

**Community-Campus Partnerships for Health  
Board Retreat and Business Meeting Results  
September 22-24, 2000 ~ Forest Grove, OR**

Board Members Present

Deb Archer, Renee Bayer, Paul Freyder, Hilda Heady, Gretchen Kinder, JoEllen Koerner, Terri Kluzik, Tom O'Toole, Monte Roulier, Douglas Simmons, Vickie Ybarra

Board Members Absent

Elmer Freeman, Cheryl Maurana

Staff Present: Piper Krauel, Sarena Seifer

<b>ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT</b>
--------------------------------------------------

**Topic: Celebrating our accomplishments over the past year**

**Discussion:** The board and staff noted these accomplishments over the past year:

*Re: gaining support and recognition*

- CCPH is gaining support and recognition in broader circles. For example, the Council on Linkages Between Public Health Practice and Academia invited us to have a seat at their table (we're the only non-public health group invited); the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy has appointed a committee to make recommendations for service-learning, and has invited CCPH to serve on it.
- CCPH has had funding renewed by two funding agencies, the Corporation for National Service and the Helene Fuld Health Trust. We also developed relationships with new funding agencies, including the WK Kellogg Foundation and the National Health Service Corps.
- The conference commissioned papers are increasing CCPH's visibility as a credible source of objective information on important issues. We are attaching methodologic and pedagogic rigor to what can be perceived by some as "warm and fuzzy" issues.
- CCPH members are getting more involved in the organization, and there are more opportunities for members to be involved (advisory groups, etc).
- Our members are advancing the field – for example, they have written discipline specific articles about service-learning, they are getting significant grants, they are being promoted and tenured.

*Re: board development*

- We recruited 4 fabulous new board members and their transition to the board was smooth.
- We are implementing a standard board timeline for recruiting new board members and transitioning new officers.

*Re: strategic planning*

- We solidified a strategic plan, and are moving towards operationalizing it.
- The Program Planning and Evaluation Committee (renamed the Mission Effectiveness Committee – see below) is re-energized and moving forward.
- This year's conference and commissioned papers have helped us move significantly forward in developing a policy and advocacy agenda.
- We have provided important opportunities for board members to meet directly with federal and foundation officials to make the case for CCPH. We need to expand upon these opportunities.
- We have begun to collaborate more deliberately with the Healthy Communities movement.

*Re: the CCPH staff*

- We have a strong staff team in Sarena, Kara, Piper and Jennet.

*Re: our accomplishments*

- We have begun to grapple with the hard question: how are we going to measure the process of effecting change?
- We are striving to connect the outcomes of our individual programs and projects with the evaluation of our effectiveness overall as a board and as an organization.
- We're part of a movement – how much "credit" can we claim for our accomplishments and outcomes? – "credit is infinitely divisible!"

**Topic: Assessing the board's contributions over the past year**

**Discussion:** Board members made these observations about their assessments of their contributions as board members over the past year:

- Many felt a “certain amount of guilt” about not contributing as much as they had hoped to as board members this past year
- The assessment re-affirmed for many board members how important it is to have different perspectives on our board
- The more one can integrate one's personal and professional goals with CCPH's goals, the better.
- There are many ways to serve the organization, both internally (i.e., during and in between board meetings and committee meetings, serving on program committees, etc) and externally (speaking to others about CCPH, representing CCPH to federal and foundation officials, etc.). Each of us brings different strengths and interests in these different roles, and that is great.
- Committees are working more effectively, increasing board members' satisfaction with their committee work. However, some board members feel unclear about their committee roles and how best to contribute to their committee work.
- There is good communication between CCPH staff and board members. Board members appreciate prompting and reminders.
- The board discussed how board member contributions and the process of board member self-assessment relate to our strategic plan. The group concluded that the board's work needs to support the plan.
- New and “old” board members need to continue revisiting the strategic plan and becoming more familiar and facile with it.

**Action:**

- Sarena and the staff will develop a “board-only” web page so that self-assessments can be entered into the site and progress tracked over time. This will allow board members to compare their goals and outcomes from year to year, track new member recruitment, and so forth. They will also post board policies on the public part of the CCPH website so that board members can more easily find and use them, and other organizations can learn from them.
- The Board Development Committee may revise the assessment instrument to incorporate “likert scale”-type responses to questions that aren't necessarily “yes” or “no”
- The Mission Effectiveness Committee will develop an approach for tracking our progress in achieving our strategic plan.
- The board will revisit the strategic plan in some way at each board meeting and become more familiar and facile with it. In planning the agenda for each board meeting, the executive committee will include a discussion of our mission.
- Future board meeting agendas developed by the Executive Committee will explicitly relate each agenda item to CCPH's strategic plan.

**Topic: CEO evaluation**

**Discussion:** The executive committee has been developing a plan for evaluating the CEO, modeled after an approach developed by the National Center for Nonprofit Boards.

**Action:**

- The board agreed with the executive committee's approach. The executive committee will administer an evaluation survey this fall and discuss the findings at the January board meeting.

**Topic: Developing a plan for organizational assessment and improvement**

**Discussion:** Sherril Gelmon, professor of public health at Portland State University and principal investigator of the evaluation of the Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation Program, facilitated a training and discussion on organizational assessment and improvement. Her handout, “How do we know we are making a difference? Organizational assessment and improvement” posted several questions that framed her presentation. A summary of the points made by board members during the discussion appear after each question, below (please note that we did not have time to discuss each of these questions in depth). Sherril covered the advantages and disadvantages of two approaches to assessment, both described in the handout:

- A variation of the concept-indicator-method approach, using the “model for improvement” (this is similar to what she used for the HPSISN evaluation)

- A modification of the “criteria for performance excellence” of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program. To receive the Baldrige award, an organization must have a system that ensures continuous improvement in the delivery of products and/or services, and provides a way of satisfying and responding to stakeholders. Sherril wasn’t suggesting that we apply for the award, but to use the award criteria and materials in our own organizational assessment.

*What is your aim in conducting an organizational assessment? What do you want to accomplish? What do you want to learn?*

- We want to determine, in an ongoing way, if we are still on track with our mission and if we are meeting our goals.
- We want to articulate outcomes – our impact on policy, our members, the field.
- We want to determine if our strategic plan is conceived and carried out well.
- We want to identify areas for improvement. We are not striving for perfection, but ongoing learning and improvement.
- We want to determine our future mission and direction.
- We strive for an involved, committed, inclusive membership and organization. We want to learn how our members feel about CCPH.
- We need to assess the community-campus partnership movement and its impact.
- We have two potential agendas in conducting an organizational assessment – the promotion of principle-centered partnerships as a movement and documenting what makes for successful partnerships. Our measures need to have an organizational and individual perspectives.
- A lot of organizations let their strategic plan guide their decisions, but we also need to look outside in the environment – new opportunities, areas for improvement.

*What do you want to be able to demonstrate? Who wants or needs the information? For what purposes do they want/need the information?*

- We want to describe the state and the “state of the art” of community-campus partnerships.
- We want to determine if and how partnerships are actually operationalizing the principles of partnership.
- We would like to develop an assessment instrument for community-campus partnerships, to assess the value and outcomes of the partnership.
- Our members – communities and campuses and partnerships – need this information.

*What resources are you prepared to commit to undertake and complete the assessment in a timely and thorough manner? Who will do the assessment?*

- Resources identified included: the Mission Effectiveness Committee, our strategic plan, the Baldrige criteria, and students in Sherril’s program evaluation class (who could work with us as a class project)

*How will you ensure that the results are used?*

- We need to connect the results with our plans for marketing, fundraising, membership development, new program development, and so forth.
- We need to communicate the results to our board and membership through an annual report.

Action:

- The Program Planning and Evaluation Committee has changed its name to the Mission Effectiveness Committee and made modifications to its job description to reflect its primary purpose of organizational assessment and improvement.
- The Mission Effectiveness Committee will discuss the questions on Sherril’s handouts and begin to develop an approach to organizational assessment that meets the needs of the CCPH board
- Sherril will assign a team of students in her program evaluation class to CCPH. The team will work with Sarena and the Mission Effectiveness Committee.
- Sarena will obtain the Baldrige criteria and bound materials for the general, health and higher education categories: [www.quality.nist.gov](http://www.quality.nist.gov); 1-800-248-1946; American Society for Quality 301-975-2036

- Sarena will follow-up with Dr. Mary Richardson at the University of Washington (JoEllen suggested her story-telling approach to disability assessment as one that CCPH might want to learn from and use)
- Sarena will follow-up with Roz Lasker re: her study of partnership functioning, and with Campus Compact re: their assessment of campus civic engagement. Both are potential models and resources for us to use.

## POLICY AND ADVOCACY

### **Topic: Policy and Advocacy – Part One – What’s Legal**

**Discussion:** Tom O’Toole, chair of the advocacy and policy committee, led a discussion around two central questions: (1) what is lobbying and what isn’t? and (2) what can we legally do or not do as a 501c3 nonprofit organization? Points made during the discussion:

- Lobbying relates to influencing the outcome of a particular piece of legislation
- It is important to make the distinction between influencing legislation (i.e., lobbying) and influencing administrative procedures and policies or regulations (i.e., this is not lobbying). In other words, there are important ways to make change without direct lobbying
- When a Congressional committee requests an organization to provide testimony on an issue or particular piece of legislation, this is not considered to be lobbying. It is considered to be lobbying if the organization asks to testify on a particular piece of legislation.
- We can educate on the pro’s and con’s of an issue or piece of legislation without influencing it
- It is important to be clear on how much of our budget and from what sources we pay for policy and advocacy-related activities. Since most of our funds come from restricted grants,
- CCPH’s strengths lie in our ability to network and facilitate training and technical assistance. These strengths will help us develop relationships that can ultimately lead to policy change. We would be well served by empowering our members to be effective change agents.
- The paper we commissioned for the conference presented a set of recommendations for CCPH’s role in this arena, i.e., hiring a lobbyist, drafting position papers, serving as an information resource, providing resources to train CCPH members in advocacy skills.

**Action:** The board agreed to the following:

- Whatever advocacy and policy activities we undertake, we commit to doing our homework – i.e., conducting a source/use analysis for our budget, being careful how we word things in print.
- Our advocacy and policy focus will not be limited to the federal level, but will also include states, funding agencies, institutions, and so forth.

### **Topic: Policy and Advocacy – Part Two – Our Priority Issues and Our Role**

**Discussion:** A number of comments were made on Handout #6 – suggestions for improvement have been incorporated into a revised document. The following points were made during the discussion:

- Our advocacy and policy agenda needs to support and be consistent with our strategic plan
- There is role for CCPH in educating our members about policy issues and advocacy skills.
- More of our members are using the principles of partnership and putting them into action. Endorsing the principles is not enough – they need to be acted upon. Similarly, mission statements are important but relatively meaningless if they are only words and not acted upon. We might want to “raise the bar” and advocate more strongly that the principles be adopted and followed. We may even want to get involved in evaluating and certifying that partnerships are principle-centered (i.e., a certification process).
- The community is not and should not be a passive partner with the campus; the community is a powerful entity. The community needs to be pro-active.
- We need to make sure that we don’t become a single issue organization.
- We need to pursue short term and long term approaches for policy change.
- We need to have conversations with other organizations to see what policy issues they are working on and how we can collaborate around positions we share.

- There is a tension between national initiatives (i.e., Healthy People 2010, the 100% access campaign) and what we can achieve and measure at the local level. Most change occurs at the local level.
- There are secondary benefits and liabilities to getting involved in advocacy – taking a strong stand can enhance our visibility and profile beyond CCPH, but in the process we might risk alienating groups of members and key stakeholders.
- CCPH can develop tools that universities can use to evaluate faculty involved in community scholarship. We can teach faculty how to document their service-learning activities, and teach institutions how to appreciate them. This is also an issue for community agencies, which do not typically include engaging in partnerships as part of one’s job description. (This is actually a CCPH project already underway).

**Action:** The board synthesized the positions listed in Handout #6 into 6 positions and then voted on their top three priorities for CCPH action.

<u># of votes</u>	<u>Position</u>
9	Communities, campuses and community-campus partnerships should adopt and implement the principles of partnership
8	Funding agencies should provide funding for partnership planning and infrastructure
6	Campuses should change promotion and tenure processes/policies to support faculty involved in community-campus partnerships; agencies should change their employment processes/policies to support staff involved in community-campus partnership
6	Funding agencies should incorporate the principles of partnership into their funding decisions
2	Accrediting agencies should require evidence of community participation in decision making roles (i.e., membership on admissions and curriculum committees) for accreditation
1	Accrediting agencies should require service-learning for accreditation

Other actions:

- We will explore all advocacy and policy options *short of* lobbying.
- The advocacy and policy committee will draft these priority actions into a position paper that the board will discuss during the January board meeting. The position paper should be a policy agenda for the community-campus partnerships movement, and conclude with the specific pieces that CCPH can take on. The position paper will address such questions and issues as:
  - What is CCPH policy? What do we stand for?
  - What specific advocacy steps are required? What are the “pressure points” for change? These should be prioritized.
  - What are the education and training implications for our members?
  - What specific advocacy steps, roles in education and training, should CCPH take on?

**OUR STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Topic: Strategic Plan – Current and emerging programs**

**Discussion:** Sarena distributed and discussed handout #4, “current and emerging CCPH programs: linking to our strategic plan.” Board members posed the following questions and comments:

- How do we measure the overall success of our programs in relation to our strategic plan objectives?
- Staff is responsible for managing outputs (making sure that what we’re doing, we’re doing right) – the Board is responsible for measuring outcomes. What benchmarks are we measuring ourselves against?

**Actions:**

- The Mission Effectiveness Committee will review these questions and issues as part of its scope of work.
- Updates of this handout will be distributed at each board meeting.

## MARKETING

### **Topic: Marketing**

**Discussion:** The board continued the discussion of marketing that started at the last board meeting. The discussion centered around the questions: Who are we trying to communicate to? What are our goals? What should marketing accomplish? The group generated these answers and ideas:

- Have people understand our mission and what we do
- Recruit new members
- Attract funding
- Ensure brand recognition of our name and logo
- Ensure influence in the policy arena
- Retain members – customer loyalty
- Inspire our membership and prospective members
- Have others view us as a premier resource and leader in community-campus partnerships
- Get more people to buy our stuff, come to our programs, consume our programs and products

Other comments:

- Our message needs to be short and to the point
- If we're fostering and leading a movement, people need to be involved. Which people and organizations renew their membership and become involved?
- We need to get past our founders to demonstrate our depth and breadth as an organization.

### **Action:**

- The executive committee will convene an "ad hoc marketing committee"
- Sarena will review Malcolm Gladwell's book on "creating sticky messages" (The Tipping Point, Harvard Business School)

## FINANCIAL PLANNING AND FUNDRAISING

### **Topic: Audit**

**Discussion:** CCPH has just had our first audit. The audit came out "clean" with no problems or issues raised by the auditor.

**Action:** The board unanimously accepted the audit report. Hilda Heady made the motion and JoEllen Koerner seconded it.

### **Topic: CCPH's 2000 budget and year-to-date financial statements**

**Discussion:** Douglas Simmons presented a proposed revised year 2000 budget (as per our fiscal policy of revising the budget "as we go" throughout the year) and year-to-date financial statements. The following points were made in the discussion:

- We need to be more deliberate about and focused on creating an operative reserve

### **Action:**

- The board unanimously approved the proposed revised 2000 budget and year-to-date financial statements. Hilda Heady made the motion and Terri Kluzik seconded it.
- The financial planning committee will continue working to improve the presentation of financial information, including making a clearer distinction between restricted and unrestricted carryover funds, restricted and unrestricted new funds, and funds in reserve.
- The financial planning committee will present a proposed 2001 budget at the January board meeting.

### **Topic: Raising unrestricted funds.**

**Discussion:** Douglas Simmons led a discussion on strategies for raising unrestricted funds. He and the board generated these ideas:

- There are promising opportunities to produce more revenue at the conference, including: approaching funding agencies in the city/state/region of the conference, charging separate registration fee for pre-courses, advertising in the program, reminders about renewing membership.
- There are promising opportunities for funding agencies such as HRSA, Dyson Foundation, etc. to underwrite technical assistance products.
- We might consider the formation of affiliates, chapters and corporate members as strategies for boosting membership and unrestricted funding.
- Board members need to fulfill their financial commitment to CCPH. This is an obligation of board membership.
- We could do a better job of marketing the CCPH Mentor Network.
- We should explore the revenue-generating potential of E-learning strategies, such as an interactive
- We should explore the revenue-generating potential of a “community-campus partnership certification program”

Although membership in CCPH is not primarily viewed as a source of revenue, it does contribute to our unrestricted revenue base. The board generated these ideas about membership recruitment and retention:

- We need to do a better job of tracking board members' membership recruitment and retention outcomes. If you mark your initials on the membership brochure, staff can more easily track recruitment successes.
- Board members can host receptions and membership meetings, which can serve to recruit new members to CCPH. For example, Gretchen is planning a CCPH reception at the Massachusetts Healthy Communities conference.
- Board members can contact current members, past members and prospective members in their state or region to encourage them to join and become active in CCPH.

**Action:**

- The financial planning committee will incorporate the above suggestions into its discussions. The committee will take the lead in reminding board members to renew their membership and make their financial contribution to CCPH.
- Board members will contact current and former members in their state to encourage their continued support and involvement in CCPH. When board members recruit new members, they will mark their initials on the form so that staff can track their recruitment successes.
- Staff will regularly send board members CCPH brochures and letterhead for their member recruitment efforts.
- Staff will work more aggressively to generate unrestricted revenue associated with the annual conference.
- Staff will revise the travel reimbursement form to clarify how travelers can donate their reimbursement to CCPH. The revised form will be emailed out to board member.
- Sarena will follow-up with JoEllen Koerner on the e-learning strategies and potential fundraising from internet companies.

## MEMBERSHIP

### Topic: Membership policy

**Discussion:** Gretchen presented the membership operating principles as proposed membership policy for the board's consideration. The following issues were raised in the discussion:

- What is the meaning of the proposed policy's phrase "diversity" - does it encompass diversity in terms of socioeconomic status, culture and ethnicity?
- How do community members (as distinguished from staff leaders of community-based organizations that serve community members) access CCPH? Does CCPH intend to be inclusive of community members as well as individuals who work for universities and community-based organizations?

### Action:

- The Membership Committee will refine and clarify the membership policy in response to the issues raised above.
- The board will discuss these issues at a subsequent board meeting.

## BOARD DEVELOPMENT

### Topic: Board leadership

**Discussion:** Monte Roulier and Renee Bayer led a discussion of board leadership. In January, the board will need to elect a new chair-elect and secretary/treasurer, and consider renewing the terms of board members Elmer Freeman, Hilda Heady, Gretchen Kinder, Terri Kluzik and Cheryl Maurana (to take effect in May 2001). The board development committee raised the question of whether we want to recruit 2-3 new board members to begin terms in May 2001. Among the points made about this included:

- If we recruit new board members to start next spring, this will essentially give us three "cohorts" of board members and minimize the impact of several board members in a cohort rotating off the board all at once.
- There is probably a minimum number of new board members – 2 or 3 – to make the time and effort in recruiting worthwhile.

**Action:** The board development committee will review the board member evaluations submitted by board members whose terms are expiring next year, and will recommend whether terms should be renewed. The committee will also take this information into account in making a recommendation about whether or not to initiate another round of board recruitment.

### Topic: Reflection on the board meeting

Discussion: Board members and staff shared their thoughts on what worked well and could have been improved during the board meeting. They also shared an action to undertake upon their return home.

#### *What worked well*

- The time frame for the meeting – we accomplished a lot in a reasonable time frame
- The policy and advocacy discussion – the handout was helpful, we ended the conversation with a set of priorities
- The training and discussion of organizational assessment and improvement
- The opportunity to network with local leaders and CCPH members
- Having outside networking opportunity, and combining work and fun
- The pre-meeting packet was smaller and more manageable
- The strategic planning document is dense but easy to follow
- We came well prepared
- We stayed on task and didn't get sidetracked
- We demonstrated the strength of our diversity

*What could have been improved*

- Sometimes we repeat ourselves; we could be more targeted in the questions we address
- It would have been helpful to have biosketches for the guests we will meet, a discussion beforehand of how best to use the time we have with guests (i.e., what's the purpose?) and a reflective discussion afterwards to debrief about what we learned and any next steps needed.
- We could have prepared Sherril and Marc more for their roles in the meeting, and involve them earlier in the planning of the agenda.
- Next time, let's not have a European style hotel with bathrooms down the hall!

*Action to undertake upon returning home:*

- Hilda offered to host the fall workshop in West Virginia (including a white lightening tasting!)
- Facilitate board member involvement through reminder phone calls, faxes and emails; board section on website.
- Remind others of our mission
- Be open and receptive
- Committee responsibilities
- Create ways to raise unrestricted dollars; make a personal financial commitments and challenge all board members to do the same
- To be more available for board-related work
- Challenge us to achieve deeper levels of human understanding

<b>AGENDA FOR NEXT BOARD MEETING</b>
--------------------------------------

**Topic: Agenda items for January 2001 board meeting**

**Discussion:** The next board meeting is January 12-14, 2001 in Houston, TX. Douglas Simmons will be hosting the board meeting and working with staff to plan social, networking and professional development activities for the board. The group generated these proposed agenda items:

- Membership policy
- Mission Effectiveness Committee report on proposed plan for organizational assessment and improvement
- Advocacy and Policy Committee report on policy agenda and "white paper"
- Marketing plan
- Report on membership recruitment, retention and involvement
- A training on the Carver model of policy governance
- CEO evaluation
- Proposed 2001 budget
- Among the colleagues we should invite to join us for part of the meeting: the Partners in Caring and Community team (our Helene Fuld-funded project) from Nagoches, Rice University, UT-Houston Health Sciences Center, community partners.

**Action:**

- The executive committee will develop the January board meeting agenda.
- Sarena will contact Hilda regarding her offer to host the fall 2001 board retreat.