**OPRA Board Conference Call Survey**

**November 2012**

**Engagement**

I felt as though people may have been doing some of their own work while the call was going on and in turn were not as involved in the call.

**Pace**

I understand that we need to keep moving, however, there was a rushed feel to the meeting.

we were on a 2 hour time schedule, normally we do 3 or 4 hours. It felt like we were rushing. Howver, I think we did spend enough time, opportunity was given for further discussion.

A bit rushed. Shorter agenda would work better via phone call and ensure adequate time for flushing out issues regarding more immediate matters. Updates with little change could be an emailed memo.

It seemed we could have used more time to discuss certain issues...I appreciate the attempt to "stick to the schedule" but maybe we need to extend the schedule. We reviewed a typical Board meeting agenda in about half the time we normally do.

**Pre-call Preparation**

I feel comfortable with conference calls once per quarter (perhaps more often after experiencing the style and its effects on the group) and for critical need. If not prescheduled, I appreciate as much notice as possible.

Although it was not directly related to call, the lack of written documentation on some subject areas (such as items under the waiver pilot) made it somewhat difficult to fully understand the purpose and desired outcomes of consultation services, grants and partnerships.

**Having a Voice**

It makes no difference between live or call-in, I will get my message heard

**Time Savings**

It was great not to spend so much time traveling.

I appreciate not having to drive to Columbus as often.

**General and Multiple Topic Comments**

Since I was the one conducting the meeting, I felt that MY voice/opinions were heard, and I hope that everyone else felt that they, too, could be comfortable enough to speak up and voice their thoughts. I am looking forward to seeing the results of this survey to see if that is the case. I want everyone to feel comfortable, to ensure free-flowing conversations, and to have everyone comfortable enough to say what is on their minds.

I think there is benefit to face to face discussion...it is easier to get a read on the concensus of the group based on body language, etc. I appreciate the fact that I did not have to travel 4-5 hours to participate. That being said I would not object to some meetings being held via conference....I would not a high frequency of meetings being conducted in this manner....maybe not even quarterly. Again I think it should be contigent on the complexity and nature of the material to be covered.....my 2 cents

If most of the agenda is to do updates then I think a conference call is adequate. If there is new information/projects that need more explanation and detail, then it helps to have face-to-face conversation.

First, I was at a disadvantage as I joined the meeting when it was in progress due to a schedule conflict. Secondly, our regular meetings last in excess of 3 hours and it was unclear to me why it was so rushed. Should we plan on 10 to 1 or could we start earlier, since we would normally be traveling to OPRA? Lastly, I appreciate the ability to reduce the driving/time/etc. however, I am more likely to speak up during in person meetings. I will overcome that hesitation.

*Here are comments that require a contextual connection to the specific question.*

Question: 2. Do you feel that conducting the OPRA Board meeting via conference call inhibited the flow of discussion?

Somewhat inhibiting when trying not to talk over someone else. Miss the facial expressions.

Just slightly.

except perhaps for Than

Well, it is the telephone. I'm sure there was less range of input than in our face-to-face mtgs.

perhaps a little, but not enough to make a difference in outcome.

Question: 6. Do you feel that conducting the meeting as a conference call detracted in any way from the Board's efficiency and/or effectiveness?

Sure, I wouldn't do it more than half the time.