

1. Creation of a new nonprofit. This organization would be the NC ACH and would have the Governing Board as its board of directors. It would (eventually if not initially) provide the necessary backbone functions, either through its own staff or through agreements with ACH partners. Presumably it would be a 501c3 corporation. Several other regions are also moving in this direction. The by-laws of the corporation would be the NC ACH's bylaws. The organization would draw on the capacities of ACH partners through contracts or memos of understanding – it would not be a tiny naked non-profit attempting to do everything for itself. But it would avoid the confusions that could occur if the ACH was part of a larger organization. Although the nature and functions of an ACH can be expected to evolve, an independent nonprofit would be flexible enough to adapt. This idea was recommended by our Backbone Workgroup.

Leaving aside for the moment the possibility of an interim backbone organization, please indicate your views on this idea:

6-Support this idea.

0-Oppose this idea.

0-Have no preference.

2-More discussion is required before I can take a position on this idea.

Comments:

- I support the creation of a new nonprofit. For those that are not experienced in forming organizations it is not expensive or time consuming to form the entity, and it does not obligate us to any particular set of decisions around the role and responsibilities the NCACH will and will not play in the future. What it does provide is a legal structure for us to operate within as we make decisions that will shape the role of the NCACH. Creating a new nonprofit and requesting tax exempt status from the IRS are separate steps. I believe it is premature to request tax exempt status until we have more clarity about what, if any revenue will be received by NCACH.
- Developing a new 501c3:
 - gives a unique identify to NCACH and a new and fresh perspective.
 - maintains current positive and collegial relationships with existing partners; reduces misperceptions of “being taken over” by any existing agency or animosity of one agency being selected over another.
 - helps the new 501c3 become efficient and effective more quickly because it is not slowed down by existing agency processes, policies or problems.
- I think this is best course and Inevitable that the ACH needs to be an independent organization and take on the backbone functions. The question of me is timing and clarity on the work and functions of the ACH. I have been concerned from the get go that so much effort has gone into governance and organizational development prior to clarity regarding role, function and strategic intent for the organization. While I would be skeptical of a full blown “strategic planning” effort, I tend to think in terms of five year goals, milestones, and critical success factors. I would support the board getting greater clarity on these things.
- The only concern is time to create the new nonprofit.
- Generally support but more information is needed.

2. *Interim backbone organization. If we did create a new nonprofit, it would take some time for it to get organized. The concept of an interim backbone host organization (presumably one of the ACH partners) has been suggested as a way to provide administrative backbone functions for 6 months or so while the nonprofit gets organized. In a practical sense this would mean that one of our partner organizations would accept the HCA funding (\$150K) we expect to get once we're officially designated as an ACH late this year or early in 2016. Any staff hired during the interim period would be employees of the interim backbone host organization, and that organization would expend other ACH funds for purposes such as meeting expenses. If we receive any other funds during the interim period (for example, for health care improvement initiatives) they would also go to the interim backbone organization. We would have to create an agreement with the interim backbone host organization providing that NC ACH funds and staffing would be controlled by the NC ACH Governing Board, and that any fund balances held by the host for the ACH would be transferred to the ACH nonprofit when the Governing Board determined the time was right for that. No doubt there will be other important details to work out; here I am just wanting to outline the concept. Note that I am not raising the question of which host organization should be used; I'm thinking we'll get to that if we have consensus on the need for one.*

Please indicate whether you believe that we should use an interim backbone host organization:

5-Support this idea.

0-Oppose this idea

0-Have no preference.

3-More discussion is required before I can take a position on this idea.

Comments:

- I feel that more discussion is needed before we select an interim backbone organization for the second round of funding. I have some concern that our energies are being expended primarily to receive the HCA funding opportunities, and then comply with those funding requirements. Getting taxpayer money and then spending it exclusively on administrative efforts is not a noble purpose worthy of our time. Waiting for clear guidance from HCA on how to build a coordinated delivery system in NCW will prove fruitless. We need to decide whether it is our intent to take a leadership role in the develop of the role of ACH, or take a wait and see approach. If our intent is to take a wait and see approach I question why we applied for early adopter funds. Since we applied for early adopter funds I suggest we clarify what value we think NCACH can offer to the residents of our 4 county area, and then we push and promote HCA to support efforts that we believe will benefit the health of our communities.
- Am not sure how effective an organization would be taking on this work for such a short term unless they are already actively performing some of it and I don't see an agency currently involved with NCACH development coming forward with immediately available resources. The expectations over the 6 months would need to be specific and attainable. This would be a good topic to discuss.

- It makes sense that we would do this to allow us sufficient time to form the new organization and to put appropriate thought into the purpose and goals of the organization.
- My suggestion would be to have an existing backbone organization as the interim as we are moving at a fast pace.

3. *Renaming Regional Council. This is a simpler one. Some other ACHs are calling a group of this kind a Leadership Council. I think this better expresses our intention, which is that this group become a vehicle for a broad range of partners to be involved in ACH leadership and decision making. Please indicate whether you agree with the idea of renaming the Regional Council the Leadership Council:*

6-Support this idea.

0-Oppose this idea.

1-Have no preference.

0-More discussion is required before I can take a position on this idea.

Comments:

- I support the idea of renaming the regional council to leadership council, and I don't feel strongly about it one way or the other.
- The title "Leadership Council" aligns with the expectations of this group (providing direction for Governing Board consideration) and it provides a better definition of the team.
- I don't have a strong preference but if this is more consistent with other ACHs, by all means. I think "Leadership" is a slightly more compelling name. See below for more thoughts and caveats.

4. *Initiating the Regional/Leadership Council. Whatever we call it, a functional Council will be crucial to our ability to meaningfully include a wider variety of partners than are included in the Governing Board. In a sense, the need for an effective Council is the corollary of the small-board approach we have adopted. Several important decisions and a considerable amount of work are needed to make the Regional/Leadership Council a reality. I am proposing that we ask Peter Morgan and Jesus Hernandez to take on the task of creating and populating the Council. Accordingly, they would be the initial occupants of the two non-voting seats we included on the Governing Board to represent the Council. Peter and Jesus, in preliminary discussions, have indicated they are probably willing to take this on. Please indicate your views on this below:*

6-Support this idea.

0-Oppose this idea.

0-Have no preference.

2-More discussion is required before I can take a position on this idea.

Comments:

- I support the idea of a regional council, and I feel that more discussion is needed to clarify roles before that group begins to meet. Is the NCACH Board giving the regional council clear direction, or is the Board asking the regional council for recommendations as to what our purpose and priorities ought to be?
- No doubts - Peter and Jesus would do a superb job pulling together a Leadership Council. It would help them to have the Leadership Council's purpose, communication pathways, and position in the NCACH structure clearly defined. Would also help to have some baseline membership competencies or "job descriptions" for the members. Also, some council expectations in regards to work outcomes – who will perform the work that supports the Council vs. what the Council will produce itself. A core group of dependable members with a mix of necessary Leadership Council competencies would be better than an ongoing open door policy with individuals coming and going.
- I presume they would do this work subject to the advice and consent of the GB.
- With good guidance from the Governing Board as to make up, especially with respect to representation from all Counties.
- I support this idea but think we should be formally charged by a board resolution to take on the design work and that whatever we do is advisory to the board. As with the ACH, I think the role, function and composition of the Leadership Council will require considerable definition. This is also true of the way in which the Council will relate to the CHIs and the Board. I'm happy to partner with Jesus on this and to work collaboratively with the Board to get the Council established and think want to be clear that it will ultimately be the Board's decision.
- I'd like to highlight functional & effective Council as I believe it is a must moving forward.
- Support this idea, but more information is needed.