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Share UNC stakeholder input on the Board of Governors

Discuss planned approach to address observations
UNC stakeholder input on Board of Governors (I)
From interviews conducted 1Q 2016

Composition

• Many stakeholders, including Board members, have connected the large size with a confusion in role clarity, negative Board dynamic, and slowness to make decisions

Board meeting processes

• Although 76% of the Board believes current frequency of meeting is appropriate, reception from other stakeholders has been mixed
  – Some GA staff and Chancellors voiced that the frequency of Board meetings prevented them from other high-value work

• Board members expressed a desire to discuss high level policy and strategy more often in meetings—55% of Board members disagreed that the Board spends a sufficient proportion of time engaging on matters of key importance

• Board members often reported that they were given too much pre-read information with too little time to digest it

• Board members felt there was a need to improve agenda setting
UNC stakeholder input on Board of Governors (II)
From interviews conducted 1Q 2016

Committees & other sub-groups

- Mixed perspectives on the effectiveness of special committees and working groups
  - Board members reported that some special committees and working groups are too narrow, with purpose unclear
  - 17 total subgroups is a large number for a board of 32 to manage (7 standing committees, 7 special committees, 3 working groups)
- Desire to better leverage system talent and higher education experts in Board and committee discussions

Board education

- 62% of Board members disagree that there are adequate procedures for orienting new members
- Board members come from a diverse range of leadership roles and may not have public sector board experience

Boards of Trustees

- Roles of Board of Trustees are unclear and highly variable across the system
  - "It is unclear to me how the Board of Trustees fits in with the Board of Governors"
- Some Board of Governors members feel they do not receive adequate support from Boards of Trustees to vet and challenge institutional decisions
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Share UNC stakeholder input on the Board of Governors

Discuss planned approach to address observations
Suggest addressing observations across two waves

**Current State (2016)**
- Elevate strategic priorities to enable the Board to 'major in the majors'
- Handle transactional activities as efficiently as possible through developing standard rotation of operational topics
- Align Board meetings with the most important issues and priorities
- Establish clarity on which committees and task forces should be overseen by the Board vs. the President

**Wave 1 (2016)**

**Wave 2 (2017-18)**
- Optimize and align the committee structure
- Adjust the meeting frequency, cadence and agendas based on lessons learned from Wave 1 changes
- Leverage best practices to the greatest extent possible

**Future State**
Specific committees on strategic priorities to be launched

**Board Standing Committees to wear 'double-hat':**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Opportunity for all</th>
<th>University Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td>Ensure a UNC education is within the financial means of all in the state</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>Increase degree attainment and ensure value &amp; relevance for students</td>
<td>Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Contribution to the state</td>
<td>Public Affairs and Audit, Risk Management, and Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent &amp; Diverse Institutions</td>
<td>Help institutions achieve excellence against their missions</td>
<td>Personnel and Tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Strategic Planning Committee will oversee strategic priority committees, in coordination with the President

In addition to Board members, each strategic priority committee should include:

- 3 to 4 chancellors
- Higher education experts, as relevant
Strategic Planning Committee has a critical coordination role

Coordinate calendars across entire process

Monitor overall workplan

Establish templates to ensure consistent and thorough output across committees

Synthesize across committees

Monitor progress on strategic priorities
Some considerations for strategic priority committees

Start with a clear understanding of current state activities and performance – both institution-level and system-wide

- What is the state of play? What are the priorities? How will progress be assessed/reported?
- Avoid jumping straight to new strategies / solutions

Involve the Chancellors as co-owners vs. minor stakeholders who are consulted for input

- E.g., ask Chancellors to provide team member(s) who will partner with GA to staff strategic priority committees

Once current state assessed, should consider what, if anything, should be done differently

- Consider not only what should be started but what current efforts should be stopped
- Be very clear about limited roles GA can and should play vs. what should be owned at institution level

Attention to these considerations will help maintain a balance between institutional ownership and a focused GA role
Suggested cadence for strategic priority committees

Initial committee work

- Establish factbase
  - Current-state performance
  - Activities and current practices at individual institutions, across institutions, and at the system level
  - National and NC context and best practices
  - Articulate gaps

- Identify metrics and set draft targets

- Develop draft actions to drive progress

Board engagement

- Review and discuss factbase

- Facilitate conversation
  - Metrics and targets
  - Board appropriate actions to drive progress
  - Policy recommendations
  - High-level budget request

Post-board meeting

- Synthesize input from discussion to finalize action plans
  - Metrics and targets
  - Actions to pursue (at institution-level and system-wide level)
  - Policy recommendations
  - Budget request

Pre-board meeting

- Track implementation progress

- Gather data on metrics and assess progress relative to targets

Board engagement

- Present update on implementation and metrics

- Facilitate conversation across Board
  - Metrics and targets
  - Modifications to actions and resourcing

Strategic priorities should become a core ongoing focus of the Board, not simply a one-time exercise
Recommend covering strategic priorities in board meetings—handling operational items as much as possible in advance.

- Handle operational items w/ phone meeting week before in-person meeting and place most items into consent agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frees up additional capacity for strategic priorities
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