

Proposed Agenda

Thursday Afternoon

- **Some Context: A Strategy for the 1990s (JJD)**
- **An Assessment of "The First Year" (all)**
- **Performance Evaluation of President (Board)**
- **Performance Evaluation of EOs and Deans (JJD)**
- **Performance Evaluation of Board (JJD & RLK)**

Friday Morning

- **The Year Ahead (all)**
- **The Role and Functioning of the Board (all)**
(and its relationship to the President and EOs)
- **Specific Issues (all)**

Specific Issues

- **Regents "Perks"**
- **Regent support staffing**
- **Advisory Groups**

Capital Campaign Advisory Group

Investment Advisory Group

Other possible groups

- **Other "sensitive issues" (e.g., honorary degrees, Inglis House, student activism, political issues)**

EO Concerns

- **Board continues to be more *regulatory* than *supportive*...
...rarely do Regents ask what they can do to help!**
- **Board continues to be far too preoccupied with micromanagement and inadequately involved in strategy and planning efforts.**
- **EOs continue to spend far too much time on Board matters (particularly individual inquiries or requests).**
- **We continue to have communication problems--both because of open meetings laws and sensitivity to personality and political divisions among Board members.**
- **The EOs continue to have only limited confidence that the Board will back them on difficult matters when push comes to shove (a concern shared by HTS and RWF).**
- **There continues to be inadequate involvement by Board in its support of University in both the political and public arena.**

The Emperor's Clothes (or lack thereof...)

The unusually long tenure of many of the Board members has generated a deceptive sense of overconfidence in the Board's knowledge of the University...

i) There is no way that a lay board can ever obtain the working knowledge of a complex institution such as the UM.

ii) The University--and the environment in which it finds itself--is changing very rapidly, and attempts simply to apply the experience of the past can lead to serious mistakes.

iii) It may well be that the unrealistic sense of confidence in the working knowledge of those with many years of Board experience has contributed to the Board's tendency to get too involved in micromanagement in recent years--and led to its inadequate involvement in the key policy and strategic issues before the University.

Key frustrations of the past year...

- **Lansing**
 - Leadership vacuum (style over substance)**
 - Low priority given higher ed (and human resources)**
 - Capital Outlay bottleneck**
 - Confrontation politics (MET, tuition control, Sederburg...)**
- **Students**
 - Lack of pride in University**
 - Lack of involvement in Michigan Mandate**
 - Total anarchy within Michigan Daily**
- **Regents**
 - Slowness of shift from micromanagement to policy and planning (strategic focus)**
 - Continued tendency toward regulation rather than support**
- **Academic Units**
 - LS&A**
 - UM Medical Center**
- **Need for more hours in the day...**

What we hoped to accomplish... but simply didn't get around to...

- **Leadership Network (CEOs)**
- **State Outreach Network**
- **Campus Community Building**
- **"Pride in Place" Campaign**
- **Federal Agenda**

Some key recommendations of the Board Retreat with Bill Friday

General Philosophy:

- 1. The Board should view its role as supportive rather than regulatory.**
- 2. The Board should "always be a loving critic of the University".**
- 3. Board members should be first, last, and always advocates for the University.**
- 4. The Board should always be perceived as supporting the President and EOs publicly (circling the wagons to protect the officers during times of personal attack).**

Friday Recommendations (cont)

Communications:

- 1. It is the President's responsibility to communicate sufficiently with the Board so that it understands his actions and can support them.**
- 1. It is the President's and EOs' responsibility never to take the Board by surprise.**
- 2. The Board and EOs must work hard to achieve effective communication both among Board members and between the Board and the President and EOs. It is important not to let the Open Meetings Act cripple effective communication.**

Friday Recommendations (cont)

Focus of Board Activities:

- 1. The Board should focus its activities on planning and policy and leave the management of the institution to the President and his officers.**
- 2. It is important that the Board focus more on the future and less on day-to-day activities.**
- 3. The Board should ask the EOs to redesign the Regents' meeting agenda to eliminate detail and focus them more on strategic issues. They should also invite the EOs to propose a more streamlined set of Regental Bylaws.**
- 4. There was a sense that the excessive involvement of the Board in details was requiring the EOs to spend far too much time on Board matters at the expense of their institutional responsibilities.**

Friday Recommendations (cont)

Board Behavior:

- 1. The Board only has power when it acts as a body; individuals acting alone have no authority. It is extremely important that all Board members support the decisions of the Board once action has been taken.**
- 2. Board members should convey negative viewpoints about staff directly confidentially to the President; it is his responsibility to convey these to the officers concerned.**

Problems with Existing EO Structure

- **No distinction between "line" and "staff" responsibilities**
- **Too horizontal**
- **Artificially decouples key academic functions (research and student affairs) from chief academic officer (Provost)**
- **Inconsistent with Michigan history...**
(which has generally functioned with a line management team of the President, VPAA, and VPCFO)