Benchmarking University Council Performance
Professor Anona Armstrong
Centre for International Corporate Governance Research
Victoria University
Paper presented to the conference, 30 March 2007,
University Governance: Managing Relationships

The term 'Governance' has as many definitions as there are disciplines but there is general agreement that it concerns decision making at the top of organisations. Governance is not about management but, (according to the Commonwealth Government's funding guidelines, DEST, 2006) about direction and control, that is, approving the mission and strategic direction, monitoring risk assessment and reviewing and approving management decisions.

Studies of governance have tended to focus on board structures: the size of boards, types of committees, independent versus executive directors, separation of chair and CEO, etc.; legal regulations and compliance with the corporations law related to the duties and responsibilities of directors, etc; and finally, what constitutes 'best practice' on boards: captured in codes of practice and guidelines for good governance (Armstrong 2004; Armstrong 2004; Armstrong 2004).

Assessment of board performance is now used widely in both the private sector (See for example Bosch, 2005, (Australian Institute of Company Directors 1994; Australian Stock Exchange 2003) and public sector (Australian National Audit Office 1999). Potential benefits, that accrue to the organisation, board and individual directors, are improved leadership, decision making, clarity of roles and duties, teamwork, and accountability (Kiel and Nicholson 2003). Assessment of performance can also help a board to operate more efficiently, reduce risks, enhance the reputations of members and universities and provide protection to members in the face of legal challenges. Evaluation of a board's performance is also a timely reminder for ensuring continuing alignment of the competency profile of a board to changing needs.

In the public sector, governance has been a major concern of numerous reports and papers from Auditors-General across the country. Within the Victorian Government, in his submission to the PAEC Report on Governance in the Victorian Public Sector, Premier Bracks said (PAEC 2005) p.33) :

> The Victorian Government is committed to improving and enhancing the corporate governance of regimes within specific public bodies and at a whole of government level. The Government is continually monitoring the governance framework as it applies to public bodies, and will continue to develop policy and where necessary legislation which improves the accountability, efficiency and operation of public bodies.

A requirement for board performance assessment has now been introduced into the Terms of Reference of public entities and many of the internal committees under the jurisdiction of Victorian Government departments.

A much more recent innovation is the interest in assessment of the performance University councils. Interest in the performance of university councils is stimulated by the desire for good governance practices. This move has been endorsed by the Federal and State Auditors-General who are responsible for auditing universities and by the issue of the National Protocols for Good Governance by the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) and endorsed by the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee (AVCC described in Storey and Armstrong, 2004).
.
The initial National Governance Protocols for Public Higher Education Institutions, published in *Backing Australia's Future,* were approved by MCEETYA in 2000 The five protocols were designed :

>to ensure consistent criteria and standards across Australia in such matters as the recognition of new universities, the operation of overseas institution in Australia, and the accreditation of higher education courses to be offered by non self-accrediting providers.

Their aim was to protect the standing of Australian Universities nationally and internationally.

The Protocols were revised again in 2006 when Minister Jacinta Allen introduced the Commonwealth Grant Scheme Guidelines to implement the Higher Education Support Act which now included details of 10 Protocols (Department of Education Science and Technology 2006). This offered institutions which complied with both the National Governance Protocols and the HE Workplace Relations Requests an increase to their base funding, rising to 7.5% from 2007.

The National Governance Protocols for Higher Education Providers listed in the legislation applying to the grants under the Commonwealth Grant Scheme (Table A of the Commonwealth Grant Scheme Guidelines, 2006) are directed at Australian Universities.   The 10 Protocols require that the objectives of the institution must be in its constitution; that it should have a statement of its governance principles, appropriate delegations, specify the duties and responsibilities of council members; that members should be protected for matters or things done is good faith; and that it should have in place nomination, selection, and removal procedures and training for appropriately skilled members; publish reports specified by the Commonwealth, risk management, and grievance procedures; and be externally audited. Many of these requirements reflect governance best practice as it is described in codes and standards of best practice governance (Armstrong 2004).

One of the benefits of the introduction of the Protocols is that they give some certainty to the legal obligations of university governing bodies and clarify the roles of council members and management. This meets some of the criticism of Corcoran (2004, p.31) that the institutionalization of management that has occurred in all corporations

>has not been accommodated in university statutes. This has led to a great deal of confusion regarding the proper place of executive management within University decision-making structures. Indeed the proliferation of Deputy Vice-Chancellors, pro Vice-Chancellors and

heads of mega-faculties or so-called 'Divisions' have clear management functions but generally speaking, no defined role in university Acts. What is worse, their positions often conflict with the roles and responsibilities of other bodies established by university Acts, such as academic boards and faculties

Universities are constitutionally independent but in practice dependent on the government for a major proportion of funds and subject to considerable legislation, Most Australian universities are appointed under State legislation, hence governance is a State issue. However, their funding is under Federal control, as the Federal Government has made increases in funding a condition of the implementation of the both the governance and workplace reforms.

When it comes to assessing performance, compliance with legal or other regulations is not necessarily useful as an evaluator of performance. In some cases, companies, which would have met their obligations of compliance with corporations acts or stock exchange regulations, were among the biggest collapses (Clarke et al 2003). An example is Enron, which, prior to its collapse, was touted as a shining example of the success of the Harvard/McKinsay management model.

Universities have also had board failures that have impinged on the reputations of their universities These include inadequate risk management systems, interpersonal relationship failures, inappropriate commercial ventures and ethical failures.

The major questions addressed in designing a University Council assessment are: Who will be evaluated? What will be the criteria against which performance will be evaluated? What will happen as a result of the evaluation?

An assessment can target the Council as a whole, the Chancellor, key personnel, e.g. the VC and the company secretary, the individual members, and/or their Committees and their Chairpersons. This paper limits its review to addressing the assessment of the effectiveness of boards as a whole.

The criteria against which performance is evaluated

The requirement for compliance with the National Protocols is not in question.. However, they are not aspirational and do not address some of the other elements of board relations that are so important for successful performance.

There are a number of frameworks against which boards can assess their performance. Among the most well known that apply directly to board performance are the NACD's Report of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Director Professionalism (National Association of Corporate Directors 2001) Carver's (Carver 1997) Policy Governance Model, the Standards Australia Governance Standards (Armstrong 2004), Kiel-Chishom and Nicholndson's compliance toolkit for assessing compliance with the ASX Corporate Governance Council's Principles (Kiel, Kiel-Chisholm et al. 2004) and their Corporate Governance Charter Framework (Kiel and Nicholson 2003), and, specifically relevant to universities, the National Governance Protocols for Higher Education Providers.

Most of these frameworks address similar aspects of best practice governance. Those directed at the private sector are also cognizant of the need for boards to 'add value' to their companies. Different additional issues are addressed in various models. Carver's model has an emphasis on board-management relationships, and Kiel and Nicholson include 'director protection' which, together with continuous improvement, is achieved through appropriate access to information and board papers, and insurance.

Standards Australia International (SAI) is the body responsible for the establishment and maintenance of ISO quality standards, and this philosophy influenced the development of their corporate governance standards.

The five AS 8000 Corporate Governance Standards issued by the SAI Committee on Business Governance consist of a set of Principles and four specific standards :

- AS 8000, *Corporate governance—Good governance principles*
- AS 8001, *Corporate governance—Fraud and corruption control*
- AS 8002, *Corporate governance—Organizational codes of conduct*
- AS 8003, *Corporate governance—Corporate social responsibility*
- AS 8004, *Corporate governance—Whistleblower protection programs for entities*

AS 8000 *Corporate governance—Good governance principles*, aims to 'provide a blueprint for the development and implementation of a generic system of governance suitable for a wide range of entities' and is intended for application which were to apply to all public and private sector entities with boards including small business and not-for-profit organisations.

Measures of the effectiveness of the standards (Armstrong, 2004b) addressed: developing the governance system for achieving good governance, the roles of the chairman, individual members and chief executive officer, company secretary and the board; disclosure and transparency obligations, and systems to protect the rights and responsibilities of shareholders.

Among the strengths of the standards are the emphasis on building and maintaining a supportive governance system, and the recognition of the responsibility of a board to build an ethical culture within a board is well as a corporation. It is one of the few frameworks to specify the values and ethical principles underlying the standards. Perhaps, a weakness is the tendency for some of the items in the roles of the members to intrude into the management of an entity rather than being confined to approval of policies and 'monitoring' the performance of management.

An alternative approach to board assessment is Richard Leblank's effectiveness profile. In their book, Leblanc and Gilles (2005) argued that board effectiveness depended on director effectiveness and that this was composed of director competence and director behaviour. They classified the board members and boards and/or committees of twenty one enterprises by behavioural characteristics and analysed the interaction of groups with differing sets of characteristics. From this they drew some conclusions about what attitudinal and personal characteristics produce highly productive boards. Using two dimensions: (a) collective-individual and (b) dissent-consensus) and different competencies they identified five profiles each of which

describes an effective and ineffective board member type. The two types of chairpersons were: Conductor-chairs 'possess remarkable leadership skills' (p.208) relate will to management, have a keen interest in good governance and serve as the hub of all important board activity. In contrast the "Caretaker-chair are ineffective Cheerleaders, Critics Conformists or Controllers whose defining characteristic is lack of leadership" (p.212). Each type of director and their competencies are contrasted with a type lacking the skills. The Change agent (exhibiting competencies of operating, strategic, public sector, marketing/consumer) was contrasted with the Controller; the Consensus builder (legal, human resources competencies) with the Conformist; the Challenger (policy making, financial literacy, consumer/marketing, international) and Critic.

The authors concluded that "best practices" are a necessary, although not sufficient condition for effective governance" but that assessment of an effective board must take into account (p.139) :

- the leadership qualities of the chair of the board,
- the nature of the relationship between the board and management;
- the operation of the board and its decision-making process,
- the "human factors" in board decision-making, and
- the "fit" among individual directors and how they relate to one another as a team.

Leblanc designed a Board Effectiveness survey of 120 items that measure board structures and composition, board processes including measures of committee leadership and board behaviours, and, how a board functions in dealing with a board's strategic direction. Better boards have directors with appropriate competencies, exhibit behavioural characteristics that lead to effective decision-making, develop strategies to manage change, and recruit new directors as needed to meet a board's requirements.

An original approach to evaluation of boards in higher education institutions in the US, was taken by Chait et al (1996). A board Self-assessment questionnaire measures six dimensions which represent the competencies of effective governing boards: contextual, educational, interpersonal, analytical, political and strategic, dimensions. The dimensions focus on the processes that guide board decision making and performance. The educational dimension refers to the training and associated steps to ensure that a board in knowledgeable about their roles, responsibilities and performance. The contextual dimensions takes into account the culture and norms of the institution, and how the board acts to reinforce the organisation's values. Board leadership, cohesiveness and collective welfare represent the interpersonal dimension. The analytical dimension measures the extent to which a board accepts ambiguity and uncertainty in its discussions. The political dimension is about managing relationships and conflict. The final dimension, strategic, measures the extent to which the board envisions the direction and shapes strategies that anticipates and resolves problems before they become urgent or crisis. A seventy three item questionnaire rated using an Agee-Disagree likert scale measured the six dimensions.

Despite the different terms, many of the measures of each dimension address similar constructs to those of the earlier theorists. Where they differ most appears to be in the

emphasis given by Chait et al to decision making processes, managing interpersonal relationships and associated with this the analytical dimension of tolerance of critical thinking, dialogue and uncertainty in board discussion. The authors also distinguish between the performance of the board and their organisation by advocating that the board sets objectives and priorities for the board itself and evaluates its performance.

 Most of the debate about what should constitute university governance has focused on compliance or conformance with constitutions, legislation and regulation. In designing the University Council Assessment Questionnaire, not only these were included but there is an emphasis on measuring some of the positive aspects of council performance that are within the control of and contribute to the performance of the Members of Councils. Another principle in its design was to include measures of governance that were important to most of the earlier designers of questionnaires, and finally, it was designed specifically for the Australian university environment.

The constructs that are measured are grouped under the headings:

- Leadership
- Structures and relationships
- Accountability
- Compliance
- Performance
- Meetings

The elements in each category are measured on a five point Likert scale. Evaluation Solutions has developed an on-line version of the questionnaire. Members of councils simply dial into the Evaluation Solutions website, complete the form and the results are automatically generated. Confidentially is protected as the questionnaires are collated by the computer system and no individual data identified. A facilitator presents the results to a council, leads a discussion of the results and encourages a council to adopt a continuous improvement approach.

The active review of a council's performance will support the evidence based approach to AUQUA reviews when they become due.

However, the UCAQ is not perfect. It suffers from the deficiencies found in all questionnaires of this kind. The first is that it must be relatively 'short' to make it easy for busy people to complete. The reductionist nature of any instrument, particularly in relation to a complex environment such as that of universities, means that it lacks depth in many instances. For example, take the question on monitoring of entities. In reality, universities engage in a range of financial arrangements appropriate for different entities and their different functions. Apart from the core business, they are engaged in direct ownership, joint ventures with other institutions especially overseas, management of private trusts, etc. A questionnaire such as this does not probe the in-depth information that a council should have about each major transaction. However, it does raise the issue and that can be the basis for further discussion within a board.

The Council Members themselves must decide whether or not to set aside time for formal consideration of their performance.

Table 1. A comparison of the elements identified as important to the governance of university boards.

Measures	UCAQ 2007	Protocols DEST 2006	Kiel & NICHOLSON 2004	SAI 2003	NACD 2001	Chait 1996
Governance policy in place		X		X		
Approves strategic direction, business plan, targets, milestones		X		X		
Sets board priorities						X
Statutory accountability		X				
Selection, appointments, removal		X		X	X	
Independence of board	X	X		X	X	
Independence of committees					X	
Structure of committees	X	X				X
Leadership	X				X	X
Competencies	X	X	X	X		
Duties	X	X				
Size and Composition	X	X			X	
Roles and responsibilities	X	X	X	X		X
Functions			X			
Control of entities	X	X				
Contacts/networking			X			
Environmental scanning						X
CEO Succession	X			X		
Performance/action	X					
Decision making processes(analytical)						X
Relationships/teamwork	X					X
Accountability	X			X		
Internal controls	X					
Reporting systems		X		X		
Report (separate) on board's activities						X
Compliance	X			X		
Risk Management		X		X		
Communication with stakeholders/constituencies	X			X	X	X
Governance practices publisised				X		
Monitoring governance	X					X
Grievance/ whistleblowing	X	X		X		
VC/CEO evaluation	X			X		
Board evaluates own performance				X		X
Relationships with senior management	X		X		X	
Teamwork	X				X	
Ethics/standards of conduct/disclosure of conflicts/transparency	X			X	X	
Contextual Dimension: Culture, values				X		X
Development and training			X	X	X	X
Record keeping				X		
Board meeting procedures, papers, preparation, information	X		X		X	

Sir John Harvey-Jones, the former chairman of ICI, has described how its main board went about assessing itself (quoted in Bosch, 1995 p. 144)(Bosch 1995):

> ... the board ought to spend some time, reasonably regularly, discussing amongst themselves how the board is actually working, in what ways the process can be improved, what the role of the board actually is, and how it can be more effective, but this occurs far too seldom. In ICI's case at least twice a year time is set aside for the board to discuss privately, as a group, the worries any members may have about the board's efficiency, or achievements, or whether they are addressing the right problems and so on. Painful though the discussions may be, they are the only way for the group to operate more effectively.

Conclusion

Although the University Council Assessment Questionnaire identifies the key elements that are required for effective performance, different Councils operate in different contexts, have different priorities and must meet different expectations. A small regional university has closer relationships with its local community than a big city based institution. While most operate under State Legislation, some are private profit making corporations. This category of universities can be expected to grow as more self-accrediting private providers enter the HE market. (At present, there are over 200 private providers of HE in Australia). The pressures on universities to source ever more of their funding from the private rather than the government sector also encourages an expansion of commercial activities and a need for ethical and transparent approaches to commercial dealings.

Because expectations of a Council, and management, will differ depending on these circumstances, comparisons of benchmarks for performance are not always appropriate. However, the results of the above review suggest that there is a fair amount of consensus about what makes for an effective Council. The research suggests that the criteria for assessment of effective Council performance are found in most frameworks and that conducting an assessment is a protection for Council members should difficult circumstances arise, and provides a guide for continuous improvement. The assessment tool also assists members of Councils and senior managers to develop, implement and maintain a robust system of governance that fits the particular circumstances of the entity; provides the mechanisms for an entity to establish and maintain an ethical culture through a committed, self-regulatory approach; and finally, assessment enhances the public reputation of a university and assists in the prevention and detection of fraudulent behaviour. Through enhanced transparency and accountability it provides external stakeholders with confidence in the performance of their university.

The board assessment tool described in this paper drew on these previous models of assessment to develop the University Council Assessment Questionnaire. This is a board self-assessment process designed for use by Council members to assess their own performance. The value of self-assessment is first, that given the confidentiality requirements of councils, only council members really know how a Council is

functioning or the processes that are in place. Second, the objective of self-assessment is continuous improvement and only the Council members themselves can improve their performance.

References

Armstrong, A. (2004). Commentary on codes of corporate governance. Introduction to Corporate Governance. A. Armstrong and R. Francis. Sydney, Standars Australia International Ltd**:** 1-10.

Armstrong, A. (2004). "Corporate governance standards: intangibles and their tangible value." Australian Journal of Corporate Law: 97-110.

Armstrong, A. (2004). Measuring the effectiveness of corporate governance standards. Applications of Corporate Governance. Sydney, Standards Australia.

Australian Institute of Company Directors, A. (1994). Checklist for Directors of Government Boards. Sydney, AICD.

Australian National Audit Office, A. (1999). Principles and Better Practices: Corporate Governance in Commonwealth Authorities and Companies. Canberra.

Australian Stock Exchange, A. (2003). Principles of good Corporate Governance and Best Practice Recommendations, Australian Stock Exchange. **2003**.

Bosch, H. (1995). The Director at Risk: Accountability in the Boardroom. South Melbourne, Pitman.

Carver, J. (1997). Boards that Make a Difference. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Chait, R. P., T. P. Holland, et al. (1996). Improving the Performance of Governing Boards. Phoenix, American Council on Education and The Onyx Press.

Clarke, F., G. Dean, et al. (2003). Corporate Collapse : Accounting, Regularoy and Ethical Failure. Cambridge, cambridge University Press.

Department of Education Science and Technology, D. (2006). Commonwealth Grant Scheme Guidelines. Canberra..

Kiel, G., K. Kiel-Chisholm, et al. (2004). The ASX Corporate Governance Council's Principles: A Compliance Toolkit. Milton, Competitive Dynamics.

Kiel, G. and G. Nicholson (2003). Boards That Work. North Rhyde, NSW, McGraw-Hill.

National Association of Corporate Directors, N. (2001). <u>Director Professionalism</u>. Washington DC, National Association of Corporate Directors.

PAEC, Public Accounts and Estimates Committee, Victoria (2005). Report on Public Governance in the Victorian Public Sector. Melbourne, Public Accounts and Estimates Committee.

University Council
Performance
Assessment Questionnaire

University Councils

Centre for International Corporate Governance Research

Victoria University
2006

Contact

Professor Anona Armstrong
Director
Email: anona.armstrong@vu.edu.au
Tel. 9919 1315

Xinting Jia
Executive Officer
Tel 9919 1252
Email: xinting.jia@vu.edu.au

Centre for International Corporate Governance Research
300 Flinders St
PO Box 14428 Melbourne City Mail Centre
MELBOURNE 8001

CICGR 2006

University Council Assessment Questionnaire

Introduction

The Centre for International Corporate Governance Research at Victoria University is recognised for its expertise in reviewing and assisting organisations to design appropriate corporate governance practices. Governance is about decision-making at the top of organisations. It encompasses authority, accountability, stewardship, leadership, direction and control exercised in organizations. Among the processes by which organizations are directed, controlled and held to account is assessment of: the role and actions of Councils and Council members, strategic leadership, control systems, risk management and compliance with legal and other responsibilities.

This assessment tool prepared by the Centre is for use in university and higher education institutions.

Since the prosecution and bankruptcy of the Chairman of the Council of the Australian Safety Council for failing to exercise due diligence prior to charges being laid against the CEO for fraud, Directors and Members of not-for-profit Councils have been made aware of their responsibilities. Personal risks can be reduced by ensuring that Council members exercise effective governance. Evidence of governance policies and practices also mitigate against prosecution and towards leniency should members be unfortunate enough to appear in court for charges such as lack of due diligence.

Good governance also serves the CEO. Appropriate accountability structures can provide assurance to the CEO on internal management and control, and ensure consultation and constructive feedback on activities.

The purpose of Assessment

Council Assessment is one way of ensuring the application of principles of good governance. The aim of the Assessment is to ensure that Council members are aware of their responsibilities, that, as a Council, they 'add value' to the organisation and where their performance as a Council needs improvement this can be addressed. The assessment process also reassures the university community and other stakeholders that Council is giving due consideration to the governance responsibilities of the Council including its reputation for transparency and accountability.

The procedure

Council members are asked to record the answers to the questions using the 5 point scale. The answers to the questions will be collated and the results discussed at the next meeting. It should be stressed that the process is not one of condemnation and blame but done in a spirit of trust and mutual confidence among the participants as part of a continuous improvement process.

Assessment

Council members are invited to assess the effectiveness of the governance processes using a ranking scale with four levels:

1= Strongly disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither agree nor disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly agree

	Leadership					
1	The Council provides leadership and vision	1	2	3	4	5
2	Council members are clear about their roles and responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
3	Council members are clear about the distinction between executive and management roles	1	2	3	4	5
4	The Council adds value to the annual review of the mission, vision and strategic objectives submitted by the university administration	1	2	3	4	5
5	The duties and responsibilities of the Council and executive are clearly stated	1	2	3	4	5
6	The duties and responsibilities of the audit committee is clearly stated	1	2	3	4	5
7	The Council has the necessary information to undertake effective decision making and actions	1	2	3	4	5
8	Issues that come before the Council are seldom framed in a way that enables members to see the connections between the matter at hand and the University's overall strategy	1	2	3	4	5
9	Ethical and governance standards are clearly stated and complied with	1	2	3	4	5
10	There sufficient skills and experience on the Council	1	2	3	4	5
11	The Council does an adequate job of evaluating the performance of the VC/CEO against predetermined criteria	1	2	3	4	5
12	The Council does an adequate job of determining his/her succession	1	2	3	4	5
13	I have major concerns about the university's future	1	2	3	4	5
14	Selection and appointment procedures are in place for all Members of the Council	1	2	3	4	5
15	Serving on the Council is a rewarding and satisfying experience	1	2	3	4	5
	Structures and relationships					
1	Council is the right size	1	2	3	4	5
2	Council Committees are functioning properly	1	2	3	4	5

3	The committee structure is satisfactory	1	2	3	4	5
4	Council Committees ad value to the University	1	2	3	4	5
5	Committee communication with the Council is satisfactory	1	2	3	4	5
6	Members ask appropriate questions of the Committees	1	2	3	4	5
7	The Council is sufficiently independent of the University management	1	2	3	4	5
8	Council members ask appropriate questions of management	1	2	3	4	5
9	Major stakeholders evaluation of the performance of the Council over the past 12 months would be positive	1	2	3	4	5
10	Individual members of Council maintain channels of communication with specific key community leaders	1	2	3	4	5
11	Council members take decisions for the good of the whole organization and not individual constituencies	1	2	3	4	5
12	There are adequate opportunity for informal discussion among Council members	1	2	3	4	5
13	Differences of opinion in council decisions are more often settled by vote than by more discussion	1	2	3	4	5
14	When a new member joins this Council, we make sure that a mentor helps this person to learn the ropes	1	2	3	4	5
15	The Council operates as an effective team	1	2	3	4	5
16	There is open and frank discussion	1	2	3	4	5
17	I have attended Council meeting where explicit attention was given to the concerns of the local community	1	2	3	4	5
18	The Council collects information on the morale of staff	1	2	3	4	5
19	Orientation programs for new Council members specifically include a segment about the university's history and tradition	1	2	3	4	5
20	The council fosters an appropriate corporate culture	1	2	3	4	5
21	Other Council members have important information that I lack on key issues	1	2	3	4	5
22	The Council communicates its decisions to all those who are affected by them	1	2	3	4	5
23	I am able to speak my mind on key issues without fear that I will be ostracized by some members of the Council	1	2	3	4	5
24	There is at least as much dialogue among council members as there is between members and administration	1	2	3	4	5
	Accountability					
1	The Council acts with care and diligence	1	2	3	4	5
2	The Council adequately monitors financial reports and understands whether the organisation is performing as projected	1	2	3	4	5
3	The Council has a code of conduct	1	2	3	4	5
4	The Council approves remuneration for the CEO	1	2	3	4	5
5	The Council identifies and addresses risks faced by the organisation	1	2	3	4	5
6	The Council adequately documents the current governance practices	1	2	3	4	5
7	The council explicitly examines the "downside" or possible pitfalls of any important decision it may take	1	2	3	4	5
8	Members disclose personal interests and potential and actual conflicts of interest	1	2	3	4	5
9	The Council adequately informs members of activities	1	2	3	4	5
10	Systems are in place for asset management, ensuring efficiency and minimising costs	1	2	3	4	5
11	Adequate procedures are in place for Council's approval of remuneration of the VC	1	2	3	4	5
12	The Council does not allocate organisational funds for the purpose of Council	1	2	3	4	5

	education and development					
13	Recommendations from the administration are usually accepted with little questioning in Council meetings	1	2	3	4	5
14	Members obtain independent advice when required	1	2	3	4	5

Compliance

1	The financial reports meet International Accounting Standards	1	2	3	4	5
2	Procedures are in place to ensure compliance with legal and other regulations	1	2	3	4	5
3	Council activities are transparent and open	1	2	3	4	5
4	Financial controls are adequate for effective operation of the organisation	1	2	3	4	5
5	Adequate controls cover fraud, risk management and contract performance	1	2	3	4	5
6	There is a Whistleblowing procedure for reporting breaches of policy, rules and governance failures	1	2	3	4	5
7	The council monitors compliance with its policies	1	2	3	4	5

Performance

1	The vision, mission and priorities of the university are clearly articulated and understood by Members of Council	1	2	3	4	5
2	Values are seldom discussed explicitly at our board meetings	1	2	3	4	5
3	The Council is decisive, action oriented and get things done	1	2	3	4	5
4	Council and Committee meetings are productive	1	2	3	4	5
5	Our council meeting tends to focus more on current concerns than on preparing for the future	1	2	3	4	5
6	Members stay abreast of issues and trends and bring that information to the Council	1	2	3	4	5
7	The Council's objectives for the past 12 months were achieved	1	2	3	4	5
8	The Council often discusses where the university should be headed in 5 or more years into the future	1	2	3	4	5
9	I have participated in board discussions about our performance	1	2	3	4	5
10	I have never received feedback on my performance as a Council Member	1	2	3	4	5
11	Council evaluates the performance of the university's Vice-Chancellor	1	2	3	4	5
12	Council goals, expectations are honestly communicated to the CEO	1	2	3	4	5
13	The Council benchmarks its performance against other institutions	1	2	3	4	5
14	The Council regularly evaluates its own performance	1	2	3	4	5
15	The Council meets high ethical standards	1	2	3	4	5

Meetings and communication

1	Council members receive timely agenda and minutes	1	2	3	4	5
2	Meetings productive	1	2	3	4	5
3	There are sufficient meetings	1	2	3	4	5
4	Council meetings are conducted in a way that ensures open communication, meaningful participation, and timely resolution of issues	1	2	3	4	5
5	Council members act as a team	1	2	3	4	5
6	Council members respect the confidentiality of the Council discussions	1	2	3	4	5
7	Council members are prepare well for meetings	1	2	3	4	5
8	I find it easy to identify the key issues that this Council faces	1	2	3	4	5