed they should continue, but 2x responded that they’d like to change them up a bit more. We will put thought into how we might design them around topics, or reaching people who don’t traditionally sign up

6. The BOT should continue to have a smaller breakfast with student groups each meeting.

- Yes, they are valuable.
 No, they are not as valuable as they once were.

Most, though not all, trustees believe this particular mechanism is still valuable.

7. Assuming that meetings remain approximately 1.5-2 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

Most, though not all, prefer to start later on day 1 and finish the afternoon of day 2. The others (2) prefer to start midday on day 1 and end close of business day 2.

SECTION II: MEETINGS – FORMAT & MATERIALS

- 1. Please help us assess the quality of materials and presentations. Each question is a check-box question, and then there is an open-ended question at the bottom for additional feedback.**

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

- Lacking Sufficient Very useful

All but one stated “very useful”; the other was “sufficient”

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

- Lacking Sufficient Very useful

All but one stated “very useful”; the other was “sufficient”

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

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

All said “agree”

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

- Agree Disagree

All said “agree”. There was good feedback about focusing more on auxiliary budgets, large units within the E&G fund, etc. We will work with the finance chair to plan.

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

Everyone agreed that presenters should not read slides; a few people each also replied that people should not feel compelled to use them, that when they are used they are pretty good, and that they should be able to stand alone in the packet (not require oral context).

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

*Sometimes PPTs are too general and are used as fluff, not to clearly articulate a point.
Overall materials are very helpful and good.*

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

Generally speaking, trustees believe that this goes as well as it could. The chair is gracious in letting people speak and handles this very well, but some observe that we could do better in following our own guidelines and limiting oral comment to topics on the agenda(s). There is recognition that is a valuable (albeit not required) part of the meeting and that it is important for people to be heard. There is some frustration with comments that are often reiterated at multiple meetings, particularly when those are about issues not on the agenda.

3. Please list any subjects or topics you would like to know more about in the coming quarters.

Pandemic contingency planning; report of innovations in teaching, research or admin that have resulted from the shut-down; more emphasis on metrics and measuring outcomes, particularly in student success; long term plans for the Knight Campus; ongoing developments with international matters, including both international student population and study abroad; specific info to schools + colleges; financial information noted in 1(d).

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

Capital projects not yet visited or not yet visited since completion (KC, HF, UHC), prospective capital projects (University + Villard); areas with redesigned infrastructure due to COVID-19 innovations; Mac Court (less about a tour, more about “what’s next”); general tour to look at areas that might need minimal investment for maximum return (deferred maintenance, graffiti); OIMB

SECTION III: MEETINGS - ARRANGEMENTS & LOGISTICS

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

Positive

2. Please provide feedback on the meeting room set-up.

Layout is good, feels safe. Audio getting better but still difficult. (NOTE: We think updated Zoom technology will help with the livestream issues to those not in the room.)

3. Regarding the dinner on the first night 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 rather have small group dinners 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.

Responses were split, but the two highest responses were that they were valuable but we should (i) mix between small and big (as we do now) and (ii) have more variety of admin and staff join.

4. Please provide feedback on the food served during the meetings on campus.

Fine. Appreciation for vegetarian options, and some variety would be good.

SECTION IV: THE BOARD

- 1. Please provide feedback for the board chair and vice chair. Please include your thoughts about the skills, traits and experiences you would like to see in future board officers.**

Fortunate to have Lillis's leadership; no one better than Lillis; current leadership is great; vice chair is a good team member with chair; terrific experience and wisdom; good knowledge of working with an executive and executive team; deep passion; real-world skills in business is important, particularly coupled with empathy and understanding of student-centered mission; partner with the president – provide guidance and support, as well as constructive input and opinions; future officers should have background in leadership of complex organizations; must be collaborative and flexible; demonstrated demand to plan strategically; chairing the board is not an easy task – Lillis's patience is a tremendous asset; the job of chair going forward will be different than it was in these first several years

- 2. Please provide feedback for your respective committee chair(s). Please include your thoughts about the skills, traits and experiences you would like to see in future board officers.**

General sentiment from all was that chairs are good; it is important that they remind people why a topic is before a committee; succession planning will be very important and leadership roles, such as committee chairs, should be considered as people are recruited to apply

- 3. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being "VERY STRONG" 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, perspective, etc.:**

Board-CEO Relationships (e.g., management, evaluation, development): 9
Enterprise Management (e.g., performance audits, business affairs, processes): 8.25
Financial Management (e.g., financial audits, budgets, investing, bonding): 9
Government Relations (e.g., federal affairs, state affairs, statutes): 6.75
Higher Education (e.g., faculty, trends, issues, history, nuances): 6.5
Legal Affairs (e.g., contracts, risk, litigation, employment matters): 7.5
Philanthropy (e.g., fundraising, stewardship): 8.25
Physical Plant and Planning (e.g., construction, bidding, timing, planning, permitting): 8
Research (e.g., grants, federal funding, commercialization, safety): 6.25
Strategic Planning and Execution (e.g., mission alignment, goal-setting): 7.9

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

Trends in higher education; sometimes this depends on transition planning (e.g., if we lose someone with great knowledge of internal audit, we'll need training-or backfill-on that); government affairs; ongoing need for those who understand complex finance issues

- 5. As we think about recruiting individuals to volunteer for the board (knowing it is ultimately up to the governor to decide), what skills, traits or experiences are most valuable?**

Broad diversity; people with large organizational leadership skills (whether that be public, private or government sector); Oregon geographic representation; patience and good listening skills; diversity of work experience; connection to and passion for UO; be sure to factor in what the president, provost and senior team need; strong financial acumen; demonstrated success in

leading complex organization(s); board experience; working with senior leaders; sector of experience is less important than people who are seasoned, established leaders

6. Opportunities and challenges.

a. What are the biggest opportunities for the BOT in the coming years?

It's hard to know at this particular moment; now more than ever need to boost online teaching; expand research infrastructure to maintain excellence; philanthropy is critical/growing the endowment; how can COVID-19 lead to innovation and change that might not otherwise be possible or acceptable; elevating the UO's prestige through quality, and making sure prospective students know of this quality

b. What are the biggest challenges – operationally or institutionally – for the BOT in the coming years?

Must avoid getting bogged down in non-consequential issues and details; fallout of COVID; financial and economic challenges from so many angles; faculty relations; government relations; student mental, physical and social health

SECTION V: COMMITTEES

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

No complaints

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.

Mixed reviews. Some thought the structure was fine to good. Others think committees are just informational and might not be necessary. More discussion forthcoming on this.

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.

This was split equally between "yes" and the two "no" answers → we are working with risk management to improve this

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.

Long term priorities; contingency planning – not just for immediate term but foreseeable future; financial strength or risk of athletics; long-term KCASI plans; learning more about schools and big units; strategic planning due up; should hear more about strengths and weaknesses, not just reports of "what" but "how well"

SECTION VI: MISCELLANEOUS

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

No concerns

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

Generally speaking all thought this was good; no concerns

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?

Generally speaking all thought this was good; no concerns

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.

It is hard to develop relationships given quarterly visits but relationships seem good. Need to strengthen relationship with new provost (not a complaint, just timing)

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

All were good

5. In 2020-2021, I would like to see the board...

The board needs to really understand its role in managing through and after the crisis (management v governance); retreat re next chapter and considering transitions; 100% participation in giving to student crisis fund; discuss budget cuts required; greater understanding of strategic goals; better understand goals/direction for Portland; ROI of student success initiatives

6. In 2020-2021, I personally would like to really engage with or focus on...

This is individualized and not summarized here; we will work with each trustee to help them engage in the areas they mention; the topics generally aligned with #5, above

7. Other thoughts, questions, suggestions?

NA for this summary