

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
Best Practices Performance Self-Evaluation Input Form**

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

Target: 100%

Period: Annual

ODF Key Performance Measure: #2


Board Adopted: September 6, 2006

Version: 2017 v1.0

Summary of Individual Board Member Evaluations – July 25, 2017

B. Best Practices Criteria Evaluation:

Key: Within Each Criteria:








Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>1. Executive Director’s performance expectations are current. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the State Forester’s Position Description is current.</i> <u>Comments:</u> - It’s still early in the tenure of the new State Forester, but the recruitment and hiring process did a good job of reviewing and confirming these expectations. Hiring from within the Department also contributes to a good understanding on expectations.</p>	6 	0	0	0
<p>2. Executive Director’s performance has been evaluated in the last year. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the State Forester’s Position Description is current and that the annual performance appraisal has been completed.</i> <u>Comments:</u> - With the transition in the State Forester’s position, this has not yet occurred given Peter has not been in this position for a full year. Based on historical practice, I anticipate we will continue to meet this objective. - This was completed for the previous State Forester by the Chair with input and review by all Board Members.</p>	3 	3	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
Best Practices Performance Self-Evaluation Input Form**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>3. The agency’s mission and high-level goals are current and applicable. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the Board’s <u>Forestry Program for Oregon</u> and Oregon Forest Practices Act/Rules are current.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> - The October 2016 Board Workshop provided a strong review of strategic initiatives and priorities – but left some open-ended issues and questions. With the transition that occurred from the previous State Forester to the new State Forester I think we should revisit this.</p>	3	3	0	0
<p>4. The Board reviews the <u>Annual Performance Progress Report</u>. <i>The Board understands this to mean that the Board reviews the report annually as a meeting agenda item.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	5	1	0	0
<p>5. The Board is appropriately involved in review of agency’s key communications. <i>The Board understands this to mean agency and Board communications at a policy level, versus a day-to-day operating level.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	3	3	0	0
<p>6. The Board is appropriately involved in policy-making activities. <i>The Board understands this to mean those policy activities that particularly have a statewide perspective, including holding Board meetings at different geographic locations around the state.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	5	1	0	0
<p>7. The agency’s policy option packages are aligned with their mission and goals. <i>The Board understands this to mean the packages included in the biennial budget process as part of the Agency Request Budget.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	5	1	0	0
<p>8. The Board reviews all proposed budgets. <i>The Board understands this to mean the Department of Forestry’s biennial budget at the Agency Request Budget level.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	5	1	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
Best Practices Performance Self-Evaluation Input Form**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>9. The Board periodically reviews key financial information and audit findings. <i>The Board understands this to mean significant financial issues and as audits are released.</i> <u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	5 	1	0	0
<p>10. The Board is appropriately accounting for resources. <i>The Board understands this to mean critical issues relating to human, financial, material and facilities resources by providing oversight in these areas. This means that the Board receives briefings on such issues as succession management, vacancies, the budget, and financial effects of the fire program.</i> <u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	4 	2	0	0
<p>11. The agency adheres to accounting rules and other relevant financial controls. <i>The Board understands this to mean the receipt of the annual statewide audit report from Secretary of State which highlights any variances in accounting rules or significant control weaknesses.</i> <u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	4 	2	0	0
<p>12. Board members act in accordance with their roles as public representatives. <i>The Board understands this to mean that they follow public meeting rules, the standard of conduct for Board members, and the public input process. Members received training and information from the Governor's Office upon appointment.</i> <u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	5 	1	0	0
<p>13. The Board coordinates with others where responsibilities and interests overlap. <i>The Board understands this to mean other public agencies and boards with statutory authority connections or overlaps, e.g. the Forest Trust Land Counties, the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission/Department of Environmental Quality; the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission/Department of Fish and Wildlife; the State Land Board; local fire districts; the United States Forest Service; the Bureau of Land Management..</i> <u>Comments:</u> - It's hard for me to fully evaluate from far eastern Oregon. I get a sense that we are doing this – particularly with FTLAC CFF, EQC, USFS, and BLM. I'm less familiar with the coordination with other Boards, Commissions and entities.</p>	4 	2	0	0

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
Best Practices Performance Self-Evaluation Input Form**

Oregon Board of Forestry Best Practices Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<p>14. The Board members identify and attend appropriate training sessions. <i>The Board understands this to mean the workshops, symposia, and field tours that accompany some Board meetings, and that the Board receives adequate technical information.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> - In general yes – although my participation in field tours has dropped off regrettably over the last six months.</p>	3	3	0	0
<p>15. The Board reviews its management practices to ensure best practices are utilized. <i>The Board understands this to mean carrying out this self-evaluation on an annual basis, conducting the annual Board work plan status check, and by conducting the periodic scan of issues on a biennial basis.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	4	2	0	0
<i>Listed below is an additional best practice for the Board of Forestry; not included in calculating the percentage adherence to best practices.</i>				
<p>16. The Board values public input and transparency in conducting its work through outreach to and engagement of stakeholders and by using its work plan communication tools. The Board also values input and communications with its standing advisory committees, special ad hoc committees and panels and external committees with board interests.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> n/a</p>	4	2	0	0
Total Number (Criteria 1-15)	70	20	0	0
Percentage of Total in Each Evaluation Category (Criteria 1-15)	78%	22%	0%	0%
Percentage of Total in “Agree” and “Disagree” (Criteria 1-15)	100%		0%	

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Governance Performance Measure
Best Practices Performance Self-Evaluation Input Form**

C. Summary Questions for Consideration:

1. How is the Board doing?

- Reasonably well given the controversy surrounding the issues before it. We function as a problem-solving board.
- I believe the board works well together in the sense that there is mutual respect even though there may be differences on issues. The riparian rule issue is a good example of that. But we also have difficult issues ahead, most notably the state forest financial liability issue.
- I think the Board works very well together – we have a strong and capable Chair, and good respect and deliberation between members.
- We could use that seventh board member. The current board members all work together quite well and have a good working relationship, in my opinion.

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

- Budgetary constraints are a big concern. This is especially true for the State Forests program, where budgetary shortfalls are magnified by the lack of diversity in funding streams and even if harvest were to be dramatically increased we can't "cut our way out" of the budget hole, management decision space is complicated by lawsuits, and management options are inadequately illuminated by incomplete cost-benefit analyses.
- Litigation hampers action and accomplishment as well as collaboration.
- Litigation involving the board and/or department creates uncertainty and awkwardness (real or perceived) in terms of communications with some key stakeholders, particularly in a board setting.
- Divisiveness of the issues and lack of effort / ability for stakeholders to engage collaboratively / constructively in identifying and developing mutually agreeable options.
- As I said previously, we could use a full board of seven.

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

- Need to try to get ahead of issues and not always be reacting to lawsuits, other challenges, etc.
- A full board of seven. Also the ability to make decisions that are long-lasting and bring in many options and thoughts about next steps.