

**Topic:** Coalition Board Structure

**List Serve Question:** How is your Board of Directors structured? What are the pros/cons of its structure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| State | Type of structure | Additional details and comments |
| Arizona | Mixed Board for over 10 years | Brings a diversity of opinions and perspectives to the Board, stronger fundraising capacity |
| California | Mixed Board for 10 years; total of 21 Board members: 7r egional member reps, Board appointed community members, and member-elected at-large members | Ability to be more strategic about skills and diversity needed on the Board, as well as getting energy on the Board; connections with other social justice movements are stronger now as well |
| Georgia | Mixed Board since 2010; total of 21 Board members10 members and 11 community membersBy Laws state that 51% of member programs are represented on the Board | Having a variety of voices and perspectives is an advantage; fundraising has increased; expertise among board members is an asset |
| Illinois | Mixed Board since 2012; total of 17 Board members5 member reps, 2 at large, 10 allies | Advantages are better fiscal oversight, fundraising, less potential for conflict of interest |
| Kentucky | Mixed Board for 1 year; total of 17 Board members, 9 community members, 8 programs | Breadth of diversity increased, broader perspectives; needs time to orient and educate new Board members |
| MA /Jane Doe  | Mixed Board for over 18 years; 12 total members, 7 are member programs and 5 are community members | More skills, connections to other arenas outside of the membership; does take time to explain the info and acronyms etc to the mixed board |
| Mississippi | Mixed Board for 6 years, starting this year it will include 5 member programs and 6 community members | More and different voices and perspectives at the table; could be hard finding community members who are invested enough in the mission |
| New Hampshire | Mixed Board for over 25 years, total 13 Board members,2 of whom are from member programs (we can have up to 4 from member programs) | Broader skill set on the board, ability to fundraise and be connected to the community |
| Oklahoma | Mixed Board for 1 year (since 2017), total of 5 Board members; 3 community and 2 programs | Access to resources, no conflict of interest, diversity, focus is on sustainability and long term vision |
| Pennsyvlania | Mixed Board 1/3 is program EDs and 2/3 community board members | Because we are a funder, the bylaws ensure that the majority of the board is made up of community members  |
| Rhode Island | Mixed Board for 24 years; > 51% of the board is made up of community members | Brought credibility and objectivity as a pass through funder; greater skill set on the Board, diversity of all kinds |
| South Carolina | Mixed Board for 3 years; 10 community members and 3 member programs (which would include 1 SA, 1 DV and 1 either) | It has created more flexibility and creativity and less conflict of interest; it is hard to get people from all over the state though |
| Washington | Mixed Board for 3 years | Significantly increased diversity; now 2/3 is native or people of color; more energy and creativity |
| West Virginia | Mixed Board for 2 years; 8 member programs and 7 community members | Increased diversity and legal and financial expertise on the Board; expanded stateside presence; people actually volunteer to do things! |
| Wisconsin | Mixed Board since 2013, 15 members total; 51% are members, so there are 8 member programs and 7 community members | We now have a range of expertise on the Board, such as accounting, HR, attorney, and more fundraising opportunities |

This information was self reported by Coalitions in August 2018.