

**BLUEPRINT TO GREAT GOVERNANCE PROPOSAL**  
**VISION/PURPOSE, PROPOSAL AND FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**  
**July 22, 2010 – revision 3**

**VISION/PURPOSE**

Create a 21<sup>st</sup> Century structure that:

- supports the changing needs of our members
- facilitates better communication and coordination, sharing of best practices, successful project management at all levels of the association
- attracts new members
- creates powerful member engagement
- improves leadership succession planning
- creates greater alignment of the governance structure among all stakeholders

**PROPOSAL**

As the restructuring proposal is being considered now all governance structures would be re-aligned with the emphasis on growing existing networks by decreasing redundant tasks and increasing the ability for the leaders to connect with the members at the local grassroots level.

- National Board and House of Delegates would combine into a National Leadership Board with 7 at-large members (elected by the entire voting membership) and 6 district representatives (eventually the immediate past chair of each district board of governors voted on by the district members), bolstering the board partner program through a direct connection of the district representatives with the national initiatives and providing for the local voice through their district representatives.
- Regional, State, and Local chapters would combine into 6 districts.
  - boundaries to be determined by the volunteer leaders
  - 8 district governors to be elected by the voting members in the district
  - Ideally there would be one governor elected by the district members from each state represented
  - District governors would elect their officers
  - Districts would be responsible for budgetary oversight; coordination and collaboration of community networks through credentialing, education, member development, and advocacy efforts.
  - A national staff member would be assigned to each district to assist the volunteer leadership in managing the governance and business of the district
- Community networks (at the state and local level) would have an affiliation agreement to use the AHDI name and logo to carry out activities related to credentialing, education, member development, and advocacy.
  - Community organizers for credentialing, education, member development, and advocacy would be selected by the district board of governors to serve on project-specific activities.

a. Projects in these area could include:

Credentialing

- Cert Study groups
- Outreach to encourage MT credentialing to employers, schools, and individuals
- Promote and advocate a fully credentialed workforce

Education

- Provide continuing education to members
- Promote and advocate the education approval program
- Bridge local students into the community/network/chapter
- Promote involvement in association conventions and regional meetings

Member Development

- Recruitment and retention
- Engagement in projects
- Leadership succession
- Promote and encourage student to post-grad to professional and KB associate to profession

Advocacy

- Promote local, regional, and national lobby days
- Organize regional or local Congressional meetings
- Establish strong alliances with allied health associations

*This proposal is an evolving, working document* and the HOD and component leaders will be asked to continue this process at the HOD and Leadership Summit meetings in Austin. Since the 2010 HOD and component leaders will be most familiar with the entire development of this proposal and have contributed greatly to its formation, it would make the most sense that the 2010 HOD vote on this proposal and its resultant resolution(s) before the year ends. Electronic voting makes that entirely feasible. The vote would be in a step-wise fashion, with the ultimate goal of a Bylaws resolution to be voted on by the House of Delegates at the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter meeting with transitional leadership working toward the new governance model with 2011 the target year of implementation/transition.

## **FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**

### **GENERAL MEMBER QUESTIONS**

Q: How would this change help the working AHDI MT?

A: What we hear from the working MT is that they want access to jobs, access to technology and access to understand their future role in the speech recognition/EHR environment, where will they fit in and how to get there. The association, at every level, needs to be able to address these specific issues and build an infrastructure that supports that.

Q: How would local members make contact with other professionals and not get lost in the larger district?

A: Districts would assist local communities to maintain strong contacts with their members and develop group goals based on membership need and alignment with AHDI initiatives.

Q: Would this new structure eliminate meetings as we know them now?

A: Face-to-face meetings would continue and be encouraged. Many members seek face-to-face meetings as a way to network and gain knowledge. From the leadership perspective, meetings also provide leadership growth and member recruitment/retention opportunities. How the content or character of the meetings could evolve and the leadership energy that is spent on meeting organization needs to be further explored and strategized with the leaders of the association.

Q: How would this new governance structure affect the general membership?

A: The idea is to enhance the AHDI member experience through a governance structure that supports raising local exposure to AHDI and raising public awareness of the critical role healthcare documentation professionals play in healthcare delivery. Under this proposal, local-only membership would change; all other membership categories would remain intact.

Q: Is this proposal a “done” deal?

A: No. The basic principles of the proposal need to be reviewed by the leadership and agreed upon to further flesh out some of the more finite details. Funding and district boundaries proposals are still in process. The HOD, with leadership and membership input, will make decisions on how to proceed at Austin ACE 2010.

## **GOVERNANCE**

Q: How many components do we have now?

A:

- State: 15 (will be 12 after new regional formations)
- Regional: 6 including the Online Association (will be 8 after new regional formations)
- Educational/Corporate components: 4
- Local Chapters: 46

Q: How many delegates do we have now?

A: The HOD is comprised of 34 delegates representing states, regionals and members at large with 20 alternates.

Q: Would local, state/regional, educational, corporate components/chapters and the Online Association be dissolved?

A: As proposed, the components' governance structure would evolve to a more centralized picture with administrative tasks performed at the district level. It is not the intention to dissolve the chapters/components connection, interaction or organization of members at any level. By moving the administrative tasks, the proposal aims to strengthen the local relationship by affording component leadership the opportunity to reduce multitasking and provide more options for leadership growth.

Q: Would my component be able to keep its name?

A: We are currently working on that answer as further definition and legal implications of what an informally organized unit or “community” would be versus what we have historically had as a formal “chapter” or component needs to be reviewed.

Q: Would this concept reduce or change volunteers being overwhelmed with tasks?

A: In concept, administrative aspects such as treasury management, recruiting officers and delegates for elections, IRS recording requirements, bylaws, liability insurance, dues collection, member roster management, newsletters, websites could be performed in a more centralized manner at the district level. The goal is to develop grassroots organizers centralized around advancing credentialing, advocacy, education and membership development. There certainly would be more options of how to engage and we would need more organizers than we have now.

Q: How would the “focus groups” or local communities affiliate with AHDI?

A: Community networks would have an affiliation agreement to use the AHDI name and logo to carry out activities related to credentialing, education, member development, and advocacy.

Q: Do we have a draft affiliation agreement.

A: If this proposal moves forward, a draft agreement would be provided.

Q: What is going to happen to my local component?

A: We do not want the groups currently organized to disband. We want them to stay together and strengthen the grassroots. It is anticipated that re-aligning some leadership tasks and roles would encourage innovation to re-vitalize members and externally focus the message of why our industry matters in healthcare delivery.

Q: What would happen to the board members and delegates from the local, state/regional, Online Association, educational and industrial components?

A: In this proposal, the administrative/governance volunteer positions would evolve to the district level. Leaders at every level of the association could run for district positions; they could continue organizing their community/chapter/state, they could run for the national leadership board, they could lead a focus group. The possibilities are many.

Q: Who would approve the final governance structure?

A: The HOD is the group that would vote. It is proposed that the 2010 House of Delegates vote on this concept in a stepwise fashion before the end of the 2010. An implementation timeline is also being explored.

Q: Who would vote on national bylaws in the future if the proposed structure is adopted?

A: National leadership board.

Q: What if a member does not want to join a district?

A: Members of AHDI national would be considered members of the district in which they reside, similar to how it works now for state/regional membership.

Q: What if a component does not want to change their current governance structure and wants to continue to have elected board members?

A: Many good suggestions on how to evolve the components and component leadership have been occurring through the regional webinars and delegate/component leadership discussions we have had since the last town hall on July 14 and the outcome of those discussions will be further reviewed by the HOD and leadership as this proposal evolves at ACE in Austin.

Q: How do international members fit into the district concept?

A: Currently international members are represented by the at-large national directors and this would continue. International member representation is a complex issue and needs to be looked at further. It has been suggested that the international members consider forming an international alliance to better understand the needs of the international members as well as formulate best practices for the varietal nature of international membership needs.

Q: Would there be a duplication of efforts between the new Districts and the existing S/R components or local components?

A: One of the basic principles of the proposal is to reduce duplication of efforts by eliminating redundancies of administrative tasks and re-positioning elected governance positions. It would continue the need for component interaction with members and encourage local community organizing. Overlapping redundancy of website management, group member messaging, newsletter management, component compliance issues, etc. would also be streamlined.

Q: How would educational and corporate components be affiliated with this new governance structure?

A: The educational and corporate components could evolve into alliances or smaller focus groups. They would enter into affiliation agreements just like other groups. How they would work with the districts still needs to be explored.

Q: How does the Online Association fit into the picture?

A: The Online Association is unique in having members across the nation through a virtual connection. We need to explore how we could keep that virtual connection while at the same time reducing administrative redundancies. The members would be represented through the districts; however, the virtual nature of the OA is why people join in the first place so that network needs to be preserved and strengthened.

Q: Would we still have local-only membership option?

A: In the current proposal, local-only membership would no longer be an option; however, how to change the option without losing the connection needs to be further explored.

Q: How many local-only members are there?

A: Not all components offer local-only membership and local-only members do not show up on national rosters. This information would have to be obtained from the components who do offer local-only membership.

## **FUTURE LEADERSHIP ROLES**

Q: How many districts would there be?

A: In the current proposal, 6 districts are being considered.

Q: How would the districts be determined?

A: District formation still needs to be explored and a district boundary subgroup has been formed to address the question and report back at ACE.

Q: Would the district governors be elected or appointed?

A: District governor positions would be voted on by the members of their district with each district having 8 to 10 BOG members (number of governors to be determined by how many states within the district). The BOG would elect its own officers.

Q: What would the district leaders be responsible for?

A: At the district level, leaders would be responsible for administrative tasks of the district with the help of AHDI staff. Most importantly, the district volunteers in total would be part of a larger vision of success through creation of community groups working in concert within the districts and across the nation on the four basic AHDI initiatives – credentialing, advocacy, education and membership development.

Q: What is meant by the National Leadership Board? Who is on this? How would they be elected?

A:

- The national leadership board would be comprised of one district director from each of the 6 districts (elected by the members of the district) and 7 at-large directors (elected by the general membership of AHDI) for a total of 13 members of the National Leadership Board.
- The NLB would elect the NLB executive board.
- Any director (at-large or district) could run for an executive position on the NLB board; however, the district directors would change yearly so a natural progression for a district director would be to run for an at-large director position should they wish to serve at an executive level that requires a longer term in office. Also, during the year the district director is on the NLB, a primary function would be that of being the voice of the district to/from the NLB.
- This structure would replace our current Board of Directors and House of Delegates in scope and responsibility.

Q: What is meant by Strategic Leadership Forum (SLF)? Who is a part of this? How would they be elected? What would they do?

A:

- The SLF would be comprised of district governors, focus group leaders/ambassadors, and national workgroup/SIGs/standing committee members and AHDI staff.
- The district governors would be elected by the members of their respective districts.

- The focus group leaders, et al, would be selected by the district leadership.
- The AHDI national workgroups/SIGs/standing committee members would be selected by the AHDI NLB president or president-elect.
- Staff would be assigned/directed by CEO.
- The SLF purpose would be to develop cohesive strategies to advance AHDI initiatives, to share best practices, and to build success of the organization.

Q: What would the future role of the delegate going to be? What would the future role of the component leader going to be?

A: Huge opportunities exist for delegates and component leaders to continue their leadership service to AHDI members; to name just a few, delegates or component leaders could run for a district governor position, be a field organizer at the state level or local community within the district, be a leader of a special interest group at any level, develop an alliance, or run for an at-large national board leadership position.

## **ELECTIONS**

Q: How would these changes affect the component elections for 2011?

A: Through recent discussion, it has been suggested that all components continue to look toward filling board positions and anticipate having elections. Those voted in for 2011 may become transitional leadership positions should the proposal be approved. The outcome at ACE 2010 will further delineate the answer about elections for 2011.

Q: How would the district governors be decided?

A: District governors would be elected by the AHDI voting members within their district.

Q: How would the executive team of the district governors be decided?

A: The district governor board would elect their executive team. Any governor within the district could run for executive office.

Q: How would the 7 national leadership board positions be elected?

A: General election by members with voting rights.

Q: How would the national leadership board executive team be elected?

A: The NLB would elect their executive team.

Q: Who can run for an executive position at the national leadership board?

A: Any national leadership board member can run for an executive NLB position. The district governors on the NLB would be in a 1-year term so it is anticipated they would run for an at-large director position if they wished to run for president-elect. The primary responsibility of the district directors on the NLB would be something akin to a chapter representative to the NLB at a district level.

## **TERMS OF OFFICE**

Q: What about terms of office? At the National Leadership Board level? District governor level?

A: Terms of office (*proposed*):

- Districts: District Governor: Two-year terms, not to exceed 2 consecutive terms. District governor/officer/executive position: 1 year, with 3 years anticipated for chair-elect, chair and immediate past chair. The immediate past chair would move to the NLB for 1 year. Accommodations would have to be made for the IPP BOG position the first year of implementation.
- National leadership board (NLB): National directors at large: Three-year terms, not to exceed 2 consecutive terms. NLB officer/executive board: 1 year positions, with 3 years anticipated for president-elect, president and IPP. District NLB director: 1 year.

### **ANNUAL MEETINGS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION CREDITS**

Q: Would there still be annual meetings in my state?

A: Districts would be responsible for running the business of the district. The districts would not necessarily be responsible for running annual meetings. Face-to-face meetings in states or local areas coordinated through the district would be of great value and encouraged, ultimately with more alignment brought to the planning process so areas do not compete for attendance but instead work in a coordinated fashion to enhance exposure.

Q: Would we still have national AHDl annual meetings as we know them?

A: Yes.

### **FINANCES/FUNDING**

Q: How would we fund the national leadership board?

A: The members of the national leadership board (district directors and directors at large) would be funded as AHDl national board members are now by the national organization.

Q: How would we fund district leaders to strategic leadership forum?

A: Districts would fund leaders to the strategic leadership forum.

Q: Who would fund the chairs of national committees, alliances, SIGs and workgroups to the strategic leadership forum?

A: How the national committees, alliances, SIGs and workgroups evolve still has to be looked at, to include funding questions.

Q: Where would AHDl national staff roles connect?

A: There has been discussion on how staff could assist with bookkeeping tasks and how a centralized alignment of volunteers within a district could be re-aligned with staff. The evolution of the staff role with the districts will become more clear as the district concept develops and through the subgroup looking at the funding portion of the proposal.

Q: What about current local/state/regional component treasuries?

A: What is currently being explored is that monies raised on behalf of the members at the local/state/regional levels (member equity) be pooled into the districts (as has been happening with regionals now) and budgets constructed. Component leaders are encouraged to participate in further exploration of this topic.

Q: How would we fund this proposal?

A: It has been proposed that a smaller group look at the funding options to include exploring the viability of a membership dues increase, evolving to split-level dues collected at the national level, component event revenue, how to handle current treasuries, how communities would receive funding for projects, AHDI staff roles, and other specifics related to funding. The subgroup working with AHDI staff would have a timeline to come back to the delegates with a funding proposal.