

Confidential Report to the Board of the Iditarod Trail Committee

December 4, 2017

Overview

The Iditarod Trail Committee (ITC) works to promote and preserve the historic Iditarod Trail, most notably through the annual staging of a sled dog race from Anchorage to Nome, Alaska.

At the conclusion of the 2017 race, it came to ITC's attention that some dogs on one team tested positive for a banned substance in a test conducted six hours after the conclusion of the race. That incident informed ITC that a clearer policy was required since the current policy didn't provide sufficient procedure to determine accountability. When ITC concluded that no one could be held accountable for this incident under current policy, it was quick to notify the musher involved, assuring him that he was not being accused, disqualified, or held accountable in any way. The ITC took the musher's word that he had no knowledge of how drugs could have been given to dogs in his team.

Since dog safety and health are the top priority of ITC, revising the policy became a priority. The revised policy will assist race officials to better handle accountability in the future if another dog tests positive.

ITC officials were concerned that notifying too many people too soon about the incident may complicate public relations, so this news was not released in a timely manner to sponsors, mushers or the public. In October 2017, it was determined by the board that it should notify all constituents of its position and actions, including the name of the musher involved. Since the information wasn't released for a number of months, many people assumed there was a need for more transparency while others questioned ITC's integrity. Animal rights groups used this incident to discredit the ITC.

In order to better understand the board's actions, the race's major sponsors asked Dennis McMillian, the former CEO of The Foraker Group who continues as a consultant through Foraker, to conduct an independent board assessment and provide suggestions to enhance the board's performance and reduce the public's concern about ITC's governance.

The Foraker Group is an Alaska nonprofit founded in 2001 dedicated to build the capacity of the nonprofit sector. It has worked with thousands of individuals and organizations throughout the state, including providing significant support to ITC ten years prior to this incident. It has not had significant contact with ITC since that time.

With the request from the sponsors and willingness of ITC officials to cooperate, Foraker conducted a board self-assessment in October 2017. After the assessment, Foraker met with members of the board in late November and on December 1 to review current governance practices and to provide training and feedback on possible solutions to improve governance. A report with findings and recommendations will be shared with the key sponsors and ITC. The ITC and its sponsors will determine what findings will be shared with others.

ITC's Structure

The ITC was incorporated in the State of Alaska as a nonprofit corporation. It secured the federal nonprofit classification as a charitable organization, which is covered in section 501(c) (3) of the IRS code. Charitable organizations represent 75% of all nonprofit organizations and because individuals and corporations can deduct contributions from their annual tax liability, such organizations are under significant oversight from the federal government and extensive information about operations and finances are open to the public through an annual report, the Form 990, filed with the IRS.

Nonprofit corporations have guidelines from state and federal authorities for operations, funding, and governance. They must have a board of directors; "director" is the legal title of board participants. The duties of any corporate "director" are the same in Alaska state statute for nonprofit and for-profit corporations. Individuals who serve on a board must agree to make decisions as a group and always in the best interests of the corporation (nonprofit) and do so with a duty to be informed, loyal, careful, and obedient to the laws and internal policies.

Organizations develop bylaws to better define governance. Bylaws determine the number of directors and their duties. They also define issues such as how a director is elected, how often the body meets, the number of votes required to take action, and how to conduct meetings. Some nonprofit boards also have "members," not to be confused with board members, who can also have a role in governance. However, most significant charitable nonprofit corporations in America provide members limited or no significant powers.

The ITC bylaws state that the Board of Directors shall consist of a total of nine directors, six of whom shall be elected by the Board of Directors, the term is "self-appointed," and three of whom shall be elected by the members; all directors must be members. Membership requires an annual payment of a fee. Members are encouraged to attend the annual meeting and are entitled to vote, through personal representation or proxy, for the three seats elected by the membership. Members may also from time to time be asked by the board to vote on other issues and can, with 100 participants, call for a special meeting of the membership. The board can amend its bylaws with a two-third vote of the board, or six affirmative votes.

Assessment Survey

A self-assessment survey was distributed to every member of the board and staff and is included as an addendum to this document. It was structured using the Foraker Nonprofit Sustainability Model, a framework developed after more than a decade of research with Alaskan nonprofits and published in a book entitled *Focus on Sustainability: A Nonprofit's Journey*. This model is now used by professionals across the nation to assess and assist organizations.

Foraker's research on nonprofit sustainability found four factors that influence a nonprofit's sustainability.

The first essential factor is “focus,” or a clear understanding of and alignment with the purpose of the organization and the principles by which that purpose is accomplished. In addition, “focus” includes clarity about the organization’s direction. The most sustainable nonprofits have all individuals involved in unanimous agreement on the questions of “who you are and where are you going” that define focus.

Another critical factor is the “right people,” both those serving on the board and on the staff. The board must fully understand its role. The higher performing the board, the better the organization. Sustainable nonprofits must also have competent and dedicated staff. The board sets policy in order that the organization acts within the law and its mission. The board also sets the direction for the future, often accomplished through strategic planning. The staff is responsible for the day-to-day operations, accomplished within the board’s policies and direction. It is critical that the board trusts the staff and work in partnership with them to accomplish mission. Clear and balanced boundaries between board and staff ensure maximum impact. No individual on the board is the “boss “of any staff member, including the CEO. All management of the CEO should be done with consent of the entire board.

In addition to focus and the right people, the research found that nonprofits are most sustainable when they have clear processes for identifying and working in “partnerships” with other organizations and individuals aligned to their mission. The board and staff should be clear on their most critical partners and have formal and informal standards to maintain such partnerships.

Finally, while it’s obvious that revenue is required for nonprofits, the most important revenue for a nonprofit’s sustainability is “unrestricted,” meaning that the organization has control over how the revenue is used.

Findings

The survey, along with a review of ITC’s bylaws and financial reports as well as with conversations with some sponsors, “directors” (members of the board), and mushers helped inform the findings and recommendations in this report. Foraker worked to not allow one person’s opinion to overly influence findings and recommendations, rather looked for common themes from various informants to provide a balanced report.

The anonymous survey was returned by all board directors minus one. The staff survey was completed by two-thirds of those contacted. While the surveys depend upon individual perceptions, when completed by multiple participants, provides useful feedback on an organization’s adherence to sustainability standards.

Focus

The survey found that almost everyone who responded perceived that they knew the purpose and the principles for achieving that purpose. However, a large percentage perceived that other staff and board members did not understand. In addition, there was agreement on a lack of clarity on the organization’s direction and priorities. There has been no formal strategic plan since 2007 (until now). While the board seems to perceive it understands the organization’s purpose, more than the staff perceives thinks they

do; both board and staff were aligned in the perception that they have no clear direction. This perception was also voiced by most of the sponsors and participants who contacted Foraker. (After the strategy session on December 1, 2017, the board and senior leadership are on the same page.)

Right People

One of the most telling responses on the board survey was that while 100% of directors say they understand their duties, most responded that their colleagues were unclear about their board duties. This was also the staff's perception. The ITC has had no formal board training reported since 2007 (until now). In conversations with directors, staff, sponsors, and participants, it was evident that the trust between certain board and staff members is lacking. And it has been long noted that there is too limited staff capacity to accomplish all required for the organization to thrive.

Partnerships

There are at least four critical partners for ITC; the sponsors, the participants (mushers) represented by the Iditarod Official Finishers Club (IOFC), the Iditarod Trail Race Foundation (ITRF), and the volunteers. There seems to be no formal protocol for maintaining positive relationships with these partners.

Few ITC volunteers contacted Foraker and most who did used the opportunity to express negative perceptions about the board and staff. However since a large number of volunteers have been involved for many years, it appears that a large percentage of volunteers continue to be supportive. A volunteer's level of frustration can be easily monitored by observing those who fail to re-engage. It seems that at this time the ITC is blessed with a strong and committed group of volunteers that seem primarily interested in giving their time and preserving this great race. However additional attention to maintaining this partnership may be in order.

The sponsors also love the race and want to see it thrive but have felt out of the loop on many key issues for many years, including the recent disclosure on the positive drug test. When Foraker worked with ITC from 2007-2010, there was also concern voiced by sponsors and at that time ITC officials were looking for strategies to improve those relationships.

Today, many sponsors seem even more frustrated with their relationship than ten years ago. They now strongly encourage more timely communication and are more concerned about decisions of the board. Ongoing communication with sponsors is typically a staff responsibility, but boards should ensure such communication occurs. While the sponsors remain committed to the race's success, many seem very concerned with ITC's board, and their future support may be contingent on the direction the board now takes.

The Iditarod Official Finishers Club, IOFC, is acknowledged as the formal voice of the mushers. In a recent meeting with the board and staff, members of the IOFC voiced their lack of trust in the ITC board. At this point, that group had not made public many comments on their confidence in staff. But in the past, some mushers have voiced their concern about the staff's competence and ethics.

The Iditarod Trail Race Foundation is the remaining critical partner. Foraker did not speak to anyone from that organization, but understands from ITC directors and staff that relationships at this point are not positive. The Foraker Group would rarely advise an organization to start such a foundation since our experience is that over-time, the relationship between the organization expecting benefit, in this case ITC, and its “foundation” holding money for its purpose, the ITRF, eventually develop differing priorities. A formal process for managing this partnership is required.

But at this time the two partnerships needing the most attention are sponsors and the IOFC.

Unrestricted Revenue

Most of the ITC’s revenue comes from sponsorships provided by major corporations interested in preserving the race. Next would be the revenue from product sales and branding efforts, gaming, fees, with the remaining small percentage of revenue coming from membership and donations. ITC does not generate the amount of revenue required for their aspirations, resulting in frustration from the mushers on issues like the size of purses and with the lack of needed staff capacity to do all that’s required to ensure a well run event. And while there is little doubt that without the volunteers the race could not exist, there should be significantly more investment in equipping and supporting these “unpaid employees.” As stated before, if they were to disappear, the financial commitment to maintain the race could be overwhelming. The ITC should immediately develop strategies to maintain the current sponsors and leverage their support for additional sponsors in order to generate more, sustainable financial capacity.

Additional Points From Research

- Sponsors were not notified about the drug test and policy change in time to prepare responses for their corporate executives and the public. The sponsors do not want to be surprised.
- It does not appear that the entire board knew about this incident for a too-long period. Such information should be transparent internally to all directors as soon as possible.
- The board and legal counsel were slow to react to revision of the flawed policy, allowing six months to pass before adopting the revised policy.
- ITC notified the musher whose dogs tested positive in a timely manner, but were not successful in working with the musher to ensure that he could stand united with ITC. Rather, the musher used the opportunity to increase distrust many mushers already have with the ITC.
- The positive drug test is just one of the major controversies confronting the ITC. Animal rights activists continue to confront this sport, calling it harmful for and exploitive of dogs. The drug test added to their effort to encourage grassroots campaigns to end sponsorship for the race.
- Ten years ago ITC made a commitment to their foundation, ITRF, that they would build their reserves. Such reserves are typically used as a “rainy day fund” for emergencies like unexpected expenses or loss of revenue. Twice since that commitment, the ITC board elected to spend a large percentage of those revenues going into the reserves on what appears to be non-emergency expenses. In conversations, this issue is one of the actions that have impacted trust in board actions.

- The loss of confidence from partners has been building for years, but seems to have gained momentum over the past two to three years.
- In closing, when Foraker worked with ITC over ten years ago and understood their concerns about improving relationships with partners and becoming more professional in their operations, it appears that those relationships are more strained now than then and ITC's overall capacity seems diminished.

Conclusions and Recommendations

From 2007 into 2010, The Foraker Group met with the board and staff leadership to assist in re-thinking its structure. The board's intent at that time was to ensure that the ITC was structured in the best possible way to achieve its strategic direction. That direction included growing sponsorship and other revenue to increase the staff's capacity and to continue to incentivize mushers with larger purses. The recommendation to build financial reserves was also included. And at that time The Foraker Group suggested that the board consider revising its bylaws, having all "directors" elected internally (self appointed board) based on a matrix of attributes and qualifications required for good governance which should help the race to grow in capacity. This model is the dominate board structure for charitable nonprofit organizations that rely on donations, both in Alaska and around the country. A comprehensive internal staff capacity assessment was also drafted by the fall of 2010 and shared with the staff. In reviewing their current operating structure, it seems some of the recommendations to the board on its structure and the staff on internal operations were implemented such as hiring someone to assist the CEO with sponsor relations, starting to build reserves, enhancing IT capacity, and with the board reducing member elected seats to three. But we assume from a lack of capacity or interest, other recommendations were not followed.

The sponsors requested that Foraker conduct a board assessment in October of 2017. They also requested that Foraker provide board training and a strategy session. They also requested this report with specific recommendations designed to improve governance. The current review includes conversations with some board members, sponsors, staff, mushers and general public who took the initiative to contact Foraker Group. The Foraker Group asked those individuals to let others know if they felt a need to share their perceptions, to make contact. It was not part of the scope of work to conduct a comprehensive survey with constituents. However Foraker attended a session between the ITC and many of its sponsors to better understand their concerns.

Those contacts, documents and the survey informed the following recommendations.

The ITC board is the legal body empowered to make decisions on behalf of the organization. At this time the board has received board training and engaged in discussions about their vision for the future and developed a strategic framework.

Based on all input and at the conclusion of the board training and strategy session, Foraker will follow best practice for board informed decisions and provide two options for the board to consider. The first set of recommendations should be considered a minimum to rebuild relationships and improve

governance. The second recommendation may be provocative, but should be discussed by the board for consideration, since this report will be available to representatives of the sponsor paying for these opinions, and the board may need to respond to questions.

These are the minimum (basic) Foraker recommendations to enhance governance and protect the interests of ITC and its sponsors.

- The ITC board should immediately develop a plan designed to rebuild trust with the sponsors and mushers.—*The two most important partner groups to address at this time are the sponsors and the mushers. It seems that neither of these groups have confidence in the ITC board. While Foraker heard some negative comments from mushers and volunteers about some staff members, most see staff issues as the result of board action or inaction and the staff's lack of capacity. Therefore, the priority of the board should be to take immediate steps to improve their relationship with sponsors and mushers. One additional suggestion would be to provide a professional opinion survey to the sponsors about their concerns and expectations. (If it is not feasible to conduct a professional survey, at least develop an internal survey, use an online process like Survey Monkey, to make sure that these initial actions will help rebuild the trust of sponsors) The IOFC submitted a written report of their concerns to the board, but if the board feels that report is not reflective of the majority of mushers, then the board should also conduct a survey with the mushers. The board must understand the urgency to mend these relationships. Foraker senses that both of these partner groups are on the verge of withdrawing their support for this race as a result of their distrust in this board.*
- The ITC should immediately establish a protocol on notification of sponsors and key constituents when expecting potential controversial news regarding ITC or the sport of dog mushing with suggested comments on how to respond to questions. — *As a nonprofit corporation, ITC is under no legal obligation for transparency of confidential information, however such disclosure is recommended, after consultation with legal counsel, to ensure the reputation of the ITC, its sponsors, and participants are protected. Sponsors are the economic engine of the ITC. Therefore, they should be informed whenever there could be controversial information in order to protect their interests. While sponsors are under no legal obligation for confidentiality, most will and should assume confidentiality when requested.*
- The board should adopt a policy for periodic review of all policies to ensure all are current, meeting legal obligations, and in line with technological advances.—*Well managed organizations review all policies including bylaws every two to three years. Had this been an ongoing practice, the flawed policy may have been exposed sooner, reducing the impact of the last situation.*
- The board should adopt a norm of engaging in periodic training on their fiduciary responsibility.— *High performing boards, both nonprofit and for-profit, meet with legal counsel or another credible representative for training on the law at least every two years. In addition, directors have a written job description with detail on all expectations and with disclosure on conflicts in interest, as well as agreement to uphold all corporate policy, then they must sign the document as an indication of their understanding of and commitment to adherence.*

- The board should continue its progress toward a self appointed board and eliminate all member elected seats as soon as possible. In addition it should adopt a strategy that would, in the future, minimize or exclude a director with a conflict of interest, either as an active musher or one with such immediate family relationship.—*This recommendation could be done over time with an appropriate board matrix designed to have the right balance of skills on the board.*
- The board should conduct more outreach with all key constituents prior to the establishment of policy, especially policy that may be misinterpreted or controversial.—*In these times of rapid communication and distrust in governance, boards can no longer afford to make major decisions in isolation. When time permits, all effort to engage key constituents for advice is in order.*

Again, these recommendations are a minimum requirement that the board should address immediately. We strongly suggest that ITC's board notify sponsors and IOFC within days of receiving this assessment with a guarantee that all recommendations, including surveys to sponsors (and mushers if desired), be completed before the end of 2017. Then the board should take action required from those findings to improve trust.

Even with such compliance, Foraker has little confidence that the sponsors or mushers may be satisfied with just these first steps; it is our opinion that the relationship damage is severe and may require additional action. While no sponsor shared specific thinking about their ongoing support, Dennis McMillian an individual with forty years in nonprofit management and fund raising, witnessed body language and questions from the sponsors at the ITC sponsor meeting in October that were clear. In his opinion, many of the most significant sponsors may not continue their support without internal changes and better communication resulting in more trust in its governance. (While I would be glad to be proven wrong on such issues, I rarely am.)

The current board has the same vision for ITC as the predecessor board that Foraker worked with in 2007. They have re-committed the purpose to “preserve the sport of dog mushing and the historic trail”. In order for that to become real, ITC must maintain a positive, trusted relationship with the mushers and its current sponsors and as important it must secure additional sponsors; without growing revenue to enhance its capacity, the ITC will lose more momentum.

If action is not taken and soon, it is Foraker's opinion that ITC will lose major sponsors, have less revenue and may have to accept that it can no longer be the leading event for the sport of dog mushing.

The second recommendation may not be required, but it provides another option for the board to consider. In addition to implementing the recommendations listed above including that the board has 100% of its directors selected by the board, it may be necessary that the directors with conflicts of interest resign. While Foraker doesn't question the integrity or dedication of the current directors, six of the nine have conflicts and are perceived by some as making decisions through those conflicts. They may or may not be making decisions based on these conflicts, however good governance cannot be easily achieved with a high level of perceived conflict.

If the six individuals with conflicts were to resign, leaving the minimum of three directors as an interim board, the remaining directors could replace the six empty seats. If that becomes a necessary approach, the newly constituted board of nine would then revise the bylaws and would adhere to the matrix of characteristics for a balanced, business-like board. Understanding that mushers want direct involvement in governance, a suggestion for the bylaws revision should consider adoption of IOFC as an official advisor to the newly constituted board on all issues effecting their participation in the race and with ability to appoint an ex-officio (non voting) representative to act as liaison between the two bodies. If the board were to take this action, we encourage ITC secure legal counsel in order that all actions are within the requirements of the current bylaws. The Foraker Group will remain available to provide any guidance required.

However, after working with this board in training and setting strategy, it is my opinion that they are sincere about their desire to improve governance and to improving their relationships with all partners. If the sponsors and mushers are willing to give the board time to adapt to their new understanding, Foraker recommends allowing the board to take the basic minimum steps to improve, and only use the second recommendation if the corrective actions are not followed.

This report does not reflect a legal opinion. It is based on an experienced view of what is required for effective governance. If the board accepts and implements the first set of recommendations and judges they have the time for such reflection and corrective action, they should act with haste through conducting the recommended surveys to ensure their partners will be comfortable with their actions. They may find that the sponsors are patient, and with strict adherence to the recommendations, ITC could begin to rebuild its credibility without drastic changes in its current structure.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Dennis G. McMillian".

Dennis G. McMillian
The Foraker Group

Board Survey

Instructions-Please read each statement and respond by providing a value from 1 to 5 for each statement. If you totally, without hesitation agree with the statement rate it as #5. If you totally and without hesitation disagree with the statement rate it #1. If your response is between total agreement and total disagreement, select the number in between that best represents your level of agreement.

The Foraker Group utilizes the framework it developed with over a decade of research on nonprofit sustainability. It focuses on four key indicators we call focus, the right people, partnerships and unrestricted revenue. Each statement will help us to assess the board's understanding and practices related to this framework.

Focus

- I know the founding story of (organization) including the person(s) responsible for its founding, its purpose, and the founding principles most important to that founding. _____
- I perceive that my colleagues on the board know the founding story of (org) including the person(s) responsible for its founding, its purpose, and the founding principles most important to that founding. _____
- I am firmly committed to making decisions as a “director” (in state statute members of the board are referred to as “director”) in the best interests of (org). _____
- I perceive that my colleagues on the board are firmly committed to making decisions as a “director” (in state statute members of the board are referred to as “director”) in the best interests of (org). _____
- At our meetings, we spend more than half of the time focused on strategic issues. _____
- We have a current strategic plan that we refer to in strategic discussions. _____
- As a board we establish consensus (at least) each year on the top 2-3 priorities needing address. _____
- I perceive that all directors and staff are on the same page about our purpose and principles/values. ____

- I perceive that all directors and staff are on the same page of the general strategic direction of the organization. _____
- I perceive that all directors and staff are on the same page about each year's priorities. _____

The Right People

- I know my duties as a director and perform in line with those duties. _____
- I perceive that my colleagues on the board understand their duties as a director and perform in line with those duties. _____
- I have participated in formal board training during the last three years. _____
- Every person on the board seems committed to making decisions in the best interests of the organization. _____
- We have the right people, with the right skills on the board. _____
- Our board is the right size (with the right # of people). _____
- Our board meets often enough to manage its duties. _____
- No one on our board has any significant conflict of interest. _____
- When we meet as a board, we have sufficient information on the issues to discuss. _____
- We often have conflicting opinions about our direction. _____
- When we make a decision, most times, we achieve unanimous consent; we are in total agreement. _____
- Directors honor their duty to maintain confidentiality on sensitive issues. _____
- Our directors have total faith in the actions of our CEO/Executive Director. _____
- Our CEO/Executive Director has the resources to employ the right people to support our mission. _____
- As a board, we spend adequate time meeting with, advising and monitoring our key staff leadership. _____
- Our CEO/Executive Director never takes action on significant issues without board consent. _____
- We have a formal volunteer program including job descriptions, organizational structure and recognition for each volunteer position. _____

Partnerships

- We have a specific strategy and policies to manage our partnership with our participants. _____
- We have a specific strategy and policies to manage our partnership with our sponsors. _____
- We have a good relationship with our participants. _____
- We have a good relationship with our volunteers. _____
- We have a good relationship with our sponsors. _____

Unrestricted Revenue

- As a director, I understand the business model of the organization. _____

- I perceive that my colleagues on the board understand the business model of the organization. _____
- As an organization, we do a good job generating sufficient revenue to accomplish our mission. _____
- Our organization has a “reserve policy” and works to ensure adequate savings are available in the case of emergencies. _____
- We have a financial reserve equivalent to at least three months of annual operations. _____
- All directors are committed to working with staff to secure sponsorships and donations. _____

Other Comments-In order to allow each director an opportunity to elaborate on or clarify the above ratings, please submit your comments below.

Staff Survey

Instructions-Please read each statement and respond by providing a value from 1 to 5 for each statement. If you totally, without hesitation agree with the statement rate it as #5. If you totally and without hesitation disagree with the statement rate it #1. If your response is between total agreement and total disagreement, select the number in between that best represents your level of agreement.

The Foraker Group utilizes the framework it developed with over a decade of research on nonprofit sustainability. It focuses on four key indicators we call focus, the right people, partnerships and unrestricted revenue. Each statement will help us to assess the board’s understanding and practices related to this framework.

Focus

- I know the founding story of the (organization) including the person(s) responsible for its founding, its purpose, and the founding principles most important to that founding. _____
- I perceive the board know the founding story of the (org) including the person(s) responsible for its founding, its purpose, and the founding principles most important to that founding. _____
- I perceive that the board is firmly committed to making decisions as a “director” (in state statute members of the board are referred to as “director”) in the best interests of (org). _____

- At Board meetings, members spend more than half of the time focused on strategic issues. _____
- We have a current strategic plan that we refer to in strategic discussions. _____
- The board establishes consensus (at least) each year on the top 2-3 priorities needing address. _____
- I perceive that all directors and staff are on the same page about our purpose and principles/values. _____
- I perceive that all directors and staff are on the same page of the general strategic direction of the organization. _____
- I perceive that all directors and staff are on the same page about each year's priorities. _____

The Right People

- The boards understands its duties as a director and perform in line with those duties. _____
- The board has participated in formal board training during the last three years. _____
- Every person on the board seems committed to making decisions in the best interests of the organization. _____
- We have the right people, with the right skills on the board. _____
- Our board is the right size (with the right # of people). _____
- Our board meets often enough to manage its duties. _____
- No one on our board has any significant conflict of interest. _____
- When we meet as a board, we have sufficient information on the issues to discuss. _____
- We often have conflicting opinions about our direction. _____
- When the board makes a decision, most times, they achieve unanimous consent; in total agreement. _____
- Directors honor their duty to maintain confidentiality on sensitive issues. _____
- Our directors have total faith in the actions of our CEO/Executive Director. _____
- Our CEO/Executive Director has the resources to employ the right people to support our mission. _____
- As a board, we spend adequate time meeting with, advising and monitoring our key staff leadership. _____
- Our CEO/Executive Director never takes action on significant issues without board consent. _____
- We have a formal volunteer program including job descriptions, organizational structure and recognition for each volunteer position. _____

Partnerships

- We have a specific strategy and policies to manage our partnership with our participants _____

- We have a specific strategy and policies to manage our partnership with our sponsors. _____
- We have a good relationship with our participants. _____
- We have a good relationship with our volunteers. _____
- We have a good relationship with our sponsors. _____

Unrestricted Revenue

- The directors , understand the business model of the organization. _____
- As an organization, we do a good job generating sufficient revenue to accomplish our mission. _____
- Our organization has a “reserve policy” and works to ensure adequate savings are available in the case of emergencies. _____
- We have a financial reserve equivalent to at least three months of annual operations. _____
- All directors are committed to working with staff to secure sponsorships and donations. _____

Other Comments-In order to allow each director an opportunity to elaborate on or clarify the above ratings, please submit your comments below.