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I. Overview

Recently the Executive Board of the Council on Undergraduate Research decided to reassess the organization's governance decision-making structure and practices. A similar emphasis took place back five years ago resulting in positive improvements; more changes resulted with the NCUR combination.

To support this governance review, CUR contracted with BoardSource¹ and its senior governance consultant, Bruce Lesley (see attached qualifications). Additionally, President William Campbell formed a Governance Task Force (GTF) made up of: Neal Abraham, Bill Campbell (Chair), Herb Childress, Beth Cunningham, Susan Larson, and Roger Rowlett. Nancy Hensel, Executive Officer, participated prior to her departure.

The Purposes of the CUR Governance Task Force were determined to be:
1. To develop recommendations on how to prepare the governance structure and practices of the CUR Officers, Executive Board (E-Board), General Council (GC), Committees or Task Forces, and Divisions for the future to reflect the growth of the organization and incorporation of NCUR.
2. To continue the professionalization of the CUR Executive Board, national office, and other bodies in the decision-making process, and as part of this,
   a. to help board members and councilors understand this professionalization as it impacts their changing roles, responsibilities, and value-added, and,
   b. to clarify who or what body is responsible for what decisions.
3. To determine ways to meaningfully engage the councilors and "grassroots" members in advancing CUR's mission and re-purpose any bodies as necessary.

Governance Task Force members were interviewed separately by the consultant (see attached questions) and the GTF met by conference call on October 18 to help frame the issues and design two separate input surveys, one for the Executive Board and the other for General Council members (see attached notes). The intention of these surveys was to obtain initial feedback on the current governance structure and practices along with any preliminary ideas for change. The feedback from these two surveys will provide a performance baseline for both the E-Board and GC and inform the governance discussion to be held by the E-Board in Washington for the January 27, 2012. Additional information drawn upon comes from an analysis of the bylaws and other governance-related materials.

What follows is an executive summary of feedback, first on the Executive Board and then from the General Council. Please keep in mind that these summary notes are the interpretation of this consultant, and any reader’s dispute may be raised and tested during the January discussions. Appendix A gives more information on how to read the numbers in this framing paper and the two Data Reports. Unless otherwise referenced, quotation marks ("...") are used for CUR respondent written comments and italics are used to denote a phrase or question from the assessment tool.

¹ BoardSource is dedicated to advancing the public good by building exceptional nonprofit boards and inspiring board service. BoardSource strives to support and promote excellence in board service, is the premier source of cutting-edge thinking and resources related to nonprofit boards, and engages and develops the next generation of board leaders.
In general, governance decision-making for the Council on Undergraduate Research is divided among the General Council (GC), the Executive Board (E-Board) of the General Council, and the Finance and Nominations Standing Committees of the General Council. These groups are responsible for the leadership, structure, practices, and policies that allow CUR and its staff leaders to carry out the mission — "to support and promote high-quality undergraduate student-faculty collaborative research and scholarship." These groups' core responsibilities cannot be delegated, although management and others often assist with their design and implementation.

II. Executive Board Self-Assessment

A. Broad Findings on Executive Board

Overview on the Board

Of the 20 questionnaires that were distributed to Executive Board members, 19 were completed and returned, a response rate of 95%, which is excellent.

From this governance self-assessment it is clear that the CUR E-Board members are very satisfied with its culture and a number of responsibilities, but still see opportunities for continuous improvement to its practices and structure.

And although this report focuses on areas for continuous improvement, it is encouraging that:

- 89% of Executive Board members are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the level of commitment and involvement demonstrated by most board members
- 83% are Satisfied or Very Satisfied that their personal service is rewarding and satisfying
- 74% are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the board's overall effectiveness

As the next chart shows, approximately 63% of all responses were Good or Excellent, so our search for enhancements will focus mostly on the O.K., Fair, and Poor responses. What is not considered in the chart below are the NA or Don't Know responses, which occurred 19.5% of the time, noting some uncertainty by some directors ("since I am a new board member, I can't answer all questions").

---

2 Constitution and Bylaws, June 2009
3 Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution adds, "in all fields of academic study and in all types of institutions of higher learning."
PERFORMANCE OF THE BOARD

The assessment is divided into four board roles: 1) Set Direction; 2) Ensure Resources; 3) Provide Oversight; and 4) Board Structure and Operations. Exhibit 1 represents a picture of the board’s averages in each of the four board roles:

Exhibit 1: Summary of Board Performance in the Four Board Roles

These results show **greatest satisfaction with its own Board Operations** (possibly influenced positively by the 2006 restructuring efforts) and **lesser satisfaction with Resource Development**. A closer look at the nine areas of responsibility and selected individual questions will show us greater distinction. Exhibit 2 represents a picture of the board’s averages for each responsibility section, from highest to lowest.
This chart shows that within the Resource Development role, **dissatisfaction is greatest with Board Composition**. Other areas for improvement include board members inclusion in strategy discussions, fiduciary program oversight, and some governance structures questions.

The good news on which to build is the effective E-Board meetings, past relations with the Executive Officer, and E-Board members passion for the mission and advocating on behalf of the organization.

Looking into even greater detail what follows are the highest rated questions by average response (Avg; 3.25 or higher), which emphasize strengths to continue, and the lowest rated questions, which suggest the greatest areas for improvement (2.25 or less). Also, you will see that the degrees of consensus (DoC, i.e., agreement) are sometimes diffuse.

**STRENGTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the board's performance in:</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>DoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*7.7 Ensuring compensation of the Executive Officer is approved by the full board or authorized body of the organization.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1.1. Supporting the organization's mission.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>75.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.1 Cultivating a climate of mutual trust and respect between the board and E.O.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>65.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9.7 Understanding the need to base decisions on the collective good of the org.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>66.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3.1 Building a positive public image of the organization.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>71.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.2 Giving the Executive Officer enough authority to lead the staff and manage the organization successfully.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>55.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.3 Adhering to the organization's bylaws regarding board composition, duties, voting rights and qualifications.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9.1 Fostering an environment that builds trust/respect among board members.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>63.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8.1 Carrying out the board's legal duties of care, loyalty, and obedience.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>58.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is very positive that the **top rated question**, in fact three of the top nine, is **about a Constructive Partnership** between the board and chief executive which is a top indicator of exceptional boards⁴ — "Exceptional boards are not just outside examiners, but also powerful forces supporting the organization and its chief executive. While respecting this division of labor, exceptional boards become allies with the chief executive in pursuit of the mission. Exceptional boards recognize that they cannot govern well without the chief’s executive’s collaboration and that the chief executive cannot lead the organization to its full potential without the board’s unflagging support."

Again, these questions reinforce the board's support of mission, advocacy, and building a positive leadership culture, in addition to carrying out its fiduciary duties.

**AREAS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the board's performance in:</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>DoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*4.2 Examining the board’s current composition and identifying gaps, e.g., in professional expertise, influence, ethnicity, age, gender.</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>36.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.5 Working with the General Council to develop a process for identifying and cultivating board officers.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>57.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.7 Effectively orienting new board members.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>71.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5.5 Identifying standards against which to measure organizational performance e.g., industry benchmarks, competitors or peers.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.6 Working with the Divisions to ensure there is an effective process for electing Division Chairs to serve on the Executive Board.</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>42.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5.6 Measuring the impact of critical programs and initiatives.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>50.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.4 Working with the CUR Nominating and Nominating Vetting committees to develop a process for identifying and cultivating potential board members.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>51.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1.4. Articulating a vision that is distinct from the mission.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.2 Focusing regularly on strategic and policy issues versus operational issues.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>52.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.5 Engaging in an effective strategic planning process.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.6 Tracking progress toward meeting the organization's strategic goals.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.9 Planning for the absence or departure of the Executive Officer, e.g., succession planning.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>58.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8.2 Defining responsibilities and setting expectations for board member performance.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>49.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8.7 Reviewing its committee structure to ensure it supports the work of the board.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>31.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.5 Establishing priorities and setting performance goals by mutual agreement with the Executive Officer.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>53.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list indicates there may be room for improvement in numerous areas, but mostly:

- **on-going board leadership development** (and then on-boarding these leaders and a new Executive Officer)
- **visioning and strategy development**
- **measuring success** (including performance expectations of the board itself and committees, and then tracking those measures)

---

Many of these lower ratings are due to a high number of neutral O.K. responses on these lowest rated questions and very few Excellent ratings, as is shown in the next chart.

### CHECKLIST OF PRACTICES

For this board self-assessment process, BoardSource tested 29 concrete, tangible practices that characterize an effective nonprofit board. The yes/no Checklist of Practice questions were answered only by the Executive Officer and are organized into four areas: organizational practices, oversight practices, board practices, and chief executive supervision. Some of these practices are required by law, and many others have become widely accepted as good practice. Exhibit 3 represents a picture of the board’s practices, reported as a percentage, in each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Practices</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Practices</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Practices</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Supervision</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3: Summary Checklist of Practices
The specific practices or policies reported by the Executive Officer not in place at the time of this assessment are:

3. Does the organization have a written code of ethics?
5. Does the organization have a diversity statement?
6. Has the organization reviewed its policies and processes to incorporate diversity and inclusion?
9. Does the full board receive financial reports at least quarterly?
11. Did the board, or a committee of the board, meet with the auditors without staff present?
12. Did all board members receive and review a copy of the association’s IRS Form 990 prior to filing?
20. Is a structured, formal orientation held for new board members?
23. Does the board have an annual retreat?
25. Is there a written policy specifying the executive committee's roles and powers?
30. Does the board periodically review executive compensation at comparable organizations?

Again, overall, this feedback is good but shows some areas for continuous improvement.

B. CONSIDERATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD

This section of the analysis offers considerations as a starting point for board discussion and action, each of which is addressed in great detail over the next few pages. Please note that these considerations are the interpretation of this consultant, based both on best practices and on CUR board members’ perspectives, concerns, and suggestions as reported by the board in the self-assessment. Again, there may be different views on the data which can be part of the January 27th retreat discussions.

CONSIDERATION #1: DEVELOP FUTURE LEADERS FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD SERVICE

CONSIDERATION #2: BE MORE ENGAGED IN VISIONING AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

CONSIDERATION #3: MEASURE SUCCESSES OF THE ORGANIZATION AND ITS GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

CONSIDERATION #4: RESTRUCTURE THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND IMPROVE ITS PRACTICES
CONSIDERATION #1: DEVELOP FUTURE LEADERS FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD SERVICE

The following survey questions raise concerns that lead to this consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the board’s performance in:</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*4.2 Examining the board's current composition and identifying gaps, e.g., in professional expertise, influence, ethnicity, age, gender.</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.4 Working with the CUR Nominating and Nominating Vetting committees to develop a process for identifying and cultivating potential board members.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.5 Working with the General Council to develop a process for identifying and cultivating board officers.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.6 Working with the Divisions to ensure there is an effective process for electing Division Chairs to serve on the Executive Board.</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.7 Effectively orienting new board members.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.9 Planning for the absence or departure of the Executive Officer, e.g., succession planning.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8.7 Reviewing its committee structure to ensure it supports the work of the board.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8.2 Defining responsibilities and setting expectations for board member performance.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This consideration area starts with better defining the responsibilities of the Executive Board and expectations for individual board members (e.g., "I think that the board could do a better job of making sure board member expectations are set"), then measuring this performance. The questions in this self-assessment speak to some common responsibilities of nonprofit boards, but these can be written more specific to CUR's needs. One director writes, "I think division chairs should be asked to contribute more...perhaps have a strategic initiative to push in a given year would help." Another reflection on this is, "the biggest concern I have had on the board is an inconsistent use of the board members in getting the work of the board done."

Another example of clarity of responsibilities and expectations relates to the board's role in networking and advocacy. Sample director comments include:

- "EO has significant role here, but board is involved"
- "I think the networking by board members and other organizations has been inconsistent"
- "I think we have improved over the past couple years on all of these fronts...however, we still have need for improvement...a few years ago we talked about creating an advisory group to assist the board...I think now is the time to do that"
- "it is not clear sometimes if folks are speaking on behalf of CUR or their own institution"
- "new board members do not always understand that advocacy is one of their responsibilities"
- "our current EO has done a great job on advocacy and partnerships and we must continue upon what she has built"
It is the specific responsibilities of this E-Board and individual expectations of its members that define what attitudes, skills, and knowledge are needed around the board table (e.g., "there is very little diversity on the board"). As Jim Collins says in a recent monograph, it is critical to "get the right people on the bus\(^5\)." One director recommends, "the board needs to update its individual profile to include fields to capture race, ethnicity and gender data...how can an organization identify its gaps if it does not track such data...organizations that don't keep it, don't want to know it." So the CUR board should consider getting more involved in future leadership development ("I think that we don't do much to really think about getting a well-rounded board...I think that there could be much better work in this arena"), specifically, working closer with the Nominating and Nominating Vetting committees, General Council, and Divisions to identify and cultivate future leaders. For example, "CUR could do some more recruiting and educating Division Chairs" and another respondent writes, "helping the divisions to elect chairs that will be competent and conscientious."

Next, properly on-boarding new board members is critical (e.g. "better training for new board members"). Many of the best boards have extensive orientation steps in place for new directors and periodically even hold a comprehensive orientation program for all interested returning directors as a reminder or refresher of governance policies and practices ("a conference call or meeting for new Eboard members would really help with orientation" or "a more formal board orientation might help"). In fact, a few boards have developed a 1st year checklist for new directors to complete as part of its orientation program. Another effective practice is assigning new board members a tenured director as mentor as a means for orienting new members, promoting individual and organizational learning, and preparing for leadership succession ("I did appreciate some materials sent to me when elected, but I would have appreciated some additional personalized outreach from another board member as I came on").

One director writes, this "board needs some 'at large' (not At Large Division) members who are expected to serve longer than two years and/or represent constituencies other than the Divisional interests...figure out why those appointed to the three at large slots with NCUR background didn't come to the meeting in June and don't seem to be voting online."

When asked, other than NCUR representation, what alternative uses should be considered for the three "Members at-Large" positions on the executive board, nine directors shared ideas. As one respondent explains, "according to the bylaws, those are NCUR positions for two years...after that, there can be restructuring to reflect the needs of the CUR organization."

The ideas for alternative use of any at large Executive Board positions include:

- "a representative for underrepresented minorities"
- "a representative from BIG (business, industry, government) to help make connections between BIG and the various disciplines"
- "bringing the following expertise/experience to the Board: past presidents; folks with focus on undergrads or grad students (in addition to URPD chair); experience in financial sector, non-profit management, elected government, lobbying, etc.; and diversity (race, ethnicity, type of institution, e.g. community college or international, etc)"

\(^5\) Good to Great and the Social Sectors, Monograph to Accompany Good to Great, Jim Collins, 2005
• "have a committee for student programming and use those members on such a committee"
• "individuals from 'allied' national/international organizations"
• "individuals who are knowledgeable about CUR but who have a more national or global expertise and is outside of CUR"
• "long experience with CUR to help improve continuity"
• "those 3 board members could work with the national office as the new version of the meetings committee, to discuss locations of the national meeting and the NCUR conference, work with the national office and the host institution, etc."
• "under-represented groups - regional, institutional type, etc."
• "used to provide additional support for the National Office via sub-contracts to buy out portions of their time to handle additional NCUR responsibilities"

Yet, two of the thirteen written comments do not believe these positions should remain, "I think we should scrap the members-at-large positions after June, 2012" and "it is already too big."

Finally, planning for the chief executive transition is an important part of every board’s work. Since the E-Board is just completing a process to hire a new Executive Officer now is the time to document what worked and what could be improved, through an official Succession Plan policy. BoardSource believes in succession planning that includes at least these elements:

- an up-to-date job description for the CEO and annual performance expectations
- measurable indicators for the performance of the entire organization
- what the key qualities of the CEO should be; assumption that the CEO must be capable of taking the organization to its expected level of performance
- a process for hiring a new chief executive (i.e., whether to use a search firm)
- options for managing executive transition (i.e., whether to use an interim executive, whether overlap between current and new chief executive is necessary)
- emergency measures for unexpected loss of the chief executive
- budgeted costs for the search and transition (i.e., executive search, interim chief executive, overlap, new salary, relocation, retention bonuses for senior managers)

**CONSIDERATION #2: BE MORE ENGAGED IN VISIONING AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the board's performance in:</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1.4. Articulating a vision that is distinct from the mission.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.2 Focusing regularly on strategic and policy issues versus operational issues.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2.5 Engaging in an effective strategic planning process.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First this Executive Board should consider working with key constituents to develop a distinct vision that describes a desired future state for the organization. Six directors wrote something along the lines of, "developing a vision to direct the next horizon of work of the organization is needed."

---

6 Chief Executive Succession Planning: The Board’s Role in Securing your Organization’s Future, N. Axelrod, 2002
Another writes, "we need to achieve clearer consensus on the next step for CUR and then can be more strategic in ensuring resources are aligned with that mission...I have seen that beginning to emerge in the past few years but we are not quite there. This starts to expand the need for visioning into greater board involvement in broader strategic planning discussions. This direction setting work should be coordinated with the Executive Council, as one director writes, "I believe that the full Council has responsibility for the 'Mission' and 'Vision'." Other directors write,

- "do not think we have a coherent strategic plan with measurable outcomes...CUR's membership and scope has increased dramatically in the past five years so gaining an understanding of the diverse needs takes some time...I do think the board has moved significantly away from micro-managing the national office"
- "focusing on policy and strategy, and leaving operational details to the national office"
- "more work could be done regarding planning...perhaps more conversation of the board between or two yearly meetings would be good"
- "need to do more planning...I think we need to be more proactive and less reactive...we need to make plans that are more far reaching 3-5 years instead of 1-2 years as we do now"

Consider using different planning methods to engage directors. Some that great nonprofit boards use to stimulate strategic thinking include:

- balanced scorecards (Kaplan and Norton, 1996)
- generative thinking for sense-making and framing emerging issues (Governance as Leadership by Chait, Ryan, Taylor (Wiley 2005)
- scenario planning (The Unfolding: Scenario Planning in Nursing, Nursing Science Quarterly, 16:1, January 2003)
- distribute and discuss a relevant publication like:
  - Jim Collins’ Good to Great and the Social Sector (2005)
  - ASAE's Seven Measures of Success: What Remarkable Associations Do that Others Don't (2006)
  - Coerver and Byers' Race for Relevance: 5 Radical Changes for Associations (ASAE, 2011)

The only strategy document shared with this consultant is dated May 2003 and consists of mission, vision, values, and three broad goal statements.
CONSIDERATION #3: MEASURE SUCCESSES OF THE ORGANIZATION AND ITS GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Although related to the first two considerations this category seems important enough to stand alone. As fiduciaries of this organization, the CUR Executive Board could do a better job of "more careful definition of goals and metrics for assessing progress."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the board's performance in:</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*2.6 Tracking progress toward meeting the organization's strategic goals.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5.5 Identifying standards against which to measure organizational performance e.g., industry benchmarks, competitors or peers.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5.6 Measuring the impact of critical programs and initiatives.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7.5 Establishing priorities and setting performance goals by mutual agreement with the Executive Officer.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to John Carver\(^7\), a well-known governance expert, these measures should be "ends-oriented" (i.e., outcomes or what is expected to happen) versus "means-oriented" (i.e., activities or how to do something). Additionally they should state any expected impacts on clients and the communities served.

This emphasis also is consistent with BoardSource’s research on exceptional boards (The Source) and another of its findings – "RESULTS ORIENTED, Exceptional boards track the organization’s advancement towards mission and evaluate the performance of major programs and services."

Specific respondent written comments are:

- "CUR needs to do more and better assessment of programs and services across the board...probably the job of the EO, but the board could lead the charge"
- "I think we could do a better job evaluating programming and sharing the evaluations we do with the board...some information is collected after institutes and such, but the board typically does not see it"
- "like most organizations, we could do a better job with regard to assessment"
- "there is room for judicious improvement here, without micromanaging...the board structure is such that committees that operate activities do not report to the board in an effective way"
- "we need to do more assessment on how our programs impact users long-term"

With respect to measuring performance, some best boards have designed a graphic dashboard\(^8\) of the most important success measures. In developing a dashboard, consider the following information:

- **Areas of Performance**
  Define the critical success factors for your organization. These variables will determine whether you flourish or falter. The board, led by the chair, needs to decide what they need measured.

- **Criteria of Performance**
  Use quantitative and qualitative data to measure and communicate these criteria.

- **Benchmarks**
  Set benchmarks for performance, e.g., “average” goals, minimal tolerances, and stretch targets. Consider points of comparison: same time last year, toward this year’s budget, other nonprofits.

Finally, CUR should consider measuring board member performance as part of this emphasis on being results oriented. Each board member can be asked to self-assess his or her own performance annually against the determined expectations. Aggregate measures can be reported throughout the year, such as:

**CONSIDERATION #4: RESTRUCTURE THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND IMPROVE ITS PRACTICES**

The questions and feedback that relates to this consideration are specific to the Executive Board but may have impact on the broader governance structure and need to be coordinated as such.

"I think that the structure of the board needs to be completely rethought and not have each division have a representative on the board. I think that there are other kinds of representation...community colleges, research universities, broader categories of disciplines, i.e., science, social science, arts/humanities, professional programs...I do not think NCUR should have representation if the board is reorganized...NCUR needs to be integrated into the total organization"

One director issues a caution, "if there is a restructuring of the board, it should not be in the next year...CUR just merged with NCUR, and there is quite a bit that is new right now...I think we need to see how the current organization functions with the addition of NCUR before we move to change CUR."

When asked, are there any alternative ways in which E-Board members could be elected that should be considered, ten of 19 respondents wrote something. Three seemed to argue for maintaining status quo:

- "changes will stem from changes, if any, in divisional structure"

---

\(^8\) This metaphor has been adapted from Richard P. Chait et al., *Improving the Performance of Nonprofit Governing Boards* (Oryx Press, 1996). See BoardSource’s new publication *The Nonprofit Dashboard: A Tool for Tracking Progress*, by Lawrence M. Butler, 2007
• "I like the division chair on EB structure, as it ensures communications between division members and the board...I don't know if we are considering expanding the EB beyond that structure, or shrinking it...a non division-based election seems problematic to me, for such a large organization"
• "the present process seems to work, as long as it is actually followed (especially deadlines)...better staff support from the CUR office would help"

Seven written comments speak to considering alternative election methods:

• "consider a Council of Division Chairs that meets by conference call and elects representatives to serve on the official Eboard"
• "elect board members that represent broader disciplines...for example: Natural Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences, etc....these E-board members then would need to work with divisional chairs to ensure that each division has a voice"
• "more emphasis should be placed on increasing diversity"
• "not sure having division chairs serve as board members is always the best strategy...electing at-large board members directly and division chairs separately would be better"
• "opening up the vote to a slate of individuals who have certain qualifications rather than division chairs just automatically being on the board"
• "possibly from the general council, if we were to eliminate the division councilor roles, however, representation from various disciplinary areas should be maintained"
• "the general council rather than within the divisions"

When asked, do you have any additional comments on how can the Executive Board's performance and practices could be improved in the next year or two, two board members suggested a "smaller Eboard." In fact 26% of respondents are Very Dissatisfied or Dissatisfied with the size of the board meets the current needs of the organization (26% Neutral, 37% Satisfied, 5% Very Satisfied, 5% No Opinion; "a smaller board I think would be more effective and don't believe we necessarily need representation from all divisions"). BoardSource research reveals that "boards that have 15-22 members are rated more effective by chief executives and repeatedly report better governance practices."

Other changes in structure or practices suggested from this question or throughout the survey include:

• "adopting of software that everyone can contribute to...'crowd source' if you will"
• "an advisory group for the board"
• "committees that operate activities do not report to the board in an effective way"
• "CUR has too many committees and I believe that the board is aware of that and they are trying to make changes in the structure"
• "do more of its work via electronic means"
• "do not think CUR needs an NCUR oversight committee in the future"

---
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"financial oversight is significantly through the Finance Committee, whose Chair is not on the board...the Treasurer I believe is an ex officio member of the Finance Committee, and is responsible for bringing issues to the board"

"have a committee for student programming"

"have some of the meeting without the EO"

"have some sub committees working at meetings and in time between meetings"

"make the President, Past President, and President Elect, and perhaps the Treasurer and Secretary the Executive Committee, charged with making decisions that must be made immediately and working directly with the EO in interpreting board decisions"

"might be good to allow for 3 year terms of chair and there to be a regular 'turn over,' 1/3 of board moves off each year"

"more ad hoc task forces"

"more committee oversight and accountability is needed"

"no committee structure that I know of within the board...there should be, especially as the board has grown...there may have been ad hoc committees a few times"

"seriously consider separating the division chair role from being a board member"

"through conference calls every two months in addition to annual meeting"

"use a committee structure (i.e., for the EB)"

Another structure change was outlined earlier under Consideration #1 on alternative uses should be considered for the three "Members at-Large" positions on the executive board.

C. CONCLUSION FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD SELF-ASSESSMENT

In conclusion, board members seem to have a very strong passion for CUR's mission and are satisfied in many ways with the current culture and performance of the Executive Board. Still, additional progress could be in future leadership development, strategic thinking, and measuring organizational and governance successes.

Concerning structure or practices changes, there are alot of ideas presented through the directors' written comments, but none yet have gained a majority's attention other than that something should be done differently. The greatest concentration seems to be over considering alternatives to how directors are nominated and elected, with particular concern over the growing size of the board, then what are their responsibilities and expectations.

Remember that great boards make great organizations, or said another way, great organizations deserve great boards. So, any additional improvements in governing the Council on Undergraduate Research should make for even greater organizational success "to support high-quality undergraduate student-faculty collaborative research and scholarship."

Next, the General Council self-assessment will be covered and integrated into some of this thinking.
III. General Council Self-Assessment

A. Broad Findings on General Council

The current Constitution and Bylaws list the Duties and Responsibilities of the General Council in Article II, Section 3.A. as:

- "elect the President, Secretary, and Treasurer of CUR and the Members at Large of the Executive Committee.
- determine the mission of CUR
- hold authority over the Constitution and ByLaws, and
- from time to time advise the Executive Board as appropriate."

Later it goes on to state in Section 5.B.1., "Matters of policy shall be decided by a majority vote of members of General Council present at meetings of the General Council or by a majority vote by ballot."

Of the 239 surveys distributed to General Council members, 179 were completed for a response rate of 75% which is very good for this large of a survey group. This total includes 19 Executive Board members who completed this survey as they also are members of the GC. Any large differences in the averages of E-Board respondents compared to others will be noted.

This survey is broken into two broad sections: 27 questions that focus on responsibilities and then a number of questions that test potential ideas identified by CUR Governance Task Force members.

On a positive note:

- 80% of respondents are Very Satisfied or Satisfied that they find serving in their respective Division to be a rewarding and satisfying experience
- 77% are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the overall effectiveness of their Divisions
- 75% are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the level of commitment and involvement demonstrated by most General Council members

While three other overview results raise some concerns:

- only 68% of respondents are Very Satisfied or Satisfied that they find serving on the General Council to be rewarding and satisfying experience (22% Neutral, 3% Dissatisfied, 1% Very Dissatisfied)
- only 63% are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the overall effectiveness of the General Council (24% Neutral, 7% Dissatisfied, 2% Very Dissatisfied), plus, the E-Board respondents average on this question is lower than that of the remaining participants, 2.12 compared to 2.75
only 53% are Very Satisfied or Satisfied with overall decision-making of CUR's governance system (25% Neutral, 11% Dissatisfied, 4% Very Dissatisfied), plus, the E-Board respondents average on this question is lower than that of the remaining participants, 2.12 compared to 2.57

In general, respondents seemed positive about the need for this survey and the Governance Task Force. Two written comments by participants stand out to this consultant:

- "CUR has done an excellent job and continues to do a very good job of promoting undergraduate research as it has grown rapidly in size and more inclusive of discipline and type of school represented...the organization faces some tough challenges on many fronts, and openness of dialog and a willingness to tap into untested pools for leaders and strategists will allow CUR to move forward in a positive way"
- "I think that it's good that CUR is evaluating its structure...I hope that whatever we come up with will recognize the grass-roots / volunteer nature of the organization and continue to allow room for people to learn, grow, and find leadership opportunities in the organization"

As the next chart shows, 64% of all responses were Good or Excellent. What is not considered in the chart below are the NA or Don't Know responses, which occurred 12% of the time.
PERFORMANCE OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

The first part of the assessment consists of 27 questions on current responsibilities and practices divided into five responsibility sections:

Overall these averages are lower than desired. This chart shows greatest support for CUR’s Mission, although not as high as would be expected, and lowest satisfaction over the EC Meetings and involvement in Strategy discussions, which is reinforced by looking at individual questions.

STRENGTHS & AREAS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

The next chart ranks the 27 EC responsibility and practices questions by percentage of total Good or Excellent ratings, from highest to lowest. It also lists the overall averages for total respondents, EC members only, and E-Board respondents, in order to compare situations where there is a great difference between these two groups.

Overall these questions show 37% to 87% combined Good or Excellent marks. Three of the top nine questions are about the current composition of the General Council and a number of the remaining high satisfaction areas relate to a positive culture toward values of: mission, advocacy, respect, the collective good, and partnership. Although the E-Board participants rate adherence to bylaws, respecting distinct roles of various bodies, and the use of the Nominating committees lower in satisfaction.

As stated earlier, many of the lowest rated questions raise concern over the GC’s meetings, strategic dialogue, and effective engagement. All of which should be covered under the ideas tested through additional questions and studying the written comments covered in the next section. In fact, it may be possible to improve engagement through more purposeful meetings on strategy.
Please rate the performance of the GC in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 Working through the Divisions to elect councilors to serve on the GC.</th>
<th>Total Good or Excellent</th>
<th>Total Avg</th>
<th>EC only</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Adhering to CUR's bylaws regarding GC composition, duties, voting rights and qualifications.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Supporting CUR's mission.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Respecting the distinct roles of the Executive Officer, EB, GC and staff.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Fostering an environment that builds trust and respect among the GC members.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Advocating on behalf of CUR and its members.</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 Understanding the need to base decisions on the collective good of CUR.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Partnering with the Board to build a positive public image of CUR.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Using CUR Nominating and Nominating Vetting committees to identify and cultivate board officers.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Fostering an environment that builds trust and respect between GC members and the Divisions.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Periodically reviewing the mission to ensure it is appropriate.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11 Ensuring that minutes of meetings and actions taken by governing bodies and authorized sub-committees are documented.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Networking to establish collaborations and partnerships with other CURs.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Implementing effective meeting practices at the Annual Business meeting.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Fostering an environment that builds trust and respect between GC members and the EB.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Establishing and enforcing policies for length of service on the GC.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Focusing regularly on strategic and policy issues versus operational issues.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Preparing for GC Annual Business meetings.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Efficiently making decisions and taking action when needed.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Understanding the needs of CUR's members and stakeholders.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Maintaining an open dialogue with CUR's members related to public image and advocacy issues.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Effectively orienting new GC members.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Allowing adequate time for GC members to ask questions and explore issues.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Establishing and enforcing policies related to attendance at the Annual Business Meeting for GC members.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Utilizing the skills and talents of individual GC members.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 Monitoring GC activities to identify and address discriminatory or non-inclusive behaviors.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12 Engaging all members in the work of the GC.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. **CONSIDERATIONS FOR GENERAL COUNCIL**

1. **OVERVIEW CONSIDERATIONS**

Again, from the first section there seems to be a general need to better define a purposeful role for councilors which yields effective engagement of these people and other members (i.e., "keep trying to involve more members in more ways"). And this greater purposeful engagement may be found through strategic thinking. Both surveys emphasize a need to "figure out what CUR actually does," or in other words, do more strategic thinking.

Some issues that may rise to this level of importance came from written comments:

- "attacking all issues at once dilutes the impact- perhaps pick 1 or 2 'issues of the year' to champion"
- "could do a better job of defining the various modes by which undergraduate research takes place...often the collaborative model used in the sciences (with students participating in faculty projects) does not work well in fields such as history and philosophy"
- "create an inclusive environment of participation"
- "CUR needs to figure out what it does besides publishing books and lobbying"
- "I don't think CUR has done a great job of reaching out to other scientific organizations that promote research, probably because most of those are focused in the disciplines"
- "I strongly suggest finding a way to include college presidents in the leadership structure of CUR"
- "I think there is some tension right now in the General Council about how strategic the organization should be and who its stakeholders are"
- "increasingly that our conversations are with higher education in general, and not as much within the disciplines"
- "models for building and supporting undergraduate research by CUR need to be refined to reflect the expanded membership and changing needs of CUR members"
- "need more diversity in CUR....not just faculty"
- "publish an online directory of undergraduate research as was done in paper previously"
- "stop ignoring the thousands of students and faculty at small underfunded colleges who are trying to develop programs and are finding the hill almost too steep to climb"
- "there has been a shift from 'grass roots' membership toward 'institutional membership' over the past five to ten years"
- differences in large and small institutions
- need "clearer mechanisms for bringing issues to the attention of the EBoard from the Divisions and then communicating back to the Council from the EBoard"
- whether "the organization is moving forward faster than some of the members and member institutions"
2. **Tested Considerations**

Next will be covered the various ideas tested through a series of specific questions.

When asked, *what is your opinion about whether the size of the General Council meets the needs of the organization*, 37% marked *Too Large* (the highest selection #4) and another 29% checked #3 (the next highest selection), compared to 23% *Just Right* (2) with only 2% leaning toward *Too Small*. The E-Board average of 3.56 is higher than the remaining participants at 3.06.

An overwhelming number of written comments in response to, *What suggestions about improving the General Council would you like to offer*, suggested reducing the size of the GC. For example:

- "Divisions do not need 20-24 members, and business does not profit from direct democracy as here exercised"
- "I am completing my first term as a councilor, and I will not seek a second...while I believe strongly in the mission of CUR, I have been very frustrated with the organizational structure, inefficiency of annual business meetings, and lack of activity in my division...I think that the organizational structure is unwieldy, with too many councilors"
- "I would find a way to shrink this body...one way would be to have divisional structure remain intact with greater autonomy for the divisions in setting their own agendas (and resources to allow them to accomplish that agenda) and then a council elected divisions or in an at-large model...if from the division, each division could elect three to four members...if at large, each division might select some number of candidates to stand for election...alternatively, the Council could be selected by geography and/or institution type--PUI vs. regional comprehensive vs. R1. or northeast, mid-Atlantic, Southeast, Mountain West, etc--while the divisions remain disciplinarily based"
- "it is just too big...each division should be reduced in size and there should be clearly defined tasks for the divisions to do that benefit the organization' mission"
- "it should shrink or even disappear...24 per division is unnecessarily large, especially as we add divisions"
- "the council size should be proportional to the individual memberships with some minimum number of representatives, i.e., a new division might begin with only 4 councilors and then build as interest grows in the general membership"
- "the General Council is rather large making meaningful discussions somewhat difficult"
- "too big to make decisions efficiently, so I recommend a smaller Council with more defined responsibilities"
- "we can and should continue to have a General Council to support the grassroots nature of the organization but perhaps reduce the number of representatives per division so as not to become too unwieldy in size and yet allow us to add divisions that would represent other functions besides discipline...for example, type of institution, etc....there are many governance models from broad based large professional organizations we could consider"
Still, there were a few cautioning comments about reducing the size, "if the number of councilors is cut, the difficulties with people getting funding to travel to the business meeting will be even more noticeable...I understand the concern about the number being so large, but I like the variety of disciplines and experiences that are present in my division."

The chart below ranks which attitudes, skills, and knowledge of councilors are most important to tap into for value-added to CUR. The fact that two of the top three items are about future strategy reinforces things said earlier about both the General Council and the Executive Board's increased role in on-going strategic thinking. All of these were considered somewhat important, receiving between 65% to 77% of top two choices, and both non-E-Board and E-Board respondents were close in their opinions except E-Board members rated networking/camaraderie assistance with members much higher. Another way of putting this is to "utilize talents better!"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The percentages below reflect the top two &quot;importance&quot; choices on a five choice scale:</th>
<th>Avg Non EB</th>
<th>Avg EB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.e Tap into creative/strategic thinking on important issues, 77%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.h Mentor Junior faculty starting programs, 75%</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b Identify future needs/trends of the discipline through needs analysis polling of membership and synthesis, 72%</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.f Invite to serve on committees, 73%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c Provide input during policy development, 67%</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.g Assist with social networking &amp; building camaraderie among members, 66%</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a Advocacy Activities, 59%</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d Communicate with membership regarding public policy issues, 65%</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked, how important it is for CUR to use social media and electronic tools to generate new ideas and allow for on-going discussions/decisions between General Council meetings, only 22% of participants lean toward Not Important indicating interest in this possibility. Four specific ideas are:

- "an electronic survey of activities that Councilors have to fill out every semester"
- "do more of the 'pre-decision making' work electronically"
- "more training/webinars"
- "web site improved to provide more opportunities for on-line interaction between councilors, for example a discussion board, forums"
There is some support that **term limits should be implemented for councilors and Division Chairs**, 44% **Agreeing** versus 20% **Disagreeing**. At least five written comments encouraged term limits:

- "encourage members who are not research active with undergraduates to stand down at the next election and let someone else have a turn"
- "put limits on councilor terms - there is too much of a 'good old boy' network in some divisions, and fresh blood is needed for fresh ideas (and to give newer/younger faculty an opportunity to be leaders in their discipline)"
- "set term limits"
- "term limits to infuse fresh ideas and maintain motivation and interest"
- "we need term limits for councilors"

Thirty-four percent of respondents support that **new divisions should be created in other ways, e.g., type of institution, region, type of undergraduate research, administrator positions**, compared to 41% who **Strongly Disagree** or **Disagree**, with 22% **Neutral**.

Those who favor more flexibility wrote:

- "additional divisions that are cross-disciplinary"
- "change divisional membership to a different structure - instead of disciplines identify regional or state representation to the council"
- "current groups of divisions should be aggregated into common areas (life sciences, physical sciences, for example)...the current divisional structure presumes a narrow provincialism in how UR is structured, and the differences are simply not that profound between similar disciplines......we make more of a difference in UR in thinking about how different areas are commonly supported in curricula, external funding, internal workload policies, and faculty development than in how each discipline does this separately"
- "I would suggest a realignment of divisions...for instance combine all of the natural science into one large division - with enough representation to develop effective working sub-groupings...perhaps add a social science division and administration division...I think a few larger divisions would make things more manageable...each division would then be working on larger issues and have more resources to effect change"
- "we are disciplinary by history rather than necessity...any new structure should be relevant to our overarching mission...if our mission is to increase the overall national quality of undergraduate education by using and advocating for UR methods, then perhaps institution type is the right model...if our mission is to help campuses launch and strengthen UR programs, then perhaps campus role is the right model...if our mission is to obtain funding and other support for UR initiatives, then perhaps we have divisions focused on the NSF, on the NEA, on the NEH, on private foundations...there are a dozen ways of making divisions, none of them the 'right one'...what kind of structure for populating the Council makes best sense for our next ten years?"

Fifty-two percent agree that **members should be allowed to belong and pay for multiple divisions**, plus another 30% have **No Opinion**.
When asked, **whether the Executive Officer's title should be changed to President, and the title of chief member officer changed to Chairperson**, only 15% Agreed or Strongly Agreed with another 33% Neutral and 23% held No Opinion, compared to 29% Strongly Disagreeing or Disagreeing.

Only one written comment addressed this issue, "EO should be President...the current title 'President' should change to 'Chair of the Board'...the Executive Board should be responsible for policy, budget, management, and every other aspect of the organization...Divisions should operate more like affinity groups, with individuals belonging to as many as they like...all members should vote for officers and for changes in the constitution...the Council would no longer have any policy or management responsibilities...the National Office should continue to manage the day to day operations of CUR, as it has in the past, and should also exercise more leadership than we have acknowledged in the past."

When asked, **whether the General Council should continue to elect the President-elect, Secretary, and/or Treasurer ('and after 2011, the Members at Large of the Executive Board'"10) as opposed to general membership of the EB itself**, 58% Agreed compared to 9% Disagreeing.

The current Constitution and Bylaws states in Article II, Section 2.B.8., "The question of who should elect officers will be revisited no later than the June 2011 business meeting." It goes on to

At least one written comment addressed this issue, "the closely held nature of our election process where councilors only, and not the general membership, elect officers is not what I expect from a mature organization...I have belonged to more than dozen professional organizations over my career...virtually all of them elected officers by general membership ballot...this is important because it instills a sense of ownership of and belonging to the organization...our general membership does not have this to the degree I would like to see."

When asked, **should CUR continue with both a Nominating Committee and a Nominating Vetting Committee**, over one-half Agreed.

### 3. RESPONDENT CONSIDERATIONS

Additional responses to, **What suggestions about improving the General Council would you like to offer**, included an emphasis on:

- **Improve two-way communication and transparency between the Executive Board and the General Council** (e.g., "greater transparency of the Eboard...use today's technologies to keep everyone in the loop" and "the key is to improve communication between the Eboard and the council and to give the divisions more power to address the ends in their areas" and "more input from the council...at times it seems we are getting reports from the E Board with a few chances to provide feedback").

---

10 Constitution and Bylaws, Article II, Section 2.E.4.
One respondent writes, "general council does not need improvement - policies and procedures of the executive board are unprofessional and unethical" and a few other comments emphasize that "broader input is important" (e.g., "less centralization of decisions at the e-Board level...Councilors should have more function in the governance of CUR"). Other ideas about the Executive Board include:

- "e-board needs to have representation/membership from standing committees and not just division chairs"
- "remain the seat of major decision making for the organization, with input from a streamlined Council"
- "rethink the appropriate size of our Executive Board (EB), decide on that size and then decide on reasonable ways to populate that Board to generate broad based representation that serves disciplinary, type of institution and other core function needs (e.g. classifications of individuals our organization supports like program directors)...it is critically important that the approach to serving the organization as an EB member not be so insular"

**Improve committee work.** For example,

- "committees also should have clearer functions and people should be recruited who have expertise"
- "my CUR wide committee does not seem to have a charge...we meet and nothing seems to happen...I'd like that clarified...I'd like to get the material more than 2 or 3 days ahead of time...this past summer it was much better but some years I have received the book the night before I leave"
- "need more committees/tasks forces for councilors and general members to be involved"
- "need to have a STAFF PERSON help to coordinate and facilitate these committees & task forces"
- "should no longer encourage all councilors to serve on a committee...we have too many committees and they are too large to be effective"
- "improve assignment of members to committees (i.e., "has been haphazard")"

**Improve communication among Divisions** (i.e., "develop strategies for Council members to communicate across divisions" and "more brainstorming across Divisions").

---

11 one participant criticized the GC survey for not covering the EB (possibly this same respondent), "I am shocked that this survey does not address problems with the EXECUTIVE BOARD...the dysfunction of the organization does not exist at the level of the general council, but rather with a disconnected and self promoting membership of the executive board...it is this structure that needs to be properly assessed and modified...shame on the individuals who put this survey out!"
• Improve the General Council meetings. For example:
  o "continue having break-out sessions"
  o "determining truly important issues, and get them on the agenda"
  o "I believe that the June meeting date is problematic...early-mid August would seem to be better for maximizing the attendance of research active faculty"
  o "make sure people come to the meeting"; "more purposeful networking"
  o "more follow-up after the business meeting"
  o "should always be given enough time to process info before voting for new divisions or other important issues"
  o "tend to go long and be a bit heavy on presentation, light on discussion...on the other hand, the St. Louis meeting was a model of concision and efficiency"
  o "time to write/plan together")

Finally, one respondent proposes a more radical re-structuring--"I would like a model where the general council goes away...have a leadership group of about 24-30 people, elected from the general membership, and a smaller executive leadership group elected by that group of 24-30...this group of about 24-30 would include representation from different affinity areas and committees (or they would be assigned those roles once they were elected)...I would form committees for publications, advocacy, assessment, etc., led by a member of the leadership group, to still involve the general membership and build leadership potential for the leadership group...I think one of the problems with the structure is also that the general membership is not very engaged either."

C. Conclusion for General Council Self-Assessment

As stated earlier, much of this feedback resonates around improving the clarity of a meaningful role for the General Council, one that effectively engages more councilors (and general members), which is also the case for the Executive Board itself, Divisions, and all committees. Also, on-going strategic thinking should involve more councilors and members so that there is diversity of opinions and ownership on final decisions. The specific how-to process or plans may be included in the specific ideas tested or in new ideas written throughout this survey.

So, it needs to be determined whether to advance or further discuss specific ideas tested:

• what is the right size of the General Council
• which attitudes, skills, and knowledge of councilors are most important to tap into
• how important is it to use social media and electronic tools to generate new ideas and allow for on-going discussions/decisions between General Council meetings
• whether term limits should be implemented for councilors and Division Chairs
• whether new divisions should be created in other ways, e.g., type of institution, region, type of undergraduate research, administrator positions
• whether members should be allowed to belong and pay for multiple Divisions
• whether the Executive Officer's title should be changed to President, and the title of chief member officer changed to Chairperson
• whether the General Council should continue to elect the President-elect, Secretary, and/or Treasurer ("and after 2011, the Members at Large of the Executive Board") as opposed to general membership of the E-Board itself,
• should CUR continue with both a Nominating Committee and a Nominating Vetting Committee

Finally, it needs to be determined how creditable are the participants' new ideas for continuous improvement in the areas of: improve two-way communication and transparency between the Executive Board and the General Council; improve committee work; improve communication among Divisions; and improve the General Council meetings

IV. CLOSING

It seems important to recognize that the various CUR governance bodies and practices are intertwined, as these two surveys show. So, final recommendations should be made as a "package" that takes this interdependence into account. Some general themes that may hold the final recommendations together could be: a) more meaningful engagement of E-Board members, Councilors, and general members, b) increased efficiencies and effectiveness of decision-making and implementation, and c) better establishing CUR as the strategic leader in this mission area.

It has been said that great governance bodies, structure, and practices make great organizations, or said another way, great organizations deserve great governance. So, any additional improvements in governing the Council on Undergraduate Research should make for even greater organizational success "to support and promote high-quality undergraduate student-faculty collaborative research and scholarship."
V. Appendices

APPENDIX A: HOW TO READ THE DATA REPORT AND INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS

The Executive Board and General Council Self-Assessments includes two sources of information for review and consideration:

- **Board Self-Assessment Data Report**: This data report presents the results from the survey completed by your board members and chief executive.
- **Interpretive Analysis by the consultant in the form of a Framing Paper**: This document summarizes the highlights of the data report and presents an unbiased, expert analysis of your board’s results.

Understanding the Numbers
The Board Self-Assessment survey instrument consists of three discrete sections: (1) Performance of the Board, (2) Checklist of Practices, and (3) General Questions.

Performance of the Board
This board performance section, which uses a rating scale, examines the board’s perception of its performance in nine areas of responsibility. This part of the survey was completed by board members, including the chief executive. The results are reported primarily in numerical format, as follows:

**Average**: Respondents were asked to rate the board’s performance on a scale ranging from poor to excellent. The results are reported on a scale that equates to a typical A to F grading scale, with a numerical value of “0” for “Poor” or needs improvement, “1” for “Fair” or below average, “2” for “OK” or average, “3” for “Good” or above average, and “4” for “Excellent” or superior. The lower the average score, the lower the level of performance.

**Degree of Consensus (DoC)**: This percentage measures the level of agreement among board members. If all board members selected the same answer, the degree of consensus would be 100%. When the degree of consensus falls below 60%, it may be useful to explore the diversity of opinion among the board. The degree of consensus is calculated using standard variation.

**Participants (Part)**: This number indicates how many respondents answered each question along the continuum from weak to strong. It does not include those who selected “Don’t Know” or “Not Applicable.”

**Not Applicable (NA)/ Don’t Know (DK)**: Respondents were instructed to select “Not Applicable” or “Don’t Know” when they were either too new to the board to know the answer or the question did not apply to the organization. These responses are not included in the averages.

**Open-Ended Questions**: The open-ended responses offer insights into strengths and challenges that numeric ratings cannot provide.
Checklist of Practices in Executive Board Self-Assessment
This second section of the survey, which is primarily yes/no questions, captures organizational demographics and governance practices in four areas. It was completed only by the chief executive. The results are reported as follows:

- **Number of Yes**: The number of questions the chief executive marked with a “Yes.”
- **Number of Questions**: The total number of checklist questions asked.
- **Percentage of Yes**: The percentage of practices your board currently has in place.

General Questions
This final part of the survey includes general questions about board members’ personal experience and priorities for the future. It was completed by board members and the chief executive. All narrative comments are recorded verbatim.

Caveats
This interpretive analysis highlights board members’ perspectives, concerns, and suggestions. While it does not attempt to offer prescriptions for resolving problems or weaknesses, it does offer some best practices from BoardSource’s extensive work with nonprofit boards. Specific solutions will require further discussion by the board to determine what might work best for your organization. The extent of our findings and considerations are limited strictly to BoardSource’s experience and knowledge in working with nonprofit organizations for more than 20 years. By its very nature, any analysis of this sort is limited by time and scope. As such, we have maintained our focus on the most significant governance issues facing your organization at the time this board self-assessment was conducted. As a result, this interpretive analysis does not address broader programmatic accomplishments and operational issues of your organization.
APPENDIX B: THE SOURCE: 12 PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNANCE THAT POWER EXCEPTIONAL BOARDS

CONSTRUCTIVE PARTNERSHIP\(^1\) Exceptional boards govern in constructive partnership with the chief executive, recognizing that the effectiveness of the board and chief executive are interdependent. They build this partnership through trust, candor, respect, and honest communication.

MISSION DRIVEN\(^2\) Exceptional boards shape and uphold the mission, articulate a compelling vision, and ensure the congruence between decisions and organizational values. They treat questions of mission, vision, and core values not as exercises to be done once, but as statements of crucial importance to be drilled down and folded into deliberations.

STRATEGIC THINKING\(^3\) Exceptional boards allocate time to what matters most and ensure the congruence between decisions and core values.

CULTURE OF INQUIRY\(^4\) Exceptional boards institutionalize a culture of inquiry, constructive debate, and engaged teamwork that leads to sound and shared decision making.

INDEPENDENT-MINDEDNESS\(^5\) Exceptional boards are independent-minded. When making decisions on behalf of the organization, board members put the interests of the organization above those of the chief executive, themselves, or other interested parties.

ETHOS OF TRANSPARENCY\(^6\) Exceptional boards promote an ethos of transparency and ethical behavior by ensuring that donors, stakeholders, and interested members of the public have access to appropriate and accurate information regarding finances and operations.

COMPLIANCE with INTEGRITY\(^7\) Exceptional boards govern with full recognition of the importance of their fiduciary responsibilities, developing a culture of compliance through appropriate mechanisms for active oversight.

SUSTAINING RESOURCES\(^8\) Exceptional boards ensure that the organization’s resources are balanced with its strategic priorities and capacities. Individual board members extend the reach of the organization by actively using their own reputations and networks to secure funds, expertise, and access.

RESULTS ORIENTED\(^9\) Exceptional boards track the organization’s advancement towards mission and evaluate the performance of major programs and services.

INTENTIONAL BOARD PRACTICES\(^10\) Exceptional boards make form follow function when it comes to their own operations. To provide stable leadership to the organization, they invest in structures and practices that transcend individuals and thoughtfully adjust them to suit changing circumstances.

CONTINUOUS LEARNING\(^11\) Exceptional boards embrace the qualities of a continuous learning organization, evaluating their own performance and assessing the value that they add to the organization.

REVITALIZATION\(^12\) Exceptional boards revitalize themselves through planned turnover, thoughtful recruitment, and intentional cultivation of future officers.
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COUNCIL ON UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH (CUR)

Name: ______________________ Telephone #: __________________ Day/Time:____

Strategic Direction & Operations Effectiveness

1. Let me start by asking, how would you describe in your own words the mission/purpose of CUR?
2. What are the three most important strategic issues that you believe will rise to the level of Executive Board attention in the near future? Is the EB/structure prepared/ready to address these issues?

Governance

3. Let me ask you to think about the CUR EB first–What three adjectives or short phrases would you use to describe this Executive Board?
4. How effective are this EB’s practices, do you have any preliminary ideas for improvement (e.g., □Composition □Size □Terms & Limits □Nominations & Recruiting □Diversity of Directors □Officers & Duties □Committees, Task Forces & Other bodies □Meetings □Roberts Rules of Order □Technology)?
5. Let me test some declarative statements with you, in your opinion:
   a. there might be alternative uses in the future for at-large positions on the Executive Board □ Tend to Agree □ Tend to Disagree □ No opinion
   b. the EB now is the right size □ Tend to Agree □ Tend to Disagree □ No opinion
   c. the EB meets frequently enough □ Tend to Agree □ Tend to Disagree □ No opinion
   d. the EB should have an Executive committee □ Tend to Agree □ Tend to Disagree □ No opinion
   e. the current ways to elect directors work well □ Tend to Agree □ Tend to Disagree □ No opinion
6. What is the Executive Board's greatest value-added to the organization?

Broader Structure

7. When you think about the other decision-making bodies of CUR---general council, councilors, and divisions---What, if anything, most impresses you or concerns you?
8. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or threats of allowing Divisions to be created by type of institution (i.e., sector) or region (i.e., this may foster more collaboration through regional meetings) in addition to the current division by discipline?
9. What are the supporting attitudes, skills, and knowledge of these 264 councilors and how best can these be used to benefit and add value to CUR (e.g., □strategic thinking, □service on 14+ committees, □policy development)?
10. Is the 264 number of councilors □too large, □just right, or □too small for these future needs?

Staff Partnership

11. How would you characterize this board’s relationship with the CEO?
12. Let me test some declarative statements with you, in your opinion, CUR should change the title of the chief staff person from Executive Director to President and then change the title of the chief member/volunteer person from President to Chairperson □ Tend to Agree □ Tend to Disagree □ No opinion

Retreat/Meeting

13. What is most important to accomplish around governance repurposing or restructuring? Or stated another way, What changes would position CUR better as the strategic leader in this mission area?
APPENDIX D: CUR EB GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE, 10/18 SUMMARY OF ADVANCING ISSUES

Members: Neal Abraham, Bill Campbell (Chair), Herb Childress, Beth Cunningham, Susan Larson, Roger Rowlett; Guests: Nancy Hensel, Executive Officer & Bruce Lesley, Facilitator/Consultant

Purposes of the CUR Governance Task Force

1. To develop recommendations on how to prepare the governance structure and practices of the CUR Officers, Executive Board (EB), General Council (GC), Committees or Task Forces, and Divisions for the future to reflect the growth of the organization and incorporation of NCUR.

2. To continue the professionalization of the CUR Executive Board, national office, and other bodies in the decision-making process, and as part of this,
   a. to help board members and councilors understand this professionalization as it impacts their changing roles, responsibilities, and value-added, and,
   b. to clarify who or what body is responsible for what decisions.

3. To determine ways to meaningfully engage the councilors and "grassroots" members in advancing CUR's mission and re-purpose any bodies as necessary.

Next Steps and Timeline

- Develop BoardSource Self-assessment survey(s) for board members and councilors, October-November
- Review 1st draft of survey questions, 10/20; Sign off on final counselor survey, 10/27/11
- Start surveying, 11/4/11; Soft deadline, 11/16/11; Final deadline, 11/21/11
- Early alert e-mail from CUR to EB and GC members to announce the task force, its purposes, and their involvement in a survey tool
- Administration Note: CUR needs to send names and e-mail addresses of all participants to BoardSource and appoint an administrator who monitors completion of surveys
- Compile and send results to Bruce: 11/30
- Framing Paper and draft discussion agenda developed, December
- 2nd Governance Task Force teleconference, mid-December-early-January, date and time to be determined (Mail the EB discussion agenda and any relevant background material to GC members to keep them informed)
- January 24 executive board meeting questions/arrangements
- Send out any recommendations in advance to leaders for continued input and dialogue
- Possibly 3rd or more Governance Task Force teleconference(s), February-May
- June 23-26 2012 General Council meeting to vote on the recommendations for general changes to be made, after which specific constitution or policy changes would be drafted and sent out for electronic ratification

Preliminary Governance Structure Issues identified

Executive Board Structure, Composition, & Size of (EB)

1. Are there alternative uses in the future for the three "Members at Large" positions on the executive board (i.e., "After 2011 nominations for Members at Large will be made by the Nominations Vetting Committee. If possible these should be members who have experience with the National Conferences on Undergraduate Research")? When will the current "officers of the NCUR" Members at Large

---

12 V.2 based on original definitions by Bill Campbell & Nancy Hensel, six consultant interviews with members (Joe Grabowsk, Tim Elgren, Beth Paul, Paula Dehn, Mary Crowe, Mike Castellani), and 1st Task Force meeting on Tuesday, October 18 at 10:00 a.m. EDT
"two year terms" be completed? Should NCUR be allowed continued representation on the EB through other means, possibly as a Division?

2. Is there sufficient diversity in the EB's leadership?

3. What are the alternative ways to elect an EB (i.e., different than each Division Chair serving as a representative)? If not, does the Division Chair need to be the representative to the EB or could a Division appoint another member to this position (e.g., spread responsibility and work)?

4. Is the current or future size of the EB too large? What is the right size for an EB (e.g., as the number of Divisions expand with possible inclusion of education, business, engineers, community college the current size will grow, or alternatively, should each new Division be given an EB seat)?

5. Should the CUR executive board have an executive committee? If yes, what would be its roles and responsibilities? Note: The current chief executive use the three "presidents" as an "ad hoc" executive committee

6. How effective are the other EB ad hoc task groups appointed from time to time by the President?

7. Does the EB meet frequently enough (in-person, teleconferencing, or virtually) to fulfill its roles and responsibilities?

8. Does the EB use social media and electronic tools effectively for idea generation and on-going discussions/decisions between meetings?

Staffing

1. Should CUR change the title of the Executive Officer to President, and then change the title of the chief member/volunteer person to Chairperson?

Divisions, Councilors, Council, Committees

2. What is the right size for a General Council (e.g., "The General Council shall consist of the councilors of the Divisions, officers and Members at Large of the Executive Board, and Emeritus Presidents ")?

3. Should Divisions continue to elect "at least twelve but no more than twenty-four councilors, as determined by the Division" or a set number?

4. Should there be term limits for councilors and Division Presidents?

5. How effective is the Finance standing committee of the General Council?

6. How effective is the Nominations standing committee of the General Council?

7. How effective is the Nominations Vetting committee of the General Council?

8. Is there a continued need for both a Nominating Committee and a Nominating Vetting Committee?

9. Does the overall governance structure and/or decision-making practices use social media and electronic tools well for idea generation and on-going discussions/decisions between meetings?

10. How do members rate the effectiveness of their Divisions, elected councilors?

11. Should the "representative" General Council continue to elect the President-elect, Secretary, and/or Treasurer ("and after 2011, the Members at Large of the Executive Board") as opposed to general membership or the EB itself? See note in current bylaws, Article II-Organization and Governance-Section 2.B.8. "The question of who should elect officers will be revisited no later than the June 2011 business meeting."

12. What are any strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or threats of allowing Divisions to be created by type of institution, or region, or types of undergraduate research, or administrator positions, or other ways, in addition to the current division by discipline? Could members belong to (and pay for?) multiple Divisions, are there any benefits or concerns?

13. Should the General Council be re-purposed (e.g., "The General Council shall: a. elect the President, Secretary, and Treasurer of CUR and the Members at Large of the Executive Committee, b.
determine the mission of CUR, c. hold authority over the Constitution and ByLaws, and d. from time
to time advise the Executive Board as appropriate. 1. Divisions may be added by the General Council
at any annual meeting, by a two-thirds vote.”)? If yes, what are the supporting attitudes, skills, and
knowledge of the 264 councilors and how best can these be used to benefit and add value to CUR
(e.g., advocacy activities creativeategic thinking on important issues, service on 14+
committees, policy development, identify future needs/trends of the discipline through needs
analysis polling of membership and synthesis, educate federal or corporate decision-makers,
mentors to Junior faculty just getting their programs started, social networking & building
camaraderie among members)? What is the most meaningful use of the General Council's time at the
annual meeting (i.e., Consultant Note: one interviewee suggested the task force audit the agendas and
decisions of past council meetings)?

Summary
1. Should CUR consider a 1-tier decision-making body/system where all members of an EB (i.e., board
of directors) are elected by all members of CUR? [This consideration was rejected by one TF
member with no challenge by other members, based on the rationale that Divisions are different sizes
and should have equal impact on decisions as opposed the larger Divisions dominating] Those
reserve powers now held by the General Council could be held by membership or transferred to the
board of directors.
2. In general, how do you rate the overall decision-making of our governance system?
3. What additional changes in the overall structure or decision-making practices would position CUR
better as the strategic leader in this mission area?

Preliminary Strategic Issues identified (i.e., "STRUCTURE FOLLOWS STRATEGY")
1. How to assert itself as a national and international leader in this mission area (i.e., "the voice")?
2. How to develop successful undergraduate research models that fit the increasing diversity of
disciplines, institution types, etc.?
3. How to expand membership into more diverse types of institutions (e.g., 2-year community colleges)
or underserved disciplines (humanities), etc., so that we really are the "voice of all undergraduate
research?" Is CUR missing any important types of academic institutions in its membership, any gaps,
missing any important market segments?
4. How to get more cross-pollination of best practices or other good ideas among divisions?
5. How to promote better and encourage more disciplines, institutions, etc., to embrace our mission
emphasis on the importance of undergraduate research?
6. How to put an even greater emphasis on being the voice of undergraduate research.
7. How to put an even greater emphasis on how to enable faculty to implement/accomplish meaningful
undergraduate research.
8. How to put an even greater emphasis on offering high quality conferences.
9. Is CUR catering too much to institutional membership versus individual membership? Is our member
emphasis catering too much to administration positions versus discipline academics?
10. Should long-standing members be encouraged to "mentor" new members?
11. Should more meetings be held by region?
12. What changes will be needed in the future to address the changing composition of our students (e.g.,
non-traditional students)?
13. What is the role of volunteers versus paid, professional staff; what new opportunities are available for
meaningful volunteer engagement?
14. What new or improved programs/services are needed for members in mid-career (i.e., beyond junior faculty, once a member has a sustainable program on campus; how to keep the "superstars" engaged?)?

15. Will the AAC&U become more interested in undergraduate research as an emphasis, and if yes, how will their discussions be different and what will it mean for the future of CUR (e.g., "As of January 2010, Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL) joined forces with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) where PKAL’s work in advancing "what works" in undergraduate STEM education is continuing to thrive and grow.").
APPENDIX E: QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT

Bruce Lesley has over 35 years of nonprofit leadership and management experiences, currently as a Senior Governance Consultant with BoardSource on strategic planning, innovation, and board development, and previously as a staff professional with Junior Achievement, Inc., where from 1989 through 1991 he was National Executive Vice President of its headquarters operations. BoardSource, formerly the National Center for Nonprofit Boards, is dedicated to improving the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations by strengthening their boards of directors. Junior Achievement is a $100 million international education organization.

SAMPLE CONSULTING CLIENTS INCLUDE:

ACCREDITION COUNCIL for CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION
AMERICAN ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY
AMERICAN BOARD of PSYCHIATRY and NEUROLOGY
AMERICAN BOARD OF EMEGENCY MEDICINE
AMERICAN HUMANICS (undergraduate nonprofit career development at 70 academic affiliates)
AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSOCIATION
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
AMERICAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION
AMERICA’S SECOND HARVEST
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE of AMERICA
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY–LODESTAR CENTER FOR PHILANTHROPY & NONPROFIT INNOVATION
ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAL ILLUSTRATORS
CORPORATION for PUBLIC BROADCASTING (14 stations including MontanaPBS a service of Montana State University and WKAR-PBS at Michigan State University)
DRURY UNIVERSITY, BREECH BUSINESS SCHOOL

ETHICS RESOURCE CENTER
FLEMING COLLEGE (Peterborough, Canada)
FULBRIGHT ASSOCIATION
GATES MILLENNIUM SCHOLARS PROGRAM
HOSTELLING INTERNATIONAL-USA
ILLINOIS COLLEGE of OPTOMETRY
INSTITUTE of MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTANTS
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY–Shreveport
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION
MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY
NATIONAL CENTER for STATE COURTS
NATIONAL LEAGUE of CITIES
NATIONAL PTA
NATIONAL STRENGTH/CONDITIONING ASSOCIATION
OHIO UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES ASSOCIATION
SKILLS USA (formerly VICA, student career association, also Business Professionals of America, DECA, & Students in Free Enterprise)
SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION
STAMFORD BLACK ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATION (USO; HQ, San Diego)
UNITED STATES SPACE FOUNDATION
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION