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MEMBERS PRESENT  Annamarie Buller, David Byers (via phone), Juan Daniel Castro, Francine Gaston, Richard Stevens, Larry Titley, Renee Williams (via phone)

STAFF PRESENT  Zoe Post, Dennis Sturtevant

The meeting was convened at 8:06 AM by Ms. Buller.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES  Minutes of the Dwelling Place Executive Committee meeting of January 8, 2019 were approved by motion of Larry Titley, supported by Rick Stevens and carried unanimously.

NEIGHBORWORKS 2018 OHTS PERFORMANCE REPORT  After NeighborWorks' triennial review, Dwelling Place again received an exemplary (highest possible) rating. As the review is based heavily on production and Dwelling Place will see the completion of several projects in 2019, next year's numbers are expected to be even better than this year.

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION VOLUNTEER DAY  Amy Henderson, the volunteer coordinator, and other employees are organizing opportunities for staff and Board members to volunteer in the community. Considerations over what and how many projects to do, in what area of Grand Rapids to do them, and whether or not to hold the event(s) on a weekend or commit company time during the week are all currently part of the planning process.

UPDATES  Heartside White Paper update  The Heartside Neighborhood White Paper convenings have been growing in impact, and discussions with major Grand Rapids players have yielded the identification of barriers to economic development and behavioral health on Division Ave. Plans to gather specific groups—local business leaders, for example—to address each of these areas are underway. These conversations have already connected many different sectors and led to opportunities for increased collaboration around existing initiatives including an upcoming meeting to discuss a potential FUSE project led by Mercedes Brown of the Corporation for Supportive Housing. A potential Sober Housing initiative is also being considered.

Project Updates  Harrison Park: about 25% complete; completion date around October 2020. Pine Avenue: asbestos removal is complete and building will soon be demolished; slated to be completed November of 2020. Ferguson: renovation starts in September; Relocation of current residents will be one of the most significant challenges in this initiative because of the large number who will need to be relocated and the limited availability of temporary housing options in the community. Plaza Roosevelt: in design planning stage with community beneficiaries group; hoping to break ground in September. St. James: finished and completely leased up. Garfield Lofts: about 40% complete and set to finish by the end of 2020.
OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Sturtevant shared the new Board Application from the Governance Sub-committee; the Committee decided to distribute the document to all Board members for their review and include the edited version in the April Board packet.

Mr. Sturtevant handed out and explained to the Committee the 2019 business plan document sent in to NeighborWorks.

ADJOURNMENT

The Executive Committee entered closed session at 9:20 AM to discuss the CEO evaluation.
MEMBERS PRESENT: Annamarie Buller, Juan Daniel Castro, Holly Jacoby (via phone), Larry Titley

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Byers, Rick Stevens, LaTarro Traylor

STAFF & GUESTS PRESENT: Zoe Post, Dennis Sturtevant

The meeting was convened at 9:04 AM by Juan Daniel Castro.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER MINUTES: Minutes of the Governance Sub-committee meeting of January 15, 2019 were approved by motion of Larry Titley, supported by Holly Jacoby and carried unanimously.

OTHER ISSUES:

**Board assessments**
After some discussion, the Sub-committee recommended to the Executive Committee that a collective Board assessment using materials from Board Source be conducted annually. Individual assessments will also be performed once a year; Board members will be expected to reach 75% of the requirements outlined in the Board Source self-assessment tool.

**Board application and background checks**
Sub-committee members suggested placing the signature line at the bottom of the Board Application Form, along with some other minor edits.

**Equity and inclusion initiatives**
The Sub-committee discussed equity and inclusion initiatives that would best use the $10,000 that Dwelling Place received from completing its Excellence in Governance program. With ideas ranging from team-building activities to provision of iPads, the Sub-committee determined that further research into the Board's variety of needs is required. The Sub-committee will review past Board meeting assessments and evaluate the mentorship program to determine where equity and inclusion gaps are and how they could be addressed.

The Sub-committee recommended the Board Source document, "Board Meeting Assessment" for use at future Board meetings.

**Other Board tasks to consider in 2019**
Mr. Sturtevant distributed a list of Board tasks to complete in 2019, including 3 major tasks and 11 additional tasks compiled from suggestions given during various meetings in the past year. The Sub-committee was particularly interested in property tours for Board members, entertaining the possibility of a future bus trip to familiarize Board members with each other and with the ongoing work at Dwelling Place.

**Board recruitment workplan review**
The Sub-committee reviewed the recruitment strategy questions sent by Ms. Julie Burmania, offering the following feedback to be synthesized into an outline of a Board recruitment work plan:
Defining the Brand:
- Benefits of Dwelling Place housing: location, cost, diversity, inclusion
- Resident perceptions of Dwelling Place: great low-income housing, but long waiting lists and few opportunities for “the missing middle”
- Contributor perceptions: what Dwelling Place does, it does well
- Desired perceptions: a full, broad understanding of the cumulative impact Dwelling Place has across West Michigan

Defining Strategy:
- Outreach strategies: utilizing Board member networks to connect with candidates that fit recruitment priorities
  - Organizational outreach to the Latino Community Coalition, West Michigan Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Latinas Network of West Michigan, Inforum Michigan, YWCA, GROW, Progressive Women’s Alliance
  - Working with Community Building & Engagement staff to identify resident leaders
  - Personal connections with CEOs and other business leaders

Community Outreach Strategy:
- Board member motivations: provide safe, dignified housing so people in the community can improve many aspects of their lives
- Overlooked target groups: non-CEO officers of major companies, young adults, LGBTQ community

Ms. Post will contact Sub-committee members who were absent from the meeting for further feedback to be given to Ms. Burmania.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Governance Sub-committee meeting was adjourned at 10:33 AM by Juan Daniel Castro.
MEMBERS PRESENT  Kyle Irwin, Richard Stevens

MEMBERS ABSENT Annamarie Buller, Leah Carpenter, Thomas Carpenter, Juan Daniel Castro, LaTarro Traylor, Tommie Wallace

STAFF/GUESTS PRESENT Kim Cross, Zoe Post, Jenn Schaub, LaTrisha Sosebee, Dennis Sturtevant

The meeting was convened at 10:04 AM by Rick Stevens.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES Minutes of the Dwelling Place Marketing & Development Committee meeting of January 29, 2019 were approved by motion of Rick Stevens and carried unanimously.

REVIEW OF DONATIONS AND TRACKING GRAPHS Ms. Post explained the donation tracking system used for 2018 and how categorizing funding sources will differ slightly in the 2019 system. The Committee reviewed 2018 year-end numbers including breakdown graphics, as well as a sample 2019 year-to-date dashboard; the former will be included in the Board of Directors packet, the latter in future Committee meetings.

BRANDING PLAN UPDATE AND REVIEW Swag Ms. Sosebee presented several items with the new Dwelling Place logo: canvas bags, distributed at the Neighbor Knowledge Exchange; T-shirts, given out to Dwelling Place Board and staff members; and scarves, worn by volunteers during community events. Additional items like mugs, hats, and jackets will be considered as part of the ongoing branding initiative.

Thank you cards Thank you cards have been updated with three new photos, a longer version to fit in a standard letter envelope, and classic, embossed cards for formal correspondence. The Committee discussed the need to begin to standardize branding for all aspects of Dwelling Place.

Website Due to go live by the end of March, the website is still undergoing evaluation; the most significant challenge is clarifying leasing information and language. Though Scott Allen Associates has provided a cohesive branding concept, some concerns over yet incomplete projects will be addressed in a meeting with John Terpstra regarding the contract with Dwelling Place.

2019 ANNUAL EVENT/FUNDRAISER Ms. Schaub distributed a comprehensive list of past event donor information to be used as a starting point for reaching out to potential sponsors for 2019 events. Ms. Irwin, Mr. Larry Titley, and CB&E staff will have a separate meeting to elaborate on and strengthen this list.

Committee members discussed characteristics of successful events and donor outreach, and hope to have an event date by the next meeting.
**2019 RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**  Staff will reassess the Resource Development Plan after considering potential sponsors and events. Donor tracking will be updated to reflect these goals.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**  The next Marketing & Development Committee meeting is scheduled for March 26, 2019.

**ADJOURNMENT**  The Marketing & Development Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:35 PM by Rick Stevens.
MEMBERS PRESENT  Juan Daniel Castro, Mike DeVries, Rich Kogelschatz, Mike McDaniels (via video conference), Pete VanderVeen  

MEMBERS ABSENT  George Larimore  

STAFF & GUESTS PRESENT  Chris Bennett, Kim Cross, Rebecca Long, Zoe Post, Steve Recker, Dennis Sturtevant, Stephen Wooden  

Alan Minert, Luanne Stanley-Hook, Stephen Steggerda (First United Methodist Church of Holland)  
Peter Boogaart, Bob Jordan, Susanne Jordan (Hope Christian Reformed Church)  
Ryan Kilpatrick (Ottawa Housing Next)  

The meeting was convened at 11:33 AM by Mr. Kogelschatz.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES  Minutes of the Dwelling Place RED & Asset Management Committee meeting of February 11, 2019 were approved by motion of Pete VanderVeen, supported by Mike McDaniels and carried unanimously.

24TH AND WAVERLY PROPOSAL  Mr. Kilpatrick introduced a 220-260-unit, mixed-income, multi-story housing development to be constructed at a Holland site currently owned by Lumir LLC and situated between a major employer, a local mission, and a Meijer store. Housing Next is in the acquisition phase of the project and looking for a LIHTC-savvy partner that can co-develop a site plan and carry it to completion. The development would likely be a joint venture project, Dwelling Place offering insight as to how much affordability could be included in the project while maintaining financial viability.

The Committee determined that the project fits Dwelling Place's mission and reached consensus to join Housing Next in continuing site development by motion of Mike DeVries, supported by Rich Kogelschatz, and carried unanimously.

DOWNTOWN HOLLAND DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL  Mr. Bennett met with City of Holland staff, who voiced support for an affordable housing development on property located near First United Methodist Church and Hope Christian Reformed Church. Representatives from the churches expressed the desire for at least part of the space to be designed for the long-term care of adults with developmental disabilities. The venture could require the acquisition of nearby property as well as unique funding sources—perhaps the HUD 811 voucher program—to make the project viable. Next steps include discussing the workability of the site with an architect and seeking to buy the properties in question. The Committee voted to move forward with this project by motion of Juan Daniel Castro, supported by Pete VanderVeen, and carried unanimously.
1438 LLC OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE PROPOSAL

Dwelling Place was approached with a joint venture opportunity with 1438 LLC: a small, mixed-use building located at 1438 S Division. Dwelling Place would own 90% of and complete a LIHTC application for the residential condo space; 1438 would own the commercial space and work jointly on community engagement. The Committee moved to propose an ideal ownership structure of 100% ownership to 1438 LLC by motion of Pete VanderVeen, supported by Juan Daniel Castro, and carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Community Land Trust
Mr. Sturtevant and Stephen Wooden met with James Jones, an expert on limited equity co-ops, and with ICCF, which has already formed its land trust entity, to gain insight on starting a CLT venture in the near future.

Sober Housing Initiative
Genesis NPHC is interested in a new sober housing initiative that would focus primarily on court-ordered housing for people with opiate abuse disorder. Dwelling Place may partner with Genesis depending on the site and if it fits Dwelling Place’s mission.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 13:11 PM by Mr. Kogelschatz.
March 21, 2019

Dennis Sturtevant
Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation
101 Sheldon SE Suite 2
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

RE: FY 2019 ROUND 1 NONBINDING GRANT AWARD LETTER

Dear Dennis,

Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation has been recommended to receive the grant funds listed below from Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, dba NeighborWorks America. These grants are made with federal funds appropriated through Public Law 116-6, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$286,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Until First Use</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Unrestricted** funds include the following awards:

- FY 2019 Round 1 Expendable $150,000.00
- FY 2019 Round 1 Capital (*for organizations rated Exemplary*) $125,000.00
- Community Impact Measurement $7,000.00
- Community Leadership Institute Action Plan $4,000.00

The **Restricted Until First Use** funds includes the following award:

- FY 2019 Round 1 Capital (*For organizations rated Strong, Good, Satisfactory, Serious, or Vulnerable*) $0.00

Please see definitions at the end of this letter.

The FY 2019 Round I Expendable awards are provided to support your organization’s mission. Due to the increase in the final FY 2019 appropriation from Congress, NeighborWorks America increased the Round I Expendable awards as compared to the initial formula amounts published last fall. Specifically, the final formula used ‘base’ amounts that were increased by $15,000 for all network members.

FY 2019 Round 1 Capital funds are provided to support the organization’s real estate development and lending activities. In FY 2019, NeighborWorks America again used a formulaic approach for capital awards using investment information reported by network organizations.

Due to the increase in the appropriation from Congress, NeighborWorks returned the capital bin awards to the amounts used in FY2018, resulting in a $5,000 increase for your organization compared to the initial bin award amounts published in the fall.
For FY 2020, NeighborWorks America plans to use a similar formula structure to the one used in FY 2019, which may not include any transition adjustments. Actual award amounts may vary based on a number of factors including the reported production of network organizations and NeighborWorks America’s FY 2020 federal appropriation.

More detailed information about the FY 2019 Round I Expendable and Capital grant formulas can be found in the Round 1 Expendable and Capital Grant instructions on the Member Site.

Please note that this is a non-binding announcement of these grant award recommendations which will become binding subject to the following contingencies, at which point funds will be disbursed:

- NeighborWorks America’s receipt of funds from the U.S. Department of Treasury.

- Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation meets NeighborWorks America’s compliance requirements for receiving grants, including but not limited to maintaining organizational health standards, timely submission of audit package, reporting, and compliance with the network charter agreement.

- Organizations with a Vulnerable health rating may be deemed ineligible to receive grants due to not maintaining organizational health standards, unless sufficient progress is made against the items noted in the organization’s health assessment.

- Issuance of an Investment and Grant Funds Letter that creates a binding obligation between Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation and NeighborWorks America.

The specific terms, allowable purposes and grant award amounts will be conveyed in the Investment and Grant Funds Letter which will be uploaded into Grants Portal upon disbursement. Therefore, it is understood that these grant funds will not be recognized on the organization’s financial statements until the above stipulated conditions have been fulfilled.

Your organization’s Relationship Manager is available to answer any questions you might have about these or other resources available through NeighborWorks America.

Thank you for applying to this grant round, for your continued contributions to the NeighborWorks Network, and the great being work done by Dwelling Place of Grand Rapids Nonprofit Housing Corporation,

Sincerely,

John Santner. Vice President, Midwest Region
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, dba NeighborWorks America

cc: Annamarie Buller, Board President
    Kathryn M. Watts, Senior Vice President Field Operations
    Andre Butler, Relationship Manager
DEFINITIONS

“Unrestricted Grant Funds” are unrestricted in nature and used to further the NeighborWorks Organization mission, including non-capitalizable expenses. Under FASB ASU 2016-14, these funds are considered net assets without donor restriction. Previously, the NeighborWorks America Investment and Grant Agreement referred to these funds as “Expendable Grant Funds.”

“Restricted Until First Use” refers to grant funds that are restricted until used in accordance with an eligible purpose outlined at Section III. These funds are not to be used for non-capitalizable purposes such as paying the day-to-day expenses of the NeighborWorks Organization. Under FASB ASU 2016-14, these funds are considered net assets with donor restrictions, subject to expenditure for a specified purpose (capitalizable real estate or lending activities).

Exemplary rated organizations receive capital funding as Unrestricted. For organizations rated Strong, Good, Satisfactory, Serious, or Vulnerable, capital funding is received as Restricted Until First Use.

Source: Investment and Grant Agreement, 2017
Excellence in Governance - Class of 2018
End of Program Survey
October 2018
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Background and Methodology

Fifteen organizations participated in the fourth round of the NeighborWorks® America Excellence in Governance Program in 2017 and 2018. Leadership teams of 4-5 board members and the chief executive officer from NeighborWorks and other community housing organizations attended three training sessions and worked with a coach to implement changes in board governance practices. The overall goal of the program is to help responsible boards become exceptional boards using the Excellence in Governance principles based on BoardSource’s Twelve Principles of Governance that Power Exceptional Boards.

Enquire queried leadership team, including chief executive officers, and board members about the experience to:

- Document changes in board governance practices and behaviors;
- Identify changes in board and organizational performance; and
- Capture perceptions of the value of the program for participating boards and gather suggestions for improvements.

A web survey was conducted in August – September 2018. Three reminder email invitations were sent to non-respondents; additional follow-up further increased the response rate, which was 90% for leadership teams and 57% for other board members.

This report aggregates the data from all groups to present an overview of the experience. Comparisons to data from end of program surveys for previous cohorts, also completed by Enquire, are included as appropriate. Numbers are used to refer to groups in some tables, but the number assigned to each group may vary throughout the report to protect anonymity. Quotations from survey respondents appear in italics.
Summary of Findings

EIG program experience continues to exceed participants’ expectations

Seventy-four percent of team participants describe the experience as exceeding their expectations. Respondents report being surprised by the high quality of the training, the amount of materials and support, what the team was able to accomplish during the 18-month program, and the extent of personal and professional growth, among other things.

2018 – Leadership Team (n=76)

- Exceeded: 74.0%
- Met: 25.0%
- Almost met: 0.0%
- Not met: 1.0%

2012-2018 Trend – Percent ‘Exceeded Expectations’

- 2012: 51%
- 2014: 70%
- 2016: 51%
- 2018: 74%
Summary of Findings

Highlights

• Coaching was rated very high, and generally a good fit for the team.
• Training was also high quality – the third training was especially valuable.
• The peer learning experience at the third training received accolades.
• Major takeaways for most groups were a much better understanding of the role of the board, greater knowledge of the organization and how to work with staff, and what a board can do to perform at a level and better support the mission.
• Groups focused on process improvement and efficiency that leads to greater board effectiveness. There were fewer examples of strategies, discussions, or decisions by the board that illustrate changes in role or approach compared to previous cohorts.
• Across all boards, the was greater emphasis on engagement, diversity and strategic recruiting.
• Sustainability will be achieved through changes in by-laws and processes, with some mention of the strategic role of EIG team members going forward, and little mention of accountability.
• Teams believe EIG has become engrained in the Board culture, board members are not as certain.
• Most groups need to continue to ‘bring the board along.’ There are gaps in perceptions of the impact of EIG between Boards and Leadership teams, which had been the pattern with other cohorts.
• Most groups are in a positive position to move forward, but will need a strong internal EIG champion to continue the momentum.
Summary of Findings

Majority of leadership team participants rate value as “Exceptional”

People determine ‘value’ as the difference between what you receive from something minus the investment.

Leadership team members invested more in the EIG program compared to board members, including travel and training time, reading and studying materials, and preparing for and completing the group work.

Still, teams are more likely to rate the overall value as ‘exceptional’ compared to other board members.

For leadership teams, the experience is much more intense compared to board members, with value coming from many elements, including personal interactions with other participants, both within and across teams. Leadership team members also are more likely to describe how the experience impacted them on a personal level.
Summary of Findings

Boards focus on practices relating to diversity, inclusion, recruiting and board engagement

Table 1. Summary of practices implemented during EIG (n=13*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Implemented or improved during EIG</th>
<th>Plan to implement next 12 mos.</th>
<th>Already in place before EIG</th>
<th>No plans to implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement and inclusion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic recruiting led by board</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/inclusion in recruiting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee work plans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission moments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent agenda</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular training and education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance dashboard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED succession plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial dashboard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member term limits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term limits - officers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*series of questions answered by CEOs - 13 participated

Engagement and diversity and inclusion in both recruiting and board meeting and activities topped the list of practices that board implemented or improved.

Boards also revised committee structures and implemented work plans; incorporated ‘mission moments’ into board meetings; and developed structures, practices and behaviors to improve accountability for board members, the CEO, and staff.
Summary of Findings

Majority say board performance has changed –
“we have stopped feeling like a rubber stamp board”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership Team % agree</th>
<th>Board members % agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board is more effective governing body</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board culture has changed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important governing practices are firmly entrenched</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board has made decisions that might not have been made</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior to EIG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both leadership team and other board members agree that the board is more effective as a governing body, that culture has changed and important governing practices are firmly entrenched. However, more leadership team members agree about changes in culture and governing effectiveness compared to other board members, and the intensity of agreement is stronger.

Interesting, both groups (LT and Board members) agree equally that practices are firmly entrenched, which could be because changes to agendas, committee structure and by-laws are apparent and easier to measure. For some boards, it also may be too early to recognize more subtle changes in culture and effectiveness.
Summary of Findings

Groups differ in ratings on key questions about changes in practice and performance

We used 4 survey questions to get a better sense of where groups are today in terms of implementing and sustaining new governance practices and behaviors:

- Governance practices are firmly entrenched
- Board culture has changed
- Board is a more effective governing body
- Board has made decisions it might not have made before EIG

We grouped organizations into three categories:

- Those with higher than average scores on three or more of these questions (there are 8)
- Those with much lower than average scores on three or more questions (there are 3)
- The ‘average’ group – in the middle (there are 4)

Looking at the ‘below average’ groups:

- Two of the three groups rated both the coaching and training lower than the average.
- LT members from one of the organizations described the program as a very “heavy lift” for team members because of the extent of work outside the trainings and a prior commitment to a major organizational project.
- Another team suffered from a lack of accountability and participation by some team members. Board members did not understand the rationale for some of the changes and may not have the capacity to become a governing board at this point. LT members may not have the heft to continue to pursue the necessary changes.
- The third group was more difficult to understand. The LT members were split on the questions that we examined; one issue might be that some members see EIG as being about process efficiency rather than capacity building and shared governance.
Teams highlight training, coaching and peer learning as ‘very helpful’ – coaching improves

- Seventy-nine percent of LT members said the training was “very helpful.”
- Seventy-six percent of LT participants rated the coaching “very helpful” – an increase of 14% over 2016.
- Peer breakout sessions during the trainings (2018 only) were rated the most helpful of the peer learning components; respondents called out these sessions in several of the open-ended comments.

Peer to peer was awesome in our last training. It gave us an opportunity to get learn more about what other boards are doing to handle different issues.

Peer to peer - Excellent strategy. Encourage even more interaction among peers.

Our coach was a great match for our team - a good mix of shared responsibility and really got to know us well enough to be most helpful in connections to relevant resources for our work.

*not rated in 2016
Summary of Findings

Sustainability Strategies

Boards will use a variety of strategies to sustain EIG changes

- Structure (committees, agenda, bylaws)
- Recruiting and training new board members
- Governance committee, EIG team as officers
- Ongoing EIG training (formal)
- Measure and evaluate (ex. strategic plan goals, dashboards)
- EIG conversations during board meetings
- Other (ex. general – culture, accountability)

Most boards will use multiple strategies to ensure that EIG changes are institutionalized and become part of board culture.

We are embedding the EIG principles into our board orientation manual, board member roles and expectation descriptions and board meeting structure to ensure they stick even after board member turnover.

A "local" EIG Academy plus future trainings and ongoing board development work with a separate consultant, along with recruiting new board members with new skills and understandings should help sustain EIG principles. This is all a work in process.

Several participants pointed to the uncertainty associated with the changes.

We have discussed various ways to build continuous improvement into the board’s work, but I am skeptical of the board’s ongoing appetite to stay focused on changing our way of doing business and becoming stronger. My hope is that as we recruit new board we will have more energy and capacity to undertake further initiatives to improve our processes.
Q1a-b. Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is “marginally helpful” and 5 is “very helpful,” please rate the value of the following in helping you complete the program: Leadership Team (n=78)

### Training
- Very helpful 5/5: 79%
- 4/5: 17%
- Helpful 3/5: 3%
- 2/5: 0%
- Marginally helpful: 1%

### Coaching
- Very helpful 5/5: 76%
- 4/5: 15%
- Helpful 3/5: 6%
- 2/5: 1%
- Marginally helpful: 1%
**Detailed Findings**

Q2a. Again, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is “marginally helpful” and 5 is “very helpful,” how helpful was the coaching in: HELPING YOU MOVE YOUR BOARD TOWARDS MORE GENERATIVE DISCUSSIONS? Leadership Team (n=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful 5/5</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful 3/5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally helpful</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coaching**

Q2b. How helpful was the coaching in RAISING AND WORKING THROUGH DIFFICULT CONVERSATIONS? Leadership Team (n=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful 5/5</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful 3/5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally helpful</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Findings

**Q2c. How helpful was the coaching in: WORKING WITH YOUR BOARD ON THE GOVERNANCE FOCUS AND ACTION PLAN?** Leadership Team (n=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful 5/5</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful 3/5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally helpful</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coaching

**Q2d. How helpful was the coaching in HOLDING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS ACCOUNTABLE?** Leadership Team (n=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful 5/5</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful 3/5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally helpful</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Findings

Q2e. How helpful was the coaching in ENSURING ALL VOICES ON THE TEAM WERE HEARD?
Leadership Team (n=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful 5/5</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful 3/5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally helpful</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaching

Our Coach......

Helped us identify best practices, learn from our peers and evaluate our strategies. She encouraged us and pushed us.

Helped us see things that we could not, by being an outsider listening to our discussions and helped us in synthesizing information.

There was a real change in going from where we started as the leadership team in interacting with the coach and how we grew as a team.

I wish the coach had been a bit more directive. I realize we are on a journey and self discovery is important, but sometimes a strong nudge can move things along.

We had very little interaction with our coach after the third in-person training, which was unfortunate because it was a good accountability mechanism for the Leadership Team.
Q14a-f. SUMMARY  Leadership Team Scale: 1 = Marginally helpful; 5 = Very helpful

- **a. Generative discussions**: 59% Very helpful, 24% Helpful, 17% Marginally helpful. Mean 2018: 4.4
- **b. Difficult discussions**: 55% Very helpful, 28% Helpful, 17% Marginally helpful. Mean 2018: 4.3
- **c. Governance focus and action plan**: 72% Very helpful, 17% Helpful, 11% Marginally helpful. Mean 2018: 4.6
- **d. Accountability**: 57% Very helpful, 26% Helpful, 17% Marginally helpful. Mean 2018: 4.3
- **e. All voices are heard**: 64% Very helpful, 19% Helpful, 17% Marginally helpful. Mean 2018: 4.4
Q6. How helpful were the following peer-to-peer learning opportunities to your work?

- a. Your governance focus presentation
- b. Other governance focus presentations
- c. Partner dialogue call
- d. Peer board chair call
- e. EIG Dropbox
- f. Peer breakouts during training

As board chair, it was very important to me ask for other chairs input and reaction to our issues and the dynamic in our board.

Really enjoyed the peer-to-peer breakout session during the last retreat. I wish we would have had more of those in earlier retreats.

(Peer learning was) Most helpful - vast array of resources that were continually updated/added to and face to face peer-to-peer time. Because we are all busy in our work and volunteer lives, it was somewhat difficult to coordinate phone options and being someone who depends on visual cues, less effective for me personally.

Note: More than 90% of respondents participated in peer activities, except for the board chair call, where 42% participated.
Q4 a-b. How helpful was the full board retreat as a tool to……?

- Identify governance principles
- Strengthen your board

Very helpful (5)
- Your team: 59%
- Your board: 58%

(4)
- Your team: 32%
- Your board: 31%

Helpful (3)
- Your team: 6%
- Your board: 9%

(2)
- Your team: 3%
- Your board: 1%

Marginally helpful (1)
- Your team: 0%
- Your board: 0%

Q4 c-d. How helpful was the governance focus as a context for (your team/board) to practice new skills…?

- Your team
- Your board

Very helpful (5)
- Your team: 60%
- Your board: 65%

(4)
- Your team: 26%
- Your board: 27%

Helpful (3)
- Your team: 12%
- Your board: 5%

(2)
- Your team: 3%
- Your board: 3%

Marginally helpful (1)
- Your team: 0%
- Your board: 0%
Detailed Findings

Q4. How effective were the board members on the leadership team in helping the rest of the board understand and practice the concepts?

Board members (n=74)

- Very effective 5/5: 34.0%
- Effective 3/5: 31.0%
- Marginally effective: 5.0%
- 4/5: 27.0%

Knowledge Transfer

Q5. What approach worked particularly well in helping the board understand the concepts? Board members (n=62)

What board members found effective:

Every step of EIG was done as a full board, with the leadership team leading the conversations. This allows for full board buy in and long term change, versus the board being told what to do.

The EIG Team was able to articulate why governance needs to be at the center of our practice as a board if we plan to be alive as an organization for decades to come.

Constant and transparent communication on what was learned and how it can be applied. Also the Leadership Team was very engaging and inclusive in getting the Board to select the governance areas to focus on.

One on one meetings with board members not attending.

The before meeting start activities were very helpful in the sense of warming up to meeting topics to have a more open opinion.

The Team led interactive small group discussions about key questions related to governance that were productive and educational.
Q7a-j series. For each of the following governance practices, please indicate whether the practice was in place prior to EIG; was in place prior and improved during EIG; was implemented during EIG; or has not been implemented.

Boards (by CEO; n=13*)

*CEOs responded to this series, number of board reflects the number of CEOs responding
Detailed Findings

Leadership Teams see greater impact from EIG than other board members

- EIG changed capacity: Board 64%, Leadership team 80%, Difference 16%
- More effective governing board: Board 58%, Leadership team 70%, Difference 12%
- Culture has changed: Board 62%, Leadership team 85%, Difference 23%

Perceptions of Impact

Leadership Teams and Board members perceptions differ

- Voice is heard: Board 82%, Leadership team 92%, Difference 10%
- What keeps CEO up at night: Board 76%, Leadership team 90%, Difference 14%
- Presence would be missed at meeting: Board 78%, Leadership team 91%, Difference 13%

Differences in the level of agreement between leadership team members and other board members show gaps of 16 - 23 percentage points on some questions relating to the impact of EIG on the board.

Leadership teams have a greater understanding of what keeps the CEO up at night, probably because of the time spent together during the training. Leadership teams are also more likely to say their presence would be missed at a meeting, while board members are slightly more likely to feel their voice is heard.
Detailed Findings

Examples of strategic changes

Leadership Team

Our most important strategic change was the adoption of committees so the board could delegate more of the board’s day-to-day business and spend time at board meetings on more high-level strategic conversations. It hasn’t worked as robustly as it could, but I think that is partly based on who is currently acting as committee chair on some committees, and not because the change wasn’t a positive one. It has helped to increase the board’s output and spread responsibilities more, which has been a positive change.

We have stopped feeling like a rubber-stamp board and are asking critical questions and holding the Executive Director accountable.

Broadening input in governance across the organization with transparency - integration and expansion of committee level work and making sure we have the right representation at the table (ongoing - equity and inclusion focus) as well as a communication structure is building ownership for organizational initiatives in our communities served.

Board Members

The specific inclusion of generative discussions has rounded out the Board’s understanding of its role and purposes. One example has been a constructive process of working through disagreement between the Board and CEO about compensation - a difficult conversation that produced a stronger relationship in the end.

The board has a culture of inquiry and has become a great problem solver. For example, in two different real estate transactions the board developed a political solution for the Agency that allowed the projects to move forward.

The strategic change of facing our commitment to bring positive change. I see the board more engaged and innovative.

Streamlining some of the disparate reports has allowed to act more effectively and strategically Separately, we are all now focused on the importance of fund raising as a strategic growth mechanism. Since our EIG board retreat we have identified the necessity of a multi-pronged approach to fundraising including grants, corporate, and individual donors.
Q9. What is the most important strategic change your board has experienced from participation in the program? Number of boards (n=15) based on leadership team and board member responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Team</th>
<th>Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent agenda</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced committees</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generative conversations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More board engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the board</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting, term limits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16. How has participation in the program impacted the overall performance of your organization?

**Base is boards (n=15)** Summary of open-ended responses, leadership teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asking better questions, more focused on strategic direction, greater participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Better prepared to manage leadership transition; know what good governance is and why it matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greater engagement from management team will advance our mission and commitment to our communities and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organization is more unified; more robust conversations; helped with decisions re new grant-funded line of business; more forward-thinking vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transformational; now know how to provide support and direction; importance of strategic orientation and future-focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Better understanding of board role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Too soon to tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teamwork between board and organization, common focus and goals, more thoughtful deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>More openness and respect; better information from dashboard; too soon to tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Focus on measuring and communicating impact to the community - board and staff working on this together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Better ability to make decisions for a complex organization given instability and uncertainty; expectations are higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Board leadership understands board and ED roles and how to support ED and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Outstanding new board members, greater trust between board and staff, deeper conversations, board helps staff fulfill the mission; members performing at a higher level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Continue to focus on 2 areas in strategic and action plans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Greater confidence; opportunities for governance improvement; shifted focus from programs to governance to the detriment of the organizational mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Findings

Q8a. Board members regularly engage in meaningful, critical thinking and important dialogue before making a decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=79)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team/Board Comparisons

Q8b. Staff bring meaningful questions and topics for discussion prior to bringing proposed solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=79)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Findings

Q8c. Discussions result in the board considering multiple and different perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=78)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team/Board Comparisons

Q8d. Important governance principles are firmly entrenched in board practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=77)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Findings

**Q8f. Board culture has really changed as a result of the program.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=70)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Team/Board Comparisons

**Q8g. The board is a much more effective governing body than before the program.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=77)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Findings

Q8n. The board has a better understanding of what keeps the CEO up at night.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=77)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team/Board Comparisons

Q8h. There is a more collaborative partnership between the board and the CEO as a result of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=75)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8i. The program has changed the capacity of the board.

**Detailed Findings**

- **Strongly agree**:
  - Board: 11%
  - Leadership Team: 25%
- **Agree**:
  - Board: 46%
  - Leadership Team: 48%
- **Neither agree nor disagree**:
  - Board: 27%
  - Leadership Team: 14%
- **Disagree**:
  - Board: 10%
  - Leadership Team: 10%
- **Strongly disagree**:
  - Board: 6%
  - Leadership Team: 3%
Q8k. If I am unable to attend a board meeting I know my presence will be missed.

- **Strongly agree**
  - Board (n=75): 6%
  - Leadership Team (n=76): 18%
- **Agree**
  - Board (n=75): 54%
  - Leadership Team (n=76): 61%
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
  - Board (n=75): 31%
  - Leadership Team (n=76): 14%
- **Disagree**
  - Board (n=75): 1%
  - Leadership Team (n=76): 5%
- **Strongly disagree**
  - Board (n=75): 1%
  - Leadership Team (n=76): 0%
- Don’t know
  - Board (n=75): 6%
  - Leadership Team (n=76): 1%

Q8l. As a board member, I feel my voice is heard.

- **Strongly agree**
  - Board (n=78): 44%
  - Leadership Team (n=68): 55%
- **Agree**
  - Board (n=78): 30%
  - Leadership Team (n=68): 50%
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
  - Board (n=78): 1%
  - Leadership Team (n=68): 3%
- **Disagree**
  - Board (n=78): 1%
  - Leadership Team (n=68): 0%
- **Strongly disagree**
  - Board (n=78): 3%
  - Leadership Team (n=68): 0%
- Don’t know
  - Board (n=78): 1%
  - Leadership Team (n=68): 12%
Q8m. My board colleagues value my opinions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board (n=76)</th>
<th>Leadership Team (n=73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8j. I feel comfortable voicing my concerns or disagreement during board meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board only (n=78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Findings

Personal

- Time and travel
- Time on top of other board work
- Intensity of the training
- Speaking up in a group
- Understanding the concepts, recognizing the benefits

The hardest part for me, as staff, was letting the Board Members take the lead in this discussion rather than trying to "do it for them." I learned they are more than capable of taking the lead.

Working with the Team

- Differences in the pace and style of learning
- Diversity and disconnectedness of the board, differences in use of technology, language, and reading skills of board members caused conflict within the team
- Rising up to meet the expectations of our coach

The most difficult part of the program for me was seeing the potential of what it could do for us as a board and as an organization, and seeing us not take full advantage of that potential because we as a board did not have the time or capacity to fully capture the opportunity.

Having meaningful participation in coaching sessions.

Challenges for the Board

- Getting out of the comfort zone, letting go
- Staying engaged
- Time diverted from strategic plan and other board work to governance
- Recognizing the value/benefits of changes and the investment (ex. term limits)
- Transitioning from an ED focus to shared governance

When it came time to allocate time at meetings and have conversations, I think folks felt like some of the time spent discussing board processes and policies was time that could have been better spent on more task-oriented things that it was easier for them to get their arms around.

Working with the Board

- Communicating concepts
- Getting board to take ownership of action plan or participate in general
- Keeping board engaged over time
- Diversity of board in terms of technology, language skills
- Working with ED and committees to implement some of the changes

It was difficult for us to get people outside of the LT engaged in a concrete way as we were trying to transition to the governance focus being on all of us and not just the LT.

Going through processes that they think they already had, but letting process be the value in communicating and further discovery.
Excellence in Governance End of Program Survey Class of 2018

Detailed Findings

Learning
- High quality of learning components
- The extent of the learning
- Self awareness ex. “We are not as inclusive as we thought we were”
- The value of the peer learning – all boards have the same issues, it helped us understand some of the concepts better

While we have learned much through this process, I think one of the big takeaways for us is that we have come to the realization that we really are a high-functioning Board overseeing a well-run organization. This has given us a renewed sense of confidence in our work.

Value from the team
- Interpersonal insights
- Warmth that was extended – feeling welcomed and part of the family
- Bonding with leadership team – “it made me look differently at how I interacted with other board members
- How quickly the board members bonded even when they had different ideas about things

We are very impressed with everything you offered our organization. We are a very "knowing" group of people. However, the course was able to let us pour some water out of our glasses so that we could fill it up with new stuff.

Implementation and impact
- How some board members would resist pursuing excellence
- How it has impacted the culture of our board
- How we could engage the entire board to take on a more strategic approach
- How much we ultimately benefitted from the process. I think, in some ways, we initially looked at the program as a "chore" or something to get through. It's so much more than that.
- The level of engagement and ultimately buy-in by the entire board.

Surprises - Themes

It worked! There were many things that I had tried to incorporate into our practices prior to EIG that were never realized. Bringing the ED and several board members together to learn these tools, understand the reason for using them and all having buy-in made all the difference.
Detailed Findings

Suggestions for program improvements from participants

Content and Delivery
- Address/include specific strategies for recruiting a diverse board considering that diversity means different things in different places.
- Incorporate suggestions for addressing turnover and change in EIG leaders – how should boards address this?
- Review training content and delivery mechanisms to make sure that the materials are accessible to everyone on the leadership team and the board.
- Try to include more board members in the training. One person suggested inviting 2-4 additional board members to join the team midway to increase buy-in.
- Continue to remind participants that bringing the message home will require time and full team participation.

Follow-up
- Consider adding a convening 18 months post EIG for groups to gather and discuss wins and challenges and the need for any additional assistance. Person who suggested this would like coaches to also attend.
- Depending on the nature of what a leadership team is dealing with, that there may need to be a deeper level of coaching (for both the board and the ED), than what EIG currently provides. Build a pre-EIG assessment into the program to identifying specific support needs. Otherwise, unless the organization itself, has the capacity to supplement the EIG program as our agency did, then the benefits of EIG might not have been as great. Alternatively, add a post-assessment with both the coach and RM about what additional resources a board might need to continue to progress.

Other
- The workload for a new board chair trying to lead the EIG team was an issue for one person who suggested that NeighborWorks consider recommending that a board chair not try to lead the EIG work, but rather pass this to the vice chair or another board member.
**Detailed Findings**

Q19. How interested are you in continuing the conversation about Excellence in Governance with peer organizations in the future? Leadership Team (n=76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May or may not be</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More Conversations**

Q20a-d. How likely would you be to participate in the following opportunities to learn more about board governance if they were offered? Leadership Team (n=63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>NTI</th>
<th>On-line repository of resources</th>
<th>Conference calls</th>
<th>Online Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May or may not be interested</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>