August 9, 2015

To: Board of Directors
From: RASP Committee

Re: DRAFT RASP Project Proposal (2015-1)

RASP would like to investigate the relationship of the 2010 Strategic Plan to the HSV Masterplan Workbook and the 2015 Enterprise Goals seeking to define each document’s role in guiding HSV’s future.

Scope:

RASP could or would:
1. Fully understand all supporting processes, Goals, Objectives, and Tasks as presented in the 2010 SP.
2. Review the Masterplan Workbook and compare it to the SP “Assumptions”.
3. Understand the 2015 Enterprise Goals as they can be used to establish and evaluate shorter term Goals and Objectives a la the SP and Masterplan.
4. Make Suggestions to the Board as to specific items that may need to be modified/amended or even deleted based on the RASP analysis.

Issue being address:

1. Decide if there is ongoing relevance of the 2010 SP.
2. Clarification of the relationship of the 2010 SP with other key management tools, such as the Masterplan, Enterprise Goals, and annual budget.

Options:

The Board has the options to not assign this to RASP, select only certain items from the above list for RASP consideration, modify any or all of the above, and/or add other actions which the Board may deem as beneficial to the 2015 Update.

Deliverable, measure of success, impacts

1. Deliverable and measure of success - written report to the Board
2. Impact – better understanding of priorities and management thereof

Timing, Resources:

1. Primarily RASP members
2. No known staff resources needed at this time.

RASP could start work immediately dependent on your consideration of other proposed projects; ideally completing this activity in time for some reflection in the 2016 Budget cycle.
Risks: RASP believes the project has a very high probability of completion.
Benefits: Create a more current and relevant SP for Board use in making long range decisions.
June 25, 2015

To: Board of Directors  
From: RASP Committee  
RE: DRAFT RASP Project Proposal (2015-2)

RASP would like to develop an orientation / training program for potential board members to help them be ready to govern immediately upon election following policy governance principles. The program would also be for the public.

Scope:
RASP could or would:
1. Develop a time line for potential board members to follow in applying to run for the POA Board.
2. Coordinate the development of a training program that anyone considering applying to run for the board must complete prior to making a formal application. NOTE: The actual training would probably be very similar to the notebook that is used currently but after the election to the board.

Issue being address:
1. Ensure new board members are fully aware of what to expect and what will be expected of them if elected.
2. Help new board members to become effective immediately upon election rather than a few weeks or months after election.
3. Help candidates campaign with more knowledge of how the POA operates and what is possible under the various documents governing the Village.
4. Further the property owners’ knowledge of how the Village is governed.

Options:
The Board has the options to not assign this to RASP, modify any or all of the above, and/or add other actions which the Board may deem as beneficial.

Deliverable, measure of success, impacts:
1. Deliverable and measure of success - written report to the Board
2. More immediately productive board members
3. More information on how the Village is governed and operates distributed to the property owners.
4. Candidates would be better able to respond to questions and suggestions.

Timing, Resources:
1. Primarily RASP members, but also staff that conduct the current orientation program.
2. Limited amount of board members’ time.

RASP could start work immediately dependent on the consideration of other proposed projects; ideally completing this activity in time for integration into the 2016 election cycle.
Risks:
RASP believes the project has a very high probability of completion. Key risk is the determining the legal restrictions and requirements for the election process.
June 26, 2015

To Board of Directors
From: RASP Committee

RASP would like to partner with the POA board as it continues its journey toward embracing Policy Governance principles.

Scope:

Using the principles of Policy Governance as its guide, RASP could or would:
- Research and recommend how best to acquire the ongoing voice of POA property owners – through surveys, focus groups, or a variety of other means of communication.
- Arrange for a facilitator to lead the board in its discovery of what the organization is to achieve, so as to provide clear guidance to the COO/GM.
- Recommend methods and schedules by which progress towards board objectives is monitored
- Advise the board towards realignment of committees, assuring that staff committees exist and function exclusively at the pleasure of the COO, and board committees exist and function exclusively at the pleasure of the Board.

Issues being addressed:
- The board should make sure its governing policies are sound, comprehensive, and provide necessary oversight and control.

Options:

The Board has the options to not assign any of the scope items to RASP, to modify any or all of the above, and/or add other actions that the Board may deem as beneficial.

Deliverable, measure of success, impacts: Addressed elsewhere

Timing, Resources:
- Subset of RASP members
- Facilitator (bullet #2)
- Quarterly partial-day work sessions for the board (at least 5 in attendance), over an 18-24 month period of time

RASP could start work immediately, dependent on consideration of other proposed projects.

Risks: Success of this project is dependent on the commitment of all board members.

Benefits:
1. Greater representative voice to guide board members’ deliberations.
2. Board, staff, and property owner clarity on what the HSV POA is to achieve.
3. Continuous improvement in the monitoring of progress towards board objectives.
4. Greater disengagement of the board in staff/operations management.

Policy Governance Principle: The board speaks on property owners' behalf, a task that requires (a) knowing who the owners are and what their desires are, (b) being able to distinguish owners from customers (clients, students, patients) and other stakeholder groups. Finding ways to link with owners even more than with management is a major challenge to any board. Most nonprofit and governmental attempts to do so deteriorate into linkage with disgruntled customers instead (watch any city council or school board meeting).

Policy Governance Principle: What should any organization achieve? This is the most important aspect of instructing the CEO. The only achievement that justifies organizational existence is that which causes sufficient benefits for the right recipients to be worth the cost. What good is this organization to accomplish, for whom, at what cost or relative worth? Traditional approaches to governance have allowed boards to sidestep this crucial determination. We have focused far more on what activities the organization will be engaged in, not the consumer results to be achieved.

Consequently, boards give their CEOs credit for programs, services, and curricula rather than demanding data on whether the right recipients received the right results at the right cost. In order to lead, boards must learn that services, programs and curricula have no value except as they produce the desired ends. Therefore, boards are well-advised to look past these operational means and on to the ends that really matter.

Policy Governance Principle: Seeing to it implies a commitment to assure, not simply to hope that things come out right. Seeing to it that things come out right requires three steps: First, the board must describe "right" - that is, the criteria that would signify success. Second, the board must hold someone accountable for reaching these criteria. This is most easily done by using the CEO function, for that role allows the focusing of performance in one individual even though actual performance occurs due to many individuals. Proper use has been hard to achieve in many nonprofits and government (though not so much in business) in that boards interfere with their CEOs, not cleanly delegating sufficient authority to them. Third, the board must systematically and rigorously check to see if criteria are being met, that is, the board must monitor performance regularly.

Traditional board operation fails in all three areas, especially in the first and third. Outcome expectations (what difference is to be made in recipients' lives) are rarely or incompletely stated. Hence, when a board tries to monitor, it has no criteria against which to do so. The result is not monitoring, but foraging about. Observe any board approving a financial statement or a budget: the board has no idea what it would disapprove, for it has given the CEO no criteria to be met.

Policy Governance Principle: For nonprofit and governmental organizations, the "one voice" aspect of governance is regularly lost by having a host of board committees running about involving themselves in issues ostensibly delegated to staff. Staff members end up taking direction from segments of the board. Common committee roles do grave damage to the integrity of CEO delegation. Personnel, finance, program, publicity, and other such committees are the prime offenders. The board should not have committees either to help or instruct staff. Board members can serve on staff committees if asked (removing their board hats in the process), but foisting board help and advice, at best, makes a mockery of the board-CEO relationship and, at worst, renders the CEO no longer a CEO.