

Master Board Member Survey

Section One: Shaping your society's mission and vision

A Mission Statement defines an organization's reason for existing; a written declaration of a society's core purpose and focus that normally remains unchanged over time.

A Vision Statement is a set of ideas that describe where a society wants to be in the near future, and it also must have a level of excitement and motivation to it. Vision statements should be revised as needed to reflect the changing business culture as goals are met and should go beyond profit margins to look toward the long-term effects on membership.

***1. Assess your board's performance in understanding your society's financial services (life insurance/annuities etc.) mission.**

POOR - Active and open disagreement about financial services mission

AVERAGE - Board understands financial services mission; disagreements are known but are not formally discussed

GOOD - Board shares understanding of financial services mission but does not discuss

EXCELLENT - Board shares understanding of financial services mission and frequently discusses it

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***2. Assess your board's performance in understanding your society's fraternal/community service mission.**

POOR - Active and open disagreement about fraternal/community service mission

AVERAGE - Board understands fraternal/community service mission; disagreements are known but are not formally discussed

GOOD - Board shares understanding of fraternal/community service mission but does not discuss

EXCELLENT - Board shares understanding of fraternal/community service mission and frequently discusses it

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***3. Assess your board's common understanding of your society's vision.**

POOR - Board members lack understanding of vision

AVERAGE - Vision not formalized; board members disagree over what is achievable

GOOD - Board members have common understanding of the vision; vision not documented and/or lacks concrete goals

EXCELLENT - All board members share common understanding of where organization wants to be in 5-10 years; vision is well documented with concrete goals

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***4. Assess your board's process for raising mission and vision issues.**

POOR - Board has no formal process to engage board in reviewing the mission and vision

AVERAGE - Informal discussion within small groups on mission or vision; rarely raised to full board for broad discussion

GOOD - informal and active discussion within small groups and brought before full board on ad hoc basis

EXCELLENT - Formalized process to foster active board member participation in examining mission/vision related issues

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Two: Strategy

Master Board Member Survey

***5. Assess your board's performance in engaging in strategic planning and policy decisions.**

POOR - No formal process for strategic planning/little or none takes place

AVERAGE - Formal process exists but on ad hoc basis; mainly staff driven; Board "rubber stamps" plan

GOOD - Process exists for developing strategic plan; mainly staff driven with active discussion by full board

EXCELLENT - Formal process; joint board and staff ownership with active discussion by entire board

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***6. Assess the quality of your society's strategic plan.**

POOR - No formal plan; board members/staff would not describe key points of the strategy in the same way

AVERAGE - Strategic plan exists but has major holes in goals, analysis etc.

GOOD - All key strategic elements addressed in plan; clear linkage of programs to mission and vision; unresolved issues identified for further investigation

EXCELLENT - Robust plan covers all key strategic elements; agreed upon program outcomes are tightly linked to mission and vision

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***7. Rate your board's performance in focusing on high level strategic issues and not on operational issues.**

POOR - Board focuses most time on immediate operational issues that should be handled by staff and no time devoted on looking to the future.

AVERAGE - Board spends some time on long term strategy and too much time on operations.

GOOD - Board refers to strategic plan often and tracks progress towards meeting goals, some of which are not measurable; leaves most operational issues to staff

EXCELLENT - Board trusts CEO to handle all operational issues and focuses almost entirely on long term strategy and performance towards achieving measurable goals

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Three: Select, evaluate and develop CEO

***8. Assess the evaluation and development process used for your CEO.**

POOR - Evaluations of CEO are subjective and occur on an ad hoc basis

AVERAGE - Evaluations performed annually against previously agreed-upon criteria; board members can provide input

GOOD - Evaluations performed formally and at least annually against previously agreed-upon criteria; written feedback reinforced through CEO compensation

EXCELLENT - Evaluations performed at least annually against predefined criteria; includes a self-assessment by the CEO. Written feedback includes skill development plan.

CEO compensation related to performance

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***9. Assess your board's performance in ensuring that the CEO is appropriately compensated.**

POOR: Your convention decides the CEO's compensation with no relevant comparative data

AVERAGE: Your convention decides the CEO's compensation and is sent relevant comparative data in advance

GOOD: Your board decides the CEO's compensation after reviewing relevant comparative data

EXCELLENT: Your board appoints a compensation committee or hires a compensation consultant to provide a recommended compensation package to the board

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***10. Assess your society's CEO search process/succession plan regardless of whether elected or hired.**

POOR - Little discussion of criteria for a new CEO; no job description provided; accountability of other employees unclear

AVERAGE - Limited discussion of criteria and search plan by board; board members feel "left out" of process; frustration with quality of candidates considered/nominated

GOOD - Formal criteria and plan discussed by board; internal and external candidates considered and at least one strong candidate emerges that membership believes to be "board approved"

EXCELLENT - Formal search criteria and search plan receives broad board support; internal and external candidates reviewed and "true choice" between qualified candidates can be made by membership or board

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Four: Building reputation

Master Board Member Survey

***11. Assess your society's network to partner with other groups on community service/member events or benefits.**

POOR - Board and staff do not explore partnering with other organizations with similar goals

AVERAGE - Staff occasionally suggests partnering with similar groups to achieve economies of scale

GOOD - Staff and board support partnering and devote time to finding partners since society members often have limited experience or training to conduct meaningful events and programs

EXCELLENT - Partnering with other groups is cited in strategic plan; staff and board regularly identify appropriate groups who can provide value. Partnerships are regularly considered and/or executed

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Five: Overseeing financial performance; ensuring risk management

***12. Assess your board's role in budget development.**

POOR - Annual budgets prepared with little input from board

AVERAGE - Board actively reviews annual financial plan; investment objectives generally understood but not clearly communicated to internal or outsourced fund managers

GOOD - Board reviews and approves 3-5 year financial plan; written investment policy exists

EXCELLENT - Board's active involvement in preparing/reviewing multi-year financial plan results in robust discussion of resource allocation, funding plans, and investment objectives in context of strategic goals

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***13. Assess the board's ongoing monitoring of financial and investment performance.**

POOR - Sporadic or infrequent review of results vs. budget with little opportunity for timely intervention; few board members feel they understand financial reports

AVERAGE - Board monitors financial statements at set intervals monthly or quarterly; open issues requiring more investigation or "surprise results" are common occurrences

GOOD - Board monitors financial results regularly; staff can answer most questions; discussion not "forward-looking"

EXCELLENT - Board monitors financial statements regularly; key performance indicators routinely reported to whole board; well prepared staff can explain variances and discuss potential corrective actions; "no surprises" because of trust based communications with staff

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***14. Assess your board's performance in fiduciary and other regulatory compliance.**

POOR - Almost no understanding of the implications of life insurance and annuities on financial performance, regulation, compliance issues and requirements

AVERAGE - Independent audit results discussed between board and auditor; little board involvement on regulatory compliance issues and requirements although some understanding of the implications of life insurance and annuities on financial performance

GOOD - Independent audit results discussed with the board; board reviews reports to/from key regulatory bodies; adequate understanding of the implications of life insurance and annuities

EXCELLENT - Board understands compliance required to regulatory bodies; feedback from auditors/regulators forms basis of recovery plan monitored by board; strong understanding of the implications of life insurance and annuities on financial performance

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***15. Assess your board's performance in risk management.**

POOR - No clear understanding or discussion of risks/exposures facing organization and concerns of regulators or what causes intervention by regulators

AVERAGE - Some discussion of key risks and mitigation strategies, but effort is largely ad hoc or in response to an event and does not cover all major exposure categories; vaguely aware of concerns and powers of regulators

GOOD - Board annually reviews financial and other risks as well as mitigation policies, but surprises regarding exposure or gaps in coverage do occur; aware of concerns of regulators

EXCELLENT - Board annually reviews potential sources of risk and mitigation plans; surprises or gaps in coverage are few; regularly discusses regulator's concerns

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***16. Rate your board's performance in ensuring that appropriate insurance is carried (general liability, directors and officers, cyber liability, workers compensation, agents errors and omissions, etc.)**

POOR - The board never discusses insurance

AVERAGE - The staff annually provides a basic update on most of these lines of coverage

GOOD - The CEO or staff annually reports on the current and potential costs for all these lines of coverage

EXCELLENT - The board discusses the risks and costs related to these lines and is given opportunities to become better educated through presentations or information provided by experts

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***17. Rate the board's performance in establishing and reviewing the society's investment policies.**

POOR - A written investment policy does not exist

AVERAGE - A written investment policy exists, but not well known by the board - only by the investment manager

GOOD - The Finance or other board Committee regularly reviews the policy and ensures the investment manager is following it

EXCELLENT - The Finance or other board Committee regularly reviews the policy and ensures the investment manager is following it and encourages the board to annually discuss its strengths and limitations.

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***18. How would your board perform if each member was interviewed during state examinations and most questions focused on enterprise risk management in the areas of low interest rates, RBC, surplus, managing expenses, product development, relevance, ORSA, etc.?**

POOR: Very few board members would be able to demonstrate knowledge in these areas.

AVERAGE: Half of our board would be able to answer these questions to a regulator's satisfaction.

GOOD: All but a few board members would answer these questions to a regulator's satisfaction; those that could not would demonstrate reliance on qualified vendors.

EXCELLENT: Each board member would be able to demonstrate to regulators strong grasp of society operations as they relate to risk.

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Six: Society oversight

Master Board Member Survey

***19. Assess your board's understanding of accountability to members and the level of transparency between the board and the members.**

POOR - Board does not view itself accountable to members for financial performance of society; zero transparency

AVERAGE - Limited discussion of accountability to members; divergent views; some high level items are shared with entire membership

GOOD - Board discussion of accountability to members occurs in unstructured format; communications to members sporadic but include status off important issues facing board

EXCELLENT - Board identifies primary stakeholders as members and ensures that performance results are communicated effectively and transparently while ensuring appropriate privacy of individual board members

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***20. Rate the board's performance in being knowledgeable about your society's financial services products.**

POOR - Most board members cannot accurately name or describe our products

AVERAGE - Most board members are able to accurately name or describe our products

GOOD - All board members can accurately name and describe our products and understand the implications of selling too few or too many

EXCELLENT - The entire board understands our product mix and routinely strategies about developing new or eliminating non performing products

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***21. Rate the board's performance in being knowledgeable about your society's (non insurance) member benefits.**

POOR - Most board members cannot describe our (non insurance) member benefits

AVERAGE - Most board members are able to accurately describe our (non insurance) member benefits

GOOD - All board members can accurately describe our (non insurance) member benefits and participate in them

EXCELLENT - The entire board understands our member benefits, annually discusses how they help meet the mission, and regularly explores new benefits that have been suggested by a committee or staff

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***22. Rate the board's performance in being knowledgeable about your society's community service projects.**

POOR - Most board members cannot describe our society's community service projects

AVERAGE - Most board members are able to accurately describe our society's community service projects

GOOD - All board members can accurately describe our society's community service projects and participate in them. There is annual productive discussion about impact and talent required to execute. Staff provides basic data on activities.

EXCELLENT - The entire board understands and participates in our society's community service projects. There is regular discussion as to their relevance and how they help meet the mission and the resources needed to execute them effectively. Staff provides detailed reports on participation and impact.

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***23. Do all board members receive a copy of the organization's IRS Form 990?**

- Yes, before it is submitted to the IRS
- Yes, after it is submitted to the IRS
- No
- I don't recall

***24. Assess your society's process for obtaining and using feedback from members.**

POOR - Board has no process to obtain feedback from members

AVERAGE - Feedback from members is requested through occasional communications and/or at conventions; not all members queried

GOOD - Board receives positive and negative feedback from members but feedback is anecdotal; board discusses feedback with CEO/staff and agrees on areas of improvement

EXCELLENT - Board has formal process in place to obtain feedback from members without filters by staff; board ensures results from member feedback are used to inform strategy and resource allocation

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Seven: Improving board performance

Master Board Member Survey

***25. Assess efforts in developing a plan for improving board performance over time (aside from this survey).**

POOR - Board discussion of its own performance is very limited and largely unstructured

AVERAGE - Informal process for evaluating board performance is largely CEO/chair driven and plan for improvement not widely known by directors

GOOD - Board organizes a review of performance every several years; board leadership generally seen to have a plan for improving performance

EXCELLENT - Formal process results in a clear plan for improvement; board collectively owns topic of improving its value to the organization

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***26. Assess the process for evaluating individual directors.**

POOR - No process in place for measuring individual board member performance

AVERAGE - Evaluations of individual directors occur informally as part of re-nomination process. Evaluations are light touch and board seems to have a lot of "dead wood"

GOOD - Board committee in place to evaluate individual director performance jointly with director at re-nomination time; most board members seen as valuable contributors to organization governance

EXCELLENT - Board committee in place to evaluate individual director performance periodically; jointly discusses how to help director give his/her best to organization; little collective tolerance for non-active directors in organization governance and support

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Eight: Leadership (board chair and committee leaders)

Master Board Member Survey

***27. Assess the process for deciding who leads and for how long.**

POOR - No clear process exists for selecting the leadership and/or most members do not know the selection process

AVERAGE - Process exists for selecting/transitioning board and committee leadership; some confusion within board about process or election criteria or leadership tenures

GOOD - Process exists for selecting leadership at board and committee levels although leadership criteria not articulated. Expected duration of leadership positions not articulated

EXCELLENT - Clear, well understood, and accepted process in place to select and transition board and committee leadership

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***28. Assess your society's process for grooming leaders on your board.**

POOR - No process (formal or informal) in place to cultivate next generation of board leaders

AVERAGE - A few board members are obvious future leaders who ask for opportunities to lead

GOOD - Future leaders are identified and given opportunities to lead; most transitions are seen as appropriate and timely

EXCELLENT - Process in place to identify and develop board leaders; committee assignments rotated; board seen to have rich set of future leaders

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***29. Assess the relationship between the board leader (Board Chair or Lead Director) and the top paid staff member (CEO; President). If your CEO is also the Chair, then assess the relationship between the Executive Committee and the CEO/President.**

POOR - Board chair relationship with CEO is strained

AVERAGE - Board chair has a good relationship with CEO though relationships with staff are underdeveloped; committee leaders do not interact with CEO or staff very often or effectively

GOOD - Board chair has an effective relationship with the CEO and key staff although at the committee level; the quality of relationship varies

EXCELLENT - Board chair has an effective working relationship with the CEO and key staff

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***30. Assess the effectiveness of board leadership.**

POOR - Current board leadership (chair, committee chairs) is largely ineffective given the complex needs of the organization

AVERAGE - Current effectiveness of board leadership group (chair, committee chairs) is mixed, due to varying degrees of skill and enthusiasm

GOOD - For the most part, board leadership is effective with a few exceptions

EXCELLENT - Current board leadership has the necessary skills, enthusiasm, energy, and time to provide leadership to the board

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Nine: Board meetings

Master Board Member Survey

***31. How many full board meetings are planned annually?**

***32. Please assess the quality of preparation for your board meetings.**

POOR - Calendar of meetings for the year and agenda for individual meetings not established in timely manner; board receives materials during meetings

AVERAGE - Calendar of meetings established early; board receives agenda and some materials ahead of meeting; materials not of appropriate quality for thorough preparation

GOOD - Board receives calendar, agenda and complete meeting materials in a timely manner

EXCELLENT - Calendar of meetings set and distributed for the year; agenda for the individual meetings sent out ahead of time; quality background materials are sent well in advance

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***33. Assess the effectiveness of your board meetings.**

POOR - Meetings often start late and run long; majority of time spent on presentations to board without sufficient time for board debate and discussion

AVERAGE - Meetings start and end on time although structure of agenda revolves around CEO/staff "show and tell"; significant board debate on issues not expected or desired

GOOD - Significant amount of agenda is CEO/staff "show and tell"; board has some time to debate but discussion is often cut short due to time constraints. Some members do not contribute, although they could

EXCELLENT - Meetings start and end on time; minimal "show and tell" by the CEO/staff; most time dedicated to board discussion and debate on strategic issues. Board members feel involved and their contributions valued

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***34. Assess board chair's (or lead director's) performance during meetings.**

POOR: Board chair does not create compelling agenda or stick to it; allows certain members to dominate conversations. Does not seem to privately manage inappropriate behavior (which includes lack of attendance). Expertise in financial issues limited.

AVERAGE: Mostly sticks to agenda; does not steer group away from operational issues; allows some members to dominate. Improved expertise in financial matters could enhance meetings. Unruly behavior generally not tolerated.

GOOD: Creates compelling agenda each meeting; draws out lots of viewpoints; overall board behavior and attendance is good implying discipline or high expectations; can sometimes get in weeds. Qualified to lead board.

EXCELLENT: Keeps conversations at high level and that engage everyone; regular reference to mission and vision during decision-making; does not tolerate bad behavior; fosters discussions that are flexible, respectful, serious and fun. High qualifications generate trust.

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***35. Assess the degree of fun and passion in board meetings.**

POOR - Board views meetings as a chore; board members do not socialize before or after the meetings

AVERAGE - Board meetings are work-driven and lack opportunities for camaraderie; members don't mind having to miss a meeting

GOOD - Board meetings are productive and fun; some attempts are made to build camaraderie; attendance is typically high

EXCELLENT - Board interactions are productive and enjoyable; good mixture of work and fun activities including efforts to connect board members to the mission (e.g. site visits); board members hate to miss meetings

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

Section Ten: Size and structure

*** 36. How many voting members currently serve on the board?**

*** 37. Assess the size of your board.**

POOR - Board either too small, or too large; board has not addressed size as issue to be resolved

AVERAGE - Board size is largely legacy of past decisions; imbalances exist in workload and/or coverage of board roles

GOOD - While not a topic of discussion, board size for most part adequately meets the board's needs

EXCELLENT - Board discusses issue of size explicitly and directors widely believe the current size adequately balances coverage of roles, cohesiveness among members, and work load

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***38. Please assess your executive committee (if it exists).**

POOR - Executive committee acts as de-facto board, which tends to demoralize other board members

AVERAGE - Executive committee exists although its role is not clearly understood by all board members

GOOD - Executive committee has clear role, well understood and supported by all board members

EXCELLENT - Executive committee has clear role, well understood and supported by all board members; serves as a valuable resource to the board chair and CEO in guiding the organization and in improving overall board performance

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***39. Assess your society's committee structure.**

POOR - Committee structure mirrors staff functions and not organizational priorities; charter unclear or indistinguishable from staff functions

AVERAGE - Committees are logically organized and reflect organizational priorities but few have clear charter/goals

GOOD - Most standing committees have clear charters and reflect organizational priorities with few exceptions

EXCELLENT - Committee structure explicitly designed with clear charter around organizational priorities; board effectively uses mix of ad hoc and standing committees to fulfill objectives

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***40. Rate your board's performance in reviewing bylaws, policies and procedures.**

POOR: It has been many years since the board has thoroughly reviewed the bylaws and other important governance documents.

AVERAGE: The board assigns a committee to periodically review the bylaws and other important governance documents. Committee unsure of what constitutes current good governance as stated by regulators, the IRS or other reputable sources.

GOOD: The board assigns a knowledgeable committee to periodically review the bylaws and other important governance documents. Recommendations are made to the board and generally accepted.

EXCELLENT: The board assigns a committee to periodically review the bylaws and other important governance documents. Recommendations are made to the board and generally accepted. A detailed communications plan is developed and executed to educate members on the need for change.

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Eleven: Composition of the board

***41. Assess the board's composition needed to make informed decisions.**

POOR - There is little discussion of desired board member skills/attributes

AVERAGE - Significant gaps exist in skills needed by board

GOOD - Process of identifying board needs is not as strong as it could be, but for the most part few gaps in skills exist

EXCELLENT - Systematic process for identifying needed board skills driven by strategic plan; gaps are understood and agreed to by the entire board; most new board members seem to "fit our needs well"

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

***42. Assess the process and criteria used for recruitment of new board members.**

POOR - Recruitment process is ad hoc; board is largely reactive to the suggestions of a few board members/CEO or self nominations

AVERAGE - Formal process exists to identify and cultivate potential members; candidate pool is generally seen as narrow due to eligibility rules dictated in bylaws

GOOD - Formal recruitment process with clear criteria in place; board seems to surface a strong list of potential candidates, but converts on a smaller percentage than it would like

EXCELLENT - Formal process with clear evaluation criteria in place; whole board reaches out to potential members from a wide range of sources; recruitment process is continuous and with multi year horizon; new members are seen as great additions to the board

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

***43. Please assess the diversity on your board (minorities, genders, recipients of community service, age, etc.)**

POOR - Diversity not a topic of conversation

AVERAGE - Board discusses diversity; currently not much seen on board

GOOD - Board understands the types of diversity needed, has a plan to achieve the desired diversity and is on its way to fulfilling it

EXCELLENT - Board values diversity; current diversity on the board is sufficient

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Master Board Member Survey

*44. Assess board term limits.

POOR - No clear policy on term limits exists

AVERAGE - Term limits policy exists, but the board tends to reappoint current members until term limits are reached

GOOD - Although term limits work for the most part, exiting directors are frequently "lost" to the organization

EXCELLENT - Term limits effectively balance the need for new members/skills and the retention of valuable directors. Mechanisms are in place for ensuring continued involvement of high performing retiring board members

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

*45. Assess the orientation of new board members.

POOR - No formal orientation exists for new board members

AVERAGE - Formal orientation exists but misses key topics; new directors feel welcome but take a while to get up to speed

GOOD - Effective formal orientation covers key topics but misses the opportunity to welcome/listen to new directors

EXCELLENT - Formal orientation process covers key topics (mission, organization, finances, responsibilities); committee assignments are welcomed by new directors who quickly become effective members

- POOR
- AVERAGE
- GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- DON'T KNOW OR N/A

Section Twelve: General Questions

Master Board Member Survey

***46. What are the two or three most important areas the board should address to improve its performance in the next year or two?**

***47. What are the three most significant risks facing the society?**

***48. Indicate how important you feel the following items are to your society's primary mission?**

	Most important	Important	Least important
To provide financial security to members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To provide meaningful contributions to members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To provide meaningful contributions to the community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***49. What prompted your society to conduct a self assessment at this time?**

- Address problems or issues
- Assist with transition of board chair
- Assist with transition of CEO
- Desire to follow best practices
- Regulator encouragement
- Enhance board performance
- Recommended by consultant

Other (please specify)

50. What other comments or suggestions would you like to offer?

Thank you for taking this important survey!