



**TO:** AUPHA Membership  
**FROM:** Gerald L. Glandon, PhD, President and CEO  
**RE:** Suggestions for Revision of Board Participation  
**DATE:** May 7, 2019

On behalf of the AUPHA Board of Directors, I am sending this memo to all members to begin a conversation regarding changes in who can serve as a member of the AUPHA Board of Directors. Starting as far back as October 2017, the Board has considered changing policy that limits Board membership to faculty from full member programs. A series of robust discussions by the Board revealed divided perspectives on the change. Both sides possess compelling arguments thus the Board suggested we distribute a proposal for inspection and let all members read, contemplate and comment. Further, we would like this to be a topic of debate during the Business Meeting in June. The specific questions to address have two components:

Recommendation 1: Modify AUPHA bylaws to enable a limited and specified number of faculty from a variety of membership categories to assume Board seats going forward.

Recommendation 2: Explicitly specify in the AUPHA bylaws that only faculty from Full Member programs can assume leadership roles on the Board

The specified number of Board members from the various categories of membership being considered:

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. Full Member Programs                      | No less than 10 |
| Graduate and Undergraduate                   |                 |
| 2. Associate Member Programs                 | No more than 1  |
| 3. Affiliate Member Programs (Practitioners) | No more than 3  |
| 4. Individual Members                        | No more than 1  |
| 5. International Members                     | No more than 1  |
| 6. President/CEO                             | No more than 1  |

### Background

AUPHA membership currently extends beyond what has been the traditional full member, e.g., CAHME accredited graduate programs and AUPHA certified undergraduate programs. In the 2019 Annual Report, you will see that while traditional full members at over 120 are still in the majority, we have more than 110 associate programs (111) along with over 120 individual members and a small number of doctoral and international member programs.

Currently, only faculty from full member programs are allowed to run for a seat on the Board of Directors. Other faculty pay dues and their faculty can serve on committees, attend and present at our professional meetings, publish in our *Journal* and otherwise participate in AUPHA activities. This policy regarding Board participation is not actually specified in the AUPHA bylaws but has been the policy of AUPHA for many years. For example, we currently allow up to three “practitioners” to serve on the Board thus violating the Full member constraint in any case. The bylaws do specify, however, that only full member programs vote on “matters placed before AUPHA members” and this will not change. These three specifically designated items (defined in Article VI, Section 10) include:

1. approval of the Association’s bylaws or any alterations, revisions or amendments thereto,
2. election of the Board of Directors, and
3. the election of those Association officers subject to election by the membership.

Furthermore, the language in Article VI, Sections 3 c, 4 c, 5 c, 6 c, and 7 c clearly empowers the Board to determine who can serve on the Board. The language “Other benefits and services made available ..... shall be established from time to time by the Association’s Board of Directors.” The Board can decide to give other categories of membership the right to serve on the Board. Despite this authority granted to the Board of Directors, current Board members believe that historical policy has precedent thus want membership to offer their perspectives.

### Pros and Cons

There are a host of arguments on both sides of this issue. On the support side is the desire to be inclusive. All dues paying member groups should have a voice on the Board and thus be included in the shared decisions of the membership organization. They represent a substantial number of organizations, programs and faculty thus should be included. In the past, the restriction on Board participation was designed to create an incentive for programs to seek accreditation and certification. Today, however, many programs do not have and will not attain either. The limitations on resources or the alternatives available make accreditation and certification less essential in their view. A notable example are public health programs with Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) accreditation that don’t need the added cost and effort of another accreditation process. By limiting Board participation to full member programs, we foster the view by those excluded

Those opposing the proposition point out that this change dilutes the influence of accredited or certified full member programs. Sharing power with those that have not undergone the rigorous quality review processes associated with accreditation and certification should be the dominant leaders of the field. Further, these full programs pay greater dues thus having the option for their faculty to occupy seats on the Board represent a value to these members.

If AUPHA moves forward with this proposal, it will involve specific changes to our bylaws and a formal vote by membership. This is not being proposed yet. You can link to the [AUPHA Board Participation Survey](#) to record your opinions for or against the proposed changes. We will synthesize comments and present during the Business Meeting.

cc: AUPHA Board of Directors