

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
2022 Summary of Best Practices Performance Evaluations**

Performance Measure: Percent of total best practices met by the Board.

Target: 100%


Period: Annual



ODF Key Performance Measure: #2

Board Adopted: September 6, 2006





Summary of Individual Board Member Evaluations – July 20, 2022

Key: Within Each Criteria:

#’s
 = Board member tally count
 = range of ratings

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>1. Executive Director’s performance expectations are current. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the State Forester’s Position Description is current.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly Agree as we just filled this position. 	2	3 	0	0
<p>2. Executive Director’s performance has been evaluated in the last year. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the State Forester’s Position Description is current and that the annual performance appraisal has been completed.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> He has not worked a year, but I’m confident this will be done. N/A Since we just hired Cal very recently. Does not apply since we hired the new State Forester at the time of the year that we normally do the evaluation. 	0	2 	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
2022 Summary of Best Practices Performance Evaluations**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>3. The agency’s mission and high-level goals are current and applicable. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the Board’s <u>Forestry Program for Oregon</u> and <u>Oregon Forest Practices Act/Rules</u> are current.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of the Forestry Plan for Oregon will update mission. • The CCCP is current, but the FPFO and State FMP are both currently being worked on, since they are out of date. • FPFO was last updated in 2011. 	0	3 	2	0
<p>4. The Board reviews the <u>Annual Performance Progress Report</u>. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the Board reviews the report annually as a meeting agenda item.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	2 	3	0	0
<p>5. The Board is appropriately involved in review of agency’s key communications. <i>The Board understands this to mean agency and Board communications at a policy level, versus a day-to-day operating level.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	1 	4	0	0
<p>6. The Board is appropriately involved in policy-making activities. <i>The Board understands this to mean those policy activities that particularly have a statewide perspective, including holding Board meetings at different geographic locations around the state.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like the board to be more involved in setting the agenda, to FOCUS on the larger, strategic issues. • Board needs to continue to meet across the state to connect with the public and understand their needs. • Although in most cases this is done, the Private Forests Accord had no Board involvement as a Board. So I agree with this statement in some but not all instances of policy decisions and agreements. 	1 	4	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
2022 Summary of Best Practices Performance Evaluations**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>7. The agency’s policy option packages are aligned with their mission and goals. <i>The Board understands this to mean the packages included in the biennial budget process as part of the Agency Request Budget.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There can be greater alignment and this was discussed during the last board meeting. • However, the process of back and forth between staff and board on policy option packages does not work all that well and has been limited by staff just simply not having enough time to address all issues in some cases. • I agree for the most part. I believe that a structuring of funding for State Forests is needed to address sustainable forest management for all forest resources going forward. 	0	5 ↔	0	0
<p>8. The Board reviews all proposed budgets. <i>The Board understands this to mean the Department of Forestry’s biennial budget at the Agency Request Budget level.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	2 ↔	3	0	0
<p>9. The Board periodically reviews key financial information and audit findings. <i>The Board understands this to mean significant financial issues and as audits are released.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board is given an excellent financial monthly update that has been developed in the past 1.5 years. This is an excellent overview in addition to audit updates. 	3 ↔	2	0	0
<p>10. The Board is appropriately accounting for resources. <i>The Board understands this to mean critical issues relating to human, financial, material and facilities resources by providing oversight in these areas. This means that the Board receives briefings on such issues as succession management, vacancies, the budget, and financial effects of the fire program.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	0	5 ↔	0	0
<p>11. The agency adheres to accounting rules and other relevant financial controls. <i>The Board understands this to mean the receipt of the annual statewide audit report from Secretary of State which highlights any variances in accounting rules or significant control weaknesses.</i></p>	1 ↔	4	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
2022 Summary of Best Practices Performance Evaluations**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<u>Comments:</u> n/a				
<p>12. Board members act in accordance with their roles as public representatives. <i>The Board understands this to mean that they follow public meeting rules, the standard of conduct for Board members, and the public input process. Members received training and information from the Governor’s Office upon appointment.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	1 ←→	4 ←→	0	0
<p>13. The Board coordinates with others where responsibilities and interests overlap. <i>The Board understands this to mean other public agencies and boards with statutory authority connections or overlaps, e.g. the Forest Trust Land Counties, the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission/Department of Environmental Quality; the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission/Department of Fish and Wildlife; the State Land Board; local fire districts; the United States Forest Service; the Bureau of Land Management..</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that there are additional efficiencies that could be realized by collaborating with other agencies around shared goals, including monitoring efforts and implementation of climate-smart land management. 	0	5 ←→	0	0
<p>14. The Board members identify and attend appropriate training sessions. <i>The Board understands this to mean the workshops, symposia, and field tours that accompany some Board meetings, and that the Board receives adequate technical information.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	2 ←→	3 ←→	0	0
<p>15. The Board reviews its management practices to ensure best practices are utilized. <i>The Board understands this to mean carrying out this self-evaluation on an annual basis, conducting the annual Board work plan status check, and by conducting the periodic scan of issues on a biennial basis.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> However, all the questions in this survey are appropriately answered with a simple agree or disagree - they are really yes or no questions. Why do we have these strongly agree and strongly disagree options? The comment boxes offer the opportunity to share more nuanced thoughts. 	2 ←→	3 ←→	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
2022 Summary of Best Practices Performance Evaluations**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<i>Listed below is an additional best practice for the Board of Forestry; not included in calculating the percentage adherence to best practices.</i>				
<p>16. The Board values public input and transparency in conducting its work through outreach to and engagement of stakeholders and by using its work plan communication tools. The Board also values input and communications with its standing advisory committees, special ad hoc committees and panels and external committees with board interests.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't have the numbers, but it seems we have record testimony and letters. The public input is very strong. • I agree, but this could be improved by contracting with a university to conduct focused social science surveys to assess the values held by all Oregonians, not simply the stakeholders to whom we always seem to return to. 	3 ←	2 →	0	0
Total Number (Criteria 1-15)	17	53	2	0
Percentage of Total in Each Evaluation Category (Criteria 1-15)	23.61%	73.61%	2.78%	0%
Percentage of Total in "Agree" and "Disagree" (Criteria 1-15)	97%		3%	

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
2022 Summary of Best Practices Performance Evaluations**

Summary Questions for Consideration:

1. How is the Board doing?

- Fine
- The Board is doing well considering the volume of issues it must address
- Really Well
- Better than when I joined. Everyone seems committed and involved and positive.
- It is a high functioning Board with members who work well together and is being led by a Board Chair who has been effective in achieving these outcomes.

2. What factors are affecting the Board's results?

- The Chair needs to focus the agenda and drive discussion on the larger, strategic issues. We overbook the agenda and then cut items. There are very large issues that need board discuss and public input that are getting crowded out.
- The number of issues the Board must address is extremely high for a volunteer Board.
- A bit of overload, with too many issues facing the board, but I think we are over the worst of it.
- Covid protocols have limited our ability to get to know each other better but that is starting to change.
- One factor is the urgency associated with the rapid change in climate, and associated extreme weather events as they influence fire frequency and severity, tree stress and mortality, and subsequent effects on underserved communities. The other factor is time – As a volunteer Board, the time needed to address all ongoing efforts is significant, especially now with a revision of the FPFO.

3. What needs to be done to improve future performance?

- Focus
- More in person meetings, more ad hoc, simple field tours.
- The committee structure to delegate Board work among members needs some careful evaluation. Involvement of Board members in committees that may have been historically important, but not now essential, should be reconsidered.

Considerations for the Board of Forestry Governance Performance Measure Self-Evaluation

The Board of Forestry reviewed their recent self-evaluation of Best Management Practices in Governance Performance at the October 2021 Planning Retreat. In response to the discussion and feedback heard, the following conceptual focus areas are offered for Board consideration during their 2022 preliminary review of the self-evaluation criteria occurring throughout the month of January 2022.

#1 – Measuring trust.

Measuring trust within the Board’s self-assessment survey could be accomplished through a variety of direct and indirect methods, as briefly explored further below.

A direct response measurement might include a scaled assessment of a trust statement (Example A) or an open-ended summary question (Example B).

Example A - New Criteria (Metric over time, Likert-scale, not included in formal KPM %):

1. ***The Board has a high level of trust amongst its members.***

Responses would be measured through the Likert scale, providing a metric that could be referenced over time. The percentage would not be included in the formal Key Performance Measure of agreement. This criterion can include an area for commenting, if desired.

Example B - Open-ended summary question(s):

1. ***What is the level of trust amongst the Board (from your perspective)?***
2. ***Do we have enough trust in our relationships with each other on the Board?***

Responses would be generally measured upon the context of the statements within.

Indirect indicators of trust (Example C) could include a variety of new criterion or open-ended summary questions along the following concepts, (Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J.E. (1999), and Gourguechon, P. (2018)):

Example C – Likert-scale criterion and/or open-ended summary questions measuring:

1. ***Competence*** – effectiveness, efficiency, ability, confidence, success, decisiveness
2. ***Dependability*** – follow-through, consistency, reliability, responsibility, disciplined
3. ***Integrity*** – fairness, transparency, honesty, openness
4. ***Inclusiveness*** – listening, inquiring, responsive
5. ***Respect*** – commitment, kindness, safety, empathy

The Likert-scale measured criterion used in examples above should remain neutrally stated; however, additional open-ended questions in the survey (Example D) could have an intentional, proactive focus on identifying good governance practices this board wants to see in its working relationship.

Example D – Open-ended summary questions focused on positive identification:

1. ***What actions over the last year have built or reinforced trust amongst board members?***
2. ***What outcomes were produced in this last year when a high level of trust was present amongst the Board?***
3. ***What were the attributes or characteristics of trust you observed in your Board relationships?***

#2 - Measuring effectiveness.

The Board previously discussed effectiveness measures during their April 2021 orientation and reflected upon these measures during the October 2021 planning retreat. Formal measurement of these areas of effectiveness could be built into a new criterion (Example E) or this example could be split into eight or more individual criteria. Alternatively, the Board's effectiveness measures could be responded to in a summary question (Example F) or a hybrid blending the evaluation styles.

Example E – Likert-scale criterion w/ option for open-ended response:

1. ***The Board has effectively performed their work over the last year with:***
 - ***no surprises;***
 - ***an openness and willingness to discuss bias;***
 - ***working on interpersonal relationships to build trust;***
 - ***honesty around meeting mission, vision, and values;***
 - ***clarity on priorities;***
 - ***results-oriented;***
 - ***drawing on multiple sources of information; and***
 - ***constructive debate or deliberations.***

Additional effectiveness criteria that could be incorporated from the October retreat include:

- ***intellectual honesty,***
- ***decisions based on the best information available,***
- ***high level of accountability,***
- ***preparedness through review of materials, and***
- ***prioritization of pre-board and business meetings.***

Example F – Open-ended summary question:

1. ***Considering effectiveness of the Board's collaborative governance space, please reflect on how the Board is performing in areas of: no surprises; openness and willingness to discuss bias; working on interpersonal relationships to build trust; honesty around meeting mission, vision, and values; clarity on priorities; results-oriented; drawing on multiple sources of information; constructive debate or deliberations, and (insert any additional criteria desired)?***

#3 - Measuring public sentiment.

Criteria #16 is an existing criterion added by the 2007 Board of Forestry focused on the Board measuring its own perspective of the Board's value in public input, outreach, engagement, and communications. At the planning retreat, interest was shared in assessing the public's sentiment and perspective on whether the Board is offering enough opportunity for input and whether the public venues utilized are viable methods to provide feedback. A full assessment of our existing and potential measurements of public sentiment will require additional investment of staff and resources beyond this January 2022 self-evaluation review; however, if the Board is interested in further pursuit of this topic, Example G contains an initial idea for evaluating our existing public engagement and/or public sentiment measures with an independent research firm. If desired, this research could be incorporated into future evaluation cycles and inform other public engagement processes:

Example G –

1. **Independent Public Opinion Research** – *formal public opinion polling, outreach, and research conducted by an independent firm with expertise in telephone and online surveys, focus groups and other tools involving public opinion and outreach.*

#4 - Measuring staff perspectives on Board performance.

Department staff could engage in a collective performance review to supplement the Board's evaluation processes. One method could involve a defined focus group of department staff utilizing the same, or a similar version, of the governance performance evaluation form the Board completes each year and a collective summary prepared for the Board's review. Alternatively, a separate, additional 360-style review could be developed using a new set of performance-based questions that the Board and Department staff would complete simultaneously and then debrief on the results. If this additional style of evaluation is desired, staff will require additional time to develop the activity. With either method of staff evaluation utilized, a subsequent collective discussion on the working relationship between the Board and Department staff would be necessary to effectively process the feedback received.

#5 - Measuring board effectiveness outside the formal evaluation cycle.

To elevate measures of effectiveness within the Board environment all throughout the year, one strategy could be to utilize a series of open-ended questions based on Examples C and E, at regular meeting intervals and particularly after the Board faces a tough decision, to promote healthy board relationships, open process, and dialogue beyond the formal evaluation cycle. A similar strategy could be utilized with Department staff in an after-action review of the meeting with highlights shared by the State Forester in ongoing check-in meetings with Board members.

References:

Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J.E. (1999). Guidelines for measuring relationships in publics. Retrieved from http://www.instituteforpr.org/research_single/guidelines_measuring_relationships

Gourguechon, P. (2018). How to Assess an Essential Leadership Capacity: Trusting Others and Inspiring Trust. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prudygourguechon/2018/02/25/how-to-assess-an-essential-leadership-capacity-trusting-others-and-inspiring-trust/?sh=1a4ae23834ff>