

**Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
Board Meeting Minutes
October 6, 2004 ~ Atlanta, GA**

Present: Cee Barnes-Boyd, Renee Bayer, Diane Downing, Elmer Freeman, Bobby Gottlieb, Ella Greene-Moton, Daniel Korin, Dennis Magill, Richard Redman, Monte Roulier & Douglas Simmons

Not Present: Chris Atchison, Kaytura Felix-Aaron & Terri Kluzik

Staff: Sarena Seifer

DISCUSSION OF ENDS

Topic: Our ends: at what cost?

Discussion: The board discussed our ends in terms of “what good, for whom, *at what cost?*” Board members shared reflections on the readings:

- “Cost” does not just mean absolute dollars. It also means opportunity costs.
- Thinking about the cost of our ends made me look at the budget differently. I concluded that the budget is being spent reasonably to get to our ends.
- “What if” scenarios are important to these discussions – to help provide a framework for setting priorities.
- It’s becoming clear what’s the board’s job and staff’s job.
- We should devote a chunk of time to these discussions at every board meeting.
- What’s the biggest bang for the buck? What is our unique contribution? How can we leverage resources to achieve change?

The board discussed the importance of constantly scanning the environment for progress being made toward our ends and potential threats and opportunities.

- What is the status of service-learning and community-based participatory research? What are the trends? Where do we want to weigh in?
- Our environmental scan needs to include trends in policy and funding.

The board discussed the role of CCPH as a leader and forward-thinking organization.

- We are seeking equitable community-campus partnerships that balance power and resources.
- We need to continue to be up-front about our values and principles – these are overarching everything we do.
- We need to move people and challenge them.
- Keep the broader definition of health, pull other people to the table to do this.
- What kind of world do we want to create? For one thing, institutions of higher education engaging with communities in radically different ways.

The board also discussed how we have “drilled down” on ends statement #1, but not #2 and #3. Community-campus partnerships that improve the health of communities

1. Communities and higher educational institutions engage in community-campus Partnerships.
 - a. Resources are available to build and maintain community-campus partnerships

- b. Comprehensive knowledge is available about the nature and outcomes of community-campus partnerships.
 - c. Institutional, organizational and governmental policies support community-campus partnerships.
2. Health disparities are reduced in communities through community-campus partnerships.
3. The health workforce, broadly defined, is more diverse and community responsive through community-campus partnerships.

The board spent some time discussing ends statement #2 and what it means:

- We need to work to eliminate health disparities, not just reduce them
- Talking about health disparities is very value laden, necessarily involving discussions about racism and classism
- Many organizations are working to eliminate health disparities. Our niche is and should be community-academic partnerships as a change strategy. We need to link more with other organizations that are focused on eliminating health disparities.
- The ultimate beneficiaries of efforts to eliminate health disparities are the communities with health disparities.
- Not all of the partnerships that our members are pursuing are focused on eliminating health disparities, and that's okay. Our overall mission is to promote health through community-campus partnerships, and we define health broadly. We are not solely focused on health disparities. That said, to what extent should our work be focused on issue- or content-specific partnerships (i.e., community-campus partnerships that focus on health disparities, workforce diversity) vs. On community-campus partnerships more generally?

Actions: At the next board meeting, we will engage in discussion around these questions/topics:

- What do we mean by community – who constitutes the community?
- What do we mean by resources, knowledge and policies?
- What is our vision for CCPH's ends – what is the world we want to create?

DISCUSSION OF OWNERS

Topic: Connecting with our owners

Discussion: Board members made some observations about our owners:

- There is a moral ownership of CCPH – the board gives voice to those who are not present. We should be thinking of who we represent who are not here in the room.
- When we talk with our members and others involved in community-campus partnerships, we should ask: Who is the community? How is community defined in your partnership? How is your partnership transforming the community and the institution? What would it take to become a transformational partnership? What is limiting your partnership's ability to grow and thrive and be successful? What is accelerating its ability?
- When we talk with our members and others involved in community-campus partnerships, we should share information about the Carver policy governance model and how our board follows this model.
- At a future board meeting, the Center for Community Health Education, Research and Service could be a case study to illustrate key issues and challenges in developing and sustaining a community-campus partnership that is transformative.

- We need to be aware of different categories of our owners: partnerships, community-based organizations (board members, staff, volunteers), higher educational institutions (administrators, faculty students), policymakers, funders.
- Over the next year, we need to pick owner groups that we want to connect with. One suggestion was to have each board member convene a local group of community-campus partnerships for a discussion about developing and sustaining community-campus partnerships.
- We need to connect more with policymakers and funders. They are key to changing the power dynamic that exists between communities and higher educational institutions.

Actions:

- Chris, Kay, Renee, Ella and Richard volunteered to continue the discussion of owners by phone.
- At the next board meeting, we will prioritize which owners we want to connect with and how, and we will discuss the topic of “what do we mean by community – who constitutes the community?”

<p style="text-align: center;">BOARD GOVERNANCE</p>
--

Topic: Board recruitment

Discussion: The board reviewed when board member terms are expiring and the timeline/process for renewing terms. The discussion centered on whether to recruit additional board members for terms to begin at the September 2005 board meeting. The board currently has 14 members. Two board members, Terri and Elmer, have terms ending in 2005. Two board members, Diane and Ella, are eligible for a second three-year board term beginning in 2005 (both expressed their desire to remain on the board for a second three-year term). In 2006, Monte’s board term ends and three board members are eligible for a second three-year term: Kay, Daniel and Richard. Looking into the future, and taking into consideration the desire to have a board of 15 members, the board quickly agreed on the need to recruit new board members to begin their terms in September 2005. The board recruitment process will need to begin in 2005, with a call for applications. Individuals who applied for this last round of board recruitment should be invited to apply again, but the process should also be open to anyone who wishes to apply.

The board also discussed the need to revisit the priorities determined for the last round of board recruitment. Some board members felt we did not fulfill all of the priorities. For example, we had wanted to recruit board members from professions and disciplines not currently reflected on the board, such as pharmacy and optometry. We had also wanted to recruit more board members from community-based organizations. There was some discussion about how to make the application process more welcoming to community-based prospects, including making some changes to the application and having board members mentor colleagues and encourage them to apply. The National Community-Based Organization Network (NCBON) and the CDC’s National Community Committee (NCC) were both seen as groups with a focus on community-campus partnerships from which to recruit community-based board members.

Actions:

- The board unanimously agreed to recruit new board members to begin their terms at the September 2005 board meeting. Diane made the motion and Richard seconded it.
- Ella, who is involved in both NCBON and NCC, offered to encourage members to apply for the CCPH board.
- Sarena will draft a timeline and work plan for board recruitment, based on our approach in the past.
- At the next board meeting, we will make decisions about board recruitment priorities and process.

Topic: Strategic planning under policy governance

Discussion: The board discussed the definition and role of strategic planning under the policy governance model. A distinction was made between the board's focus on defining the organization's ends and connection with the owners, while the staff focus on determining the means and reporting on progress toward ends. For both to do their jobs well, there is a need for continuous scanning of the environment, identifying trends and issues that can affect CCPH's ends and our ability to achieve them.

Topic: Board's role in fundraising

Discussion: The board discussed the ideas and suggestions in the handout, including the idea of raising funds to support the linkage activities between the CCPH board and our owners. Having the board raise scholarship funds to help increase community participation in the organization was proposed, but at least one board member felt this was within the purview of the staff in terms of writing grants and raising funds for this purpose. Earned income strategies were raised as an important part of CCPH's fundraising.

Actions:

- The group identified at the last board meeting to help define the board's role in fundraising and make recommendations for operationalizing that role will meet by conference call and report back at the next board meeting. This group consists of Elmer, Bobbie, Ella, Diane, and Kay.
- Sarena will gather information about fundraising strategies pursued by other national organizations, to inform the board's discussion of this topic at the next board meeting.

Topic: Agenda items for future board meetings

Discussion: The board reaffirmed its earlier decision to have less frequent but longer board meetings, to be able to discuss issues in greater depth. The board generated a list of agenda items for the next board meeting, below.

- Monitoring reports
- Board recruitment process
- Board term renewals and election of new chair-elect
- Prioritizing which owners we want to connect with and how
- A discussion of our Ends and Owners around the topic of "what do we mean by community" – who constitutes the community?"
- A discussion of our Ends around the topic of "what do we mean by resources, knowledge, policies?"
- A discussion of the board's vision for CCPH's ends – what is the world we want to create?

Actions:

- Cee will provide information about the Bureau of Primary Health Care institute she mentioned during the meeting

Topic: Location of 2005 board meetings

Discussion: Dennis offered to host the September 2005 board meeting in Toronto.

Denver/Boulder was suggested as a possible location for the March 2005 board meeting, in part because of the weather that time of year and also the proximity of the Active Living By Design initiative.

Actions:

- The board unanimously agreed to have Dennis host the September 2005 board meeting in Toronto, Ontario Canada.
- Sarena will make a decision about the location of the next board meeting, based on willingness of a board member to host the meeting, the costs and other factors.
- Elmer, Douglas, Renee and Sarena will develop the agenda for the next board meeting.

- Board materials will be sent to board members at least one week before the meeting. Included will be questions to consider when reading through the material.

Topic: Reflection on the board meeting

Discussion: Board members shared their reflections on the board meeting:

- We are “trotting toward our ends.”
- We tend to look down and in more than we look up and out – but it’s still better than down and out!
- We are acting more and more like a board.
- We need to talk about what kind of world we should be creating.
- Our agenda is largely board driven.
- We need to talk about our vision of the organization.
- It will be helpful to define more precisely our ends and owners.
- We work well when there is a balance between the abstract and the concrete in our meetings.

<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY MONITORING</p>

Topic: Asset protection policy

Discussion: The board discussed the process and frequency of obtaining an external audit. The board felt that the responsibility of hiring the auditor could be delegated to the CEO and language be added to the executive limitations policies to this effect. An audit should be conducted annually. It would help if the auditor is familiar with policy governance and could specifically address and report on the extent to which we are adhering to those policies. The board also discussed whether staff are bonded. Staff do not have material access to cash or funding and are not bonded. However, our bookkeeper is bonded.

Actions:

- The board unanimously approved the asset protection policy monitoring report. Renee made the motion and Douglas seconded it.
- The board unanimously approved a change to the asset protection policy to reflect the board’s delegation of the hiring of an external auditor: “The CEO must not fail to receive, process or disburse funds under controls which are insufficient to meet the CEO-appointed auditor’s standards” and “The CEO shall not fail to appoint an auditor....” Monte made the motion and Richard seconded it.
- Sarena will move forward in securing an auditor for the 2004 tax year.

Topic: Compensation and benefits policy

Action: The board unanimously approved the compensation and benefits policy monitoring report. Renee made the motion and Dan seconded it.

Topic: Ends focus of grants and contracts

Actions:

- The board unanimously approved the ends focus of grants and contracts policy monitoring report. Ella made the motion and Richard seconded it.
- At the board’s suggestion, Sarena will add an additional core competency of legitimizing community-campus partnerships at the national level to the ends focus of grants and contracts policy monitoring report.
- The board unanimously approved taking out the last item in the policy because it was confusing to the board and the CEO: “Fund specific methods except when doing so for research purposes,

or when no better method is known, when the result to be achieved is knowledge about differential effectiveness of various methods.” Douglas made the motion and Cee seconded it.

Topic: Financial condition and activities policy

Topic: Financial planning and budgeting policy

Actions:

- The board unanimously approved the financial condition and activities policy monitoring report. Renee made the motion and Dan seconded it.
- The board unanimously approved the financial planning and budgeting policy monitoring report. Ella made the motion and Douglas seconded it.