

**Environmental Scan of
Governance and Funding Models in
Federated Not-for-Profit Organizations**

Prepared for the
Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators

by

*Parker-Tailon Consulting Inc.
May 2013*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

1.0 Introduction/Background..... 1

2.0 Approach..... 1

3.0 Literature Review Findings 2

 3.1 Definition of governance 2

 3.2 Models of governance..... 2

 3.3 Trends/best practices in governance..... 6

 3.4 Current Alliance governance model 8

4.0 Findings from Review of Selected Professions 9

 4.1 Information from national comparator organizations..... 9

 4.2 Information from national federations of regulatory authorities 11

 4.3 Key informant interviews 12

5.0 Analysis..... 16

6.0 Summary and Next Steps..... 17

Appendix A: Key Informant Interview Guide 19

Appendix B: List of Key Informants 21

Appendix C: Information from selected national organizations 22

Appendix D: Information from selected national federations of regulatory authorities ... 25

Executive Summary

The Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators (the Alliance) is currently undertaking a governance review as part of their Strategic Planning initiatives. This present governance review was precipitated by:

- A need to review the present governance system having experienced its strengths and limitations for over 8 years.
- An examination of funding requirements to support the future operations of the Alliance.
- A sense that changes in funding requirements and changes in governance might be inter-related, suggesting that the two topics should be addressed together.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an external environmental scan of current models, trends and “best practices” in governance/funding from the literature and from similar umbrella/federated not-for-profit organizations. The goal is to gain a better understanding of strengths and challenges of various models, as well as lessons learned and begin to identify elements for future consideration by the Alliance within the context of a governance review. This report will provide background information for the Alliance Board discussions on governance at their May 9, 2013 meeting.

The approach used to develop this paper involved three key activities which included: 1. A focused literature review; 2. A review of selected organizations using internet search and key informant interviews; and 3. Analysis of the findings according to common themes. The literature review provides a definition of governance and a description of five governance models. This is followed by a summary of governance information from selected national comparator organizations and national federations of regulatory authorities obtained through internet searching/key informant interviews. The summary of findings from key informant interviews includes what works well; challenges; and interesting/emerging practices.

The analysis of the findings revealed congruity in a number of themes related governance practices and are presented in the following table. **It should be noted that these themes summarize what was learned during this investigation and are not intended as specific recommendations for the Alliance.**

Summary of Themes in Governance Practices Identified in this Review	
Governance Practice Area	Themes Identified
Mandate of organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the literature and the key informant interviews suggested that having a clear mandate is useful in identifying the most appropriate governance structure. In other words, “form needs to follow function”.
Size and composition of Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the size of boards in the organizations examined varied considerably (from 10-42 members), the literature suggested a trend toward smaller boards (e.g., 8-12 people). Smaller boards are seen to be more effective, focused, and nimble in decision-making which is important in a constantly changing environment. The desire for smaller boards was echoed in the key informant interviews. • The literature suggested that there is no ‘perfect’ size for boards and different boards have different needs. What is important is to achieve a balance between enough members to ensure the necessary mix of skills, experience, and diversity of perspectives, while ensuring the board can function effectively. • Ensuring geographical representation on the board is an important consideration. This may not necessarily mean one or more representatives per jurisdiction. While the majority of the organizations examined have at least one representative per jurisdiction, a regional approach to geographical representation was also identified.
Selection and nomination of Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the literature and key informant interviews indicated longer terms for board members assists in promoting collaboration and maintaining focus/momentum. • The key informant interviews suggested that board members with experience at the jurisdictional level can help to minimize the learning curve at the federation level and better understand the culture of the organization. • The literature and key informant interviews suggested that board member orientation and training are useful in developing effective and committed board members.

Summary of Themes in Governance Practices Identified in this Review	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature suggested a collaborative approach to the nomination process to ensure the desired mix of board members (e.g., member organizations making appointments consult with the federation about the skills/experience needed in new board members).
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the national regulatory federations examined have an executive committee. The key informant interviews suggested that due to the large size of some boards, frequently the Executive Committee fulfils the functions of a board.
Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature indicated that federations benefit from clear decision-making processes based on shared leadership, consensus building and accurate, timely information. A consensus-based approach to decision-making is used by the majority of the organizations examined. Both the literature and the key informants indicated that decision-making through consensus promotes trust and collaboration.
Fees/Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key informant interviews indicated that ensuring sufficient resources is important to support, sustain, and grow the organization's activities. A trend towards organizational operations being funded by member fees was noted in the national regulatory federations examined. Other activities are generally seen to be self-supporting and do not contribute to the operational budget (e.g., credentialing). In the majority of the national regulatory federations examined, membership fees are charged per capita of registrants in the jurisdiction. To manage discrepancies between larger and smaller jurisdictions, two of the organizations examined indicated they use a sliding scale approach that has per capita contribution levels.
Board Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature and key informant interviews indicated that building a culture of shared values, trust and respect facilitates effective board functioning. The literature and key informant interviews indicated that balancing the interests of the federation with that of the jurisdictions contributes to a positive board culture. The literature and key informant interviews indicated that effective and efficient communication mechanisms ensure members are well informed.
Role of the Registrars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key informant interviews indicated that Registrars, who are seen to be very knowledgeable about regulatory issues and responsible for jurisdictional implementations, need to have some type of direct relationship with the board. This was attained in these organizations through Registrar membership on the board or via a communication system.

In summary, as one author notes, “Each federation must consider its history, mission, culture and capacity in order to design the best possible governance structure and processes”.¹ As a result, four next steps are offered for the Alliance’s consideration in moving forward with their governance review including:

1. Determine the present and emerging mandate(s) of the Alliance. The governance structure should have the elements required to efficiently and effectively support and sustain these directions.
2. Gain an understanding of the present governance limitations from all key stakeholders to guide changes or modifications to current elements and processes.
3. Consider the findings of this paper which highlights themes in governance practices and what works well in other similar organizations to identify elements for a “preferred governance model” which will address limitations identified in the current Alliance governance structure and support future directions.
4. Develop a transitional plan which includes a specific time period for implementation of the new governance structure and a period of time at which the model will be evaluated to see if it is meeting the intended needs.

¹ Mollenhauer, L. (2009). A framework for success for not for profit federations revised. Available at: <http://www.theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Federations-Framework-for-Success-for-Nonprofit-Federations-November-2009.pdf>.

1.0 Introduction/Background

The Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators (the Alliance) is currently undertaking a governance review as part of their Strategic Planning initiatives. This present governance review was precipitated by:

- A need to review the present governance system having experienced its strengths and limitations for over 8 years.
- An examination of funding requirements to support the future operations of the Alliance.
- A sense that changes in funding requirements and changes in governance might be inter-related, suggesting that the two topics should be addressed together.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an external environmental scan of current models, trends and best practices in governance/funding models from the literature and from similar umbrella/federated not-for-profit organizations. The goal is to gain a better understanding of strengths and challenges of various models, as well as lessons learned and begin to identify elements for future consideration by the Alliance within the context of a governance review. This report will provide background information for the Alliance Board discussions on governance at their May 9, 2013 meeting.

2. Approach

The approach used to develop this paper involved three key activities. The following provides a description of the activities:

Activity 1 Focused Literature Review

Due to the time constraints for this project, a focused search was conducted to identify articles/reports that reviewed the literature related to governance models and best practices. In addition, key historic documents from the previous Alliance governance review were examined. Reference lists of review articles were also scanned for other possible references. All relevant articles/reports were reviewed for key issues and best practices related to governance and funding models in not for profit organizations.

Activity 2 Review of Selected Organizations

Information on issues and practices related to governance and funding models was gathered from a number of selected organizations as follows:

- On-line searching of the websites and email follow-up where required from various types of national organizations including: the Canadian Healthcare Association, Canadian Cancer Society, Heart and Stroke Association, Canadian Medical Association, Canadian Nurses Association and the Canadian Public Health Association.
- On-line searching of the websites from national federations of regulatory organizations including: the National Association of Pharmacy Regulatory Authorities, Engineers Canada, Federation of Law Societies of Canada, Association of Canadian Occupational Therapy Regulatory Organizations, the Federation of Medical Regulatory Authorities of Canada, Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Alliance.
- Key informant interviews were conducted with five individuals involved with federations of regulatory organizations including National Association of Pharmacy Regulatory Authorities (NAPRA), Engineers Canada, Federation of Law Societies of Canada (FLSC), the Federation of Medical Regulatory Authorities of Canada (FMRAC) and the Alliance. Two additional regulatory federations were contacted for key informant

interviews (Association of Canadian Occupational Therapy Regulatory Organizations (ACOTRO) and Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA). However, despite repeated follow-up the interviews were unable to be scheduled. A copy of the Key Informant Interview Guide is found in Appendix A and a list of Key Informants in Appendix B.).

Activity 3 Analysis and Report Preparation

The Consultants reviewed the findings from each of the activities individually and identified key themes. The key themes from the two activities were then analyzed for areas of commonality and recommendations were developed. A draft report was prepared and submitted to the *Alliance Key Contact* for feedback. The document will be revised based on the feedback received on the draft report.

3.0 Literature Review Findings

3.1 Definition of Governance

A paper on governance prepared by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) indicates that the concept of governance is not new, but rather is as old as civilization itself. They define governance as “the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented).² The Institute of Governance (IOG) suggests that the complexity of governance is difficult to capture in a simple definition.³ The IOG indicates that the need for governance exists anytime a group of people come together to accomplish an end. They propose that, although there are many definitions of governance in the literature, most include three dimensions: authority; decision-making, and accountability. The IOG’s working definition of governance reflects these three dimensions and states, “Governance determines who has power, who makes decisions, how other players make their voice heard, and how account is rendered”. They conclude that the ultimate purpose of good governance is to “realize organizational and societal goals”.³

3.2 Models of Governance

While each individual organization’s specific governance structure is unique, researchers have uncovered broad trends in how organizations are organized. Using this information, they have created several generic models of governance that can be used to guide discussions of this topic. Table 1 summarizes five types of not-for-profit governance models described in the literature. It should be noted that in practice, these models are not mutually exclusive. For example, an organization using a federation model could also incorporate elements of the policy governance and constituent/representative models into their governance structure and processes.

² United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. What is Good Governance. Author. Available on-line at <http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp>

³ Institute of Governance. (2013). Defining Governance. Author, Ottawa. Available on-line at <http://iog.ca/defining-governance/>.

Name of Model	Policy Governance (“Carver”) Model	Constituent/ Representative Model	Entrepreneurial Board Model	Emergent Cellular Model	Federation Model
Key Features of the Model	-An approach that defines and guides appropriate relationships between organization's owners, board of directors, and chief executive. Provides a clear differentiation between governance and management responsibilities.	-Model with a clear link between board and constituents who are usually represented on the board and participate in policy planning and development. -board size is between 15 and 40 members. Elections follow strict rules and regulations.	-Business or corporate model which has a focus on competition, market share, rewards, and dominance. -The board is elected by “Investors” who are proportionally represented in a shareholder structure.	-Model where the organization is distributed into self-managed teams that communicate well and often. This style of governance is very flexible and responsive to new information. -The size of the board is 6-10 elected at the AGM.	-Model involves a federation of regional bodies and a national body that share a mission. -Some are more centralized than others.
Type of organization this model is used for	-Used for solitary organizations. The board is focused on stewardship, and is a familiar option used by many types of non-profit organizations.	-Used for organizations where constituents demand access to the board.	-Used in industries and areas where innovation and being able to react to the market are paramount concerns.	-Used in organizations where being flexible and quick to respond is a top priority. Using technology to coordinate geographically disparate groups is also a major feature of this model.	-Used to coordinate complex organizations that have regional chapters or divisions.
Advantages of this Model	-Increased clarity of roles -Increased accountability -Connects board and stakeholders -Satisfying for board leaders	-Broad base of participation and decentralized power -Emergent, inclusive vision -Action oriented committees -An emphasis on communication	-Participants’ efforts are clearly focused on achieving the organization’s goals. -Emphasizes efficient and effective processes. -Widespread sensitivity to the environment around the organization.	-Very adaptable to changing internal and external issues. -Capacity for dissolving unneeded elements. -Rich communication. -Decision making based on power sharing and mutual interdependence	-Creates a more equal playing field for all parts of the country. -Forces consensus of decisions rather than a head office approach. -Attracts local volunteers. -High regional visibility.

⁴ References: Policy Governance, Constituent/Representative, Entrepreneurial and Emergent Cellular Models - Bradshaw, Hayday and Armstrong, (2007); Federation Model: Mollenhauer (2009).

Name of Model	Policy Governance (“Carver”) Model	Constituent/ Representative Model	Entrepreneurial Board Model	Emergent Cellular Model	Federation Model
	-Empowers CEO -Board works with the ‘big picture’ and ensures resources are adequate	-Focus on big picture -Balancing competing interests and stakeholders leads to creativity	-Resources are committed to discovering and implementing best practices.	-High capacity for partnerships -Issues driven planning balancing local and global issues	-Responsive to local needs -Each organization legally accountable for its own actions
Challenges of the model	-Disconnection between board and staff -Disconnection between board and operations -Staff often mistrust board due to disconnections and weak links between policies, operations, and outcomes -Board can overrule the role of others, leading to very concentrated power	-Communication can fail to meet standards of constituents -Energy can be spread too thinly, leading some committees to become unproductive -Vision can lose focus due to board members turn over and other constituency matters becoming higher priority -Conflicts can damage board relationships -Tendency towards self-preservation of individuals at expense of shared interests -Requires legal contract	-Lack of focused attention on common interests and social concerns -The quality of inter-organizational partnerships are measured by returns to investors, not to the collective benefit to consumers -Broad-based societal needs are discounted -Organizational horizons are too short create systemic social and community changes	-Few examples and limited literature -Requires strong board and staff leadership -Significant negotiations -Hard to implement in a pre-existing organization -Problematic for organizations that require stable environments -The above disadvantages are theoretical, as this is still a new model and there is very limited data on the long-term impacts of adopting it.	-Role confusion can render a federation ineffective through duplication, turf wars, or some duties ‘falling through the cracks’ -Undervaluing of the national office -National board of directors has little power to make autonomous decisions
Additional Info	-Is focused on stability and maintaining the status quo and is increasingly being seen as a weaker model.	-The CEO/board relationship mirrors the policy governance model, though it is vulnerable to changing expectations and being unclearly defined.	-The Chair of the board often also acts as the CEO. These organizations are also often focused on the short-term.	-Specifically meant to combat the inertia that often slows down organizations over time.	.

While devising a governance framework for the Canadian Health Network, a team of academics theorized that there were two main scales, or axis, on which governance structures could be judged, and the resulting paper is the basis for the first four models in the table.⁵ The horizontal axis measures how “established” or “innovative” an organization is. Some groups are always experimenting with new methods of accomplishing their goals (innovative) while others are focused on perpetuating both certain ways of doing things and the organization itself (established). The vertical axis measures whether an organization is more unitary, consisting of a sole organization, or pluralistic, being made up of a group or network of related organizations. By looking at where organizations fell along these axes, the researchers were able to determine four basic governance models (see Table 1 for details):

- *Policy Governance Model*, an establishment-oriented single organization,
- *Constituency/Representative Model*, an establishment-oriented pluralistic organization,
- *Entrepreneurial Model*, an innovative single organization, and
- *Emergent Cellular Model*, an innovative pluralistic (network) organization.⁵

The fifth model in the chart is the *Federation Model*, which is described by Mollenhauer (2009).⁶ The federation model is complex and its features vary widely from one organization to the next, but at its core, a federation is an organization with a national body and several subsidiary or regional bodies that share a mission and clearly delineated lines of responsibility (see Table 1 for details). This is the model that is the closest to how the Alliance currently functions as the members are autonomous bodies while the Alliance has its own role in supporting those organizations.

In terms of deciding on the best model of governance for an organization, Mollenhauer (2009) notes that “there is no one model that is the best choice for federations. Each federation must consider its history, mission, culture and capacity in order to design the best possible structure and processes (p.7).” The IOG also agrees that governance is a highly contextual concept and note that “the governance process and practices will vary significantly, given the environment in which they are applied. Even within various sectors, size, shape, form and function will vary greatly from one organization to the next. When working in the field of governance, one operates in an area *where one size does (never) not fit all.*”⁷ A similar statement is made in a 2004 report prepared for the Alliance,

It remains that an organization needs to determine what suits its needs based on a myriad of factors. Decisions related to the selection of models consider factors including but not limited to the stage of development of the organization, the degrees of accountability required, and the mission and purpose of the organization. A more hands-on approach to governance is required when organizations are in the early development phase and is often replaced with a more strategic approach as the organization grows. The challenge is to recognize the stages of growth and adjust governance practices accordingly (p.11).⁸

⁵ Bradshaw, P & Hayday, B. (2007). Non-profit governance models: Problems and Prospects. The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal. Volume 12(3) Article 5. Available at: <http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style/bradshaw5final.pdf>.

⁶ Mollenhauer, L. (2009). A framework for success for not for profit federations revised. Available at: <http://www.theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Federations-Framework-for-Success-for-Nonprofit-Federations-November-2009.pdf>.

⁷ Institute of Governance. (2013). Defining Governance. Author, Ottawa. Available on-line at <http://iog.ca/defining-governance/>.

⁸ Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators. (2004). Organizational Governance: An Overview. Author, Toronto.

3.3 Trends/Best Practices in Governance

According to the UNESCAP paper on governance, there are eight major characteristics of good governance including:

- Participation: providing all men and women with a voice in decision making either directly or through representatives. Participation needs to be informed and organized.
- Transparency: information is freely available and decision making follows rules and regulations.
- Responsiveness: of institutions and processes to stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe.
- Consensus orientated: differing interests are mediated to reach a broad consensus on what is in the general interest.
- Equity and inclusiveness: opportunities to become involved.
- Effectiveness and efficiency: processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.
- Accountability: of organization to its stakeholders.
- Rule of law: requires fair legal frameworks that are enforced impartially.⁹

A report prepared for the Alliance in 2004, outlines some “best practice” components of good governance based on the literature including:

- A high degree of key stakeholder agreement on mission and values
- Appropriate representation of different stakeholders
- Role clarity and clear lines of accountability
- Positive working relationships between board, management and staff
- A process for monitoring achievement of objectives
- A balance between stability and flexible response to environmental change
- Respect for organizational norms (p.5).¹⁰

A key element in looking at trends/best practices in governance is the role and characteristics of the board. According to John Carver, “We must ascertain what the board exists to accomplish; form follows function.”¹¹ A literature review by Comforth (1996) identifies four main board functions including:

- *Strategic leadership and decision-making*: Setting the organization’s overall goals and high level policies, defining the mission and values, and shaping a positive culture.
- *Stewardship*: Holding the executive to account, supervising and supporting the executive, establishing appropriate delegation, and ensuring legal and financial responsibilities are met.
- *External relations and accountability*: Maintaining relations with important stakeholders, ensuring obligations to stakeholders are met, representing the organization externally, and where applicable managing volunteers and fundraising.

⁹ United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. What is Good Governance. Author. Available on-line at <http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp>

¹⁰ Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators. (2004). Organizational Governance: An Overview. Author, Toronto.

¹¹ Carver, J. (2006). Boards That Make a Difference: A New Design for Leadership in Nonprofit and Public Organizations. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey Boss. p.197.

- *Board maintenance*: Sustaining, checking and repairing the ways in which the board functions. High performing boards recruit members, review and evaluate their performance and develop their ability to work effectively.¹²

In the paper *Board Size and Effectiveness: Advice to the Department of Health Regarding Health Professional Regulators* from the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence, the authors argue that Boards of Directors in the 8 to 12 person range are most effective. According to the authors:

It appears that smaller sized groups are able to communicate more effectively and reach decisions more quickly than larger ones. In addition, they are less likely to suffer from a fragmentation and clique formation and more likely to develop a culture of inclusiveness than their larger counterparts (p.10).¹³

The authors also note that regulatory bodies should not be focused on having a representative board and be “solely focused on effective governance in the interests of patients and the public”. They suggest that:

Small boards cannot ‘represent’ all relevant constituencies or stakeholders nor should they attempt to do so. Rather, boards should demonstrate the knowledge, understanding and awareness to properly take into account relevant interests, but should not attempt to ‘represent’ them (p.10).¹³

The authors recognize the need for balance between having enough members to ensure the necessary mix of skills, experience, and diversity of perspectives, while ensuring the board can function effectively. They suggest that one way to achieve this where board members are appointed is to have the outside body consult with the governing body about the required skills and experience desired in the new appointee. They also point out that there is no ‘perfect’ size for board members and different boards have different needs.¹³

Mollenhauer (2009) outlines a *Framework for Success for Nonprofit Federations* that describes 14 critical success factors. One of the factors is related to governance and states that the federation needs to “ensure that the national board has the willingness and capacity to fulfill its role in the federation.” The author suggests that best practices for this factor include using the right governance model; having the right size board; having board members with the right mix of skills/expertise to think strategically and make good national-wide decisions; and having the necessary orientation, training and formal performance review of board members. She indicates that best practices in terms of federation decision making include: clear decision making processes based on shared leadership; a consensus building approach; and access to accurate, timely information. She notes that:

Board members make decisions based on the best interests of the national office and the federation. They are equipped to handle issues of conflict of allegiance between

¹² Comforth, C. (1996). *Governing Non-Profit organizations: Heroic Myths and Human Tales*. Revised version of a paper prepared for the conference, “Researching the UK Voluntary Sector, NCVO London, 7-8 Sept. 1995. Available on-line at http://www7.open.ac.uk/oubs/research/pdf/WP96_03.pdf.

¹³ Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence. (2011). *Board size and effectiveness: advice to the Department of Health regarding health professional regulators*. Author, London. Available on line at <http://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/psa-library/september-2011---board-size-and-effectiveness.pdf?sfvrsn=0>.

local and national interests and are therefore prepared to speak with a common voice once decisions are made (p.21).¹⁴

3.4 Alliance Current Governance Model

Information gathered from Alliance documents, reports and discussion with Alliance representatives reveals the following picture of the most recent governance review and the current governance model. Prior to 2005, the Board of Directors of the Alliance consisted of five or six individuals appointed by the Chief Executive Officer and recommended by the Board to members for ratification. In 2005, the Alliance underwent a significant governance review. Following this review, the profile of the Board changed significantly. At present the Board consists of eleven members (10 provincial and one territorial regulatory body) with each member having two representatives (and two votes): the Registrar from the jurisdiction and an appointed representative. The Board thus grew from five to six Directors to a total of 22. Decision making is by voting, although efforts are made to use a consensus approach. There is no specified term for the nominated Directors and frequent turnover. The Board meets twice a year and its mandate is to set the strategic directions of the organization.

An Executive Committee is elected by the Board consisting of four members: the President, the Vice-President, the Treasurer, and a Member-at-Large. The term of office is two years. The purpose of the Executive is to: monitor activities between Board meetings to ensure activities are progressing related to the strategic directions; provide oversight of the organization's finances and risk management; appoint committee chairs and all responsibilities related to the CEO.

Funding of the Alliance is \$14 per registrant in each jurisdiction and \$400 per member organization. This funding rate has been in place for the past eight to ten years. Alliance operations are supported by credentialing and examination activities. Membership fees represent 8.3% of the total operating budget.

¹⁴ Mollenhauer, L. (2009). A framework for success for not for profit federations revised. Available at: <http://www.theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Federations-Framework-for-Success-for-Nonprofit-Federations-November-2009.pdf>

4. Findings from Review of Selected Professions

4.1 Information from selected national comparator organizations

The findings from selected national comparator organizations are summarized in Table 2. This information is provided in more detail in Appendix C.

Table 2 Summary of information from selected national comparator organizations

	Mandate*	Membership Size	BOD Size	Equal Vote	Exec Ctte	Fees/ Members	Operating Budget	Membership Fees % of Operations
Canadian Healthcare Association	CC PA	11 orgs	15	N/A	No	-674 K total - Sliding scale with max/min	2.7 million	25%
Canadian Cancer Society	CC ER PA	170K volunteers	16	Yes	No	0	31 million	0
Heart and Stroke Association	CC ER PA	140K volunteers	17	N/A	No	0	39 million	0
Canadian Medical Assoc.	CC PA	76K members	27	N/A	Yes	\$430 per member	N/A	N/A
Canadian Nurses Assoc.	CC PA	11 orgs representing 149 members	19	Yes	No	\$7.97 million Total	20.3 million	39.3%
Canadian Mental Health Assoc.	CC PA	10K Volunteers	20	N/A	N/A	\$236.5 K CMHA Divisional Fees	377.5K	62.5%

Legend

N/A – Info not available

*Mandate:

CC - Coordination/communication

ER – Eradication of disease

PA - Policy advocacy

A review of the findings across the six selected national comparator organizations identified a number of similarities and differences which have been clustered by topic including:

Mandate of the Organization

- All of the organizations were national and had some type of advocacy role, but they differed in terms of their focus: three represented specific health conditions/diseases; two represented specific health professional groups; and one was promoting the national healthcare discussion. Half of organizations examined were registered charities.

Membership

- The nature and size of the membership of the studied corporations varied considerably. Some organizations had large bases of volunteers, while others (including both professional associations) had memberships that were smaller or consisted of their regional organizations.

Size and Composition of the Board of Directors

- The size of the boards ranged in size from 15 to 27, with a median of 18. These numbers are due to the inclusion of one or more representatives from provinces and territories.

Selection and Nomination of the Board of Directors

- A variety of mechanisms were used to appoint board members including nominations and elections. Some board members are appointed based on the populations of the regions they serve, while others are elected directly by the members.

Executive Committee

- Only one of the organizations (the Canadian Medical Association) had an Executive Committee, which was comprised of Directors that did not represent specific regions or groups. This organization was also the one that had 27 members on their Board of Directors.

Decision Making

- In the organizations examined where this information was available, Directors had equal voting privileges.

Fees/Budget

- Different types of not-for-profits have different methods for raising funds. While most collect some part of their budget from membership fees, others are totally dependent on fundraising, grants, and donations in lieu of fees.
- Most of the organizations examined did not make public the method used to determine membership fees, or even how much individual members were charged. The professional associations set their membership fees at the Annual General Meeting, and the Canadian Health Care Association (policy advocacy) determines its membership fees on a per capita basis.

4.2 Information from national federations of regulatory authorities

The findings from selected national federations of regulatory authorities are summarized in the Table 3. More detailed findings from the national federations of regulatory authorities are provided in Appendix D.

	Federated Organization	Mandate*	Membership Size	BOD Size	Equal Vote	Exec Ctte Size	Fees/ Registrant	Operating Budget	Membership Fees % of Operations	Method of Decision-Making***
Comparator										
Alliance	√	CC PA C E	11	22	√	4	\$14 (\$400/org)	\$3.3 million**	8.3	C M/V
FMRAC	√	CC PA	13	Max 42	√	6	\$15	\$1.5 Million	100	C
FLSC	√	CC PA C	14	17	√	4	\$25	\$2 Million	100	C
Engineers Canada	√	CC PA A	12	21	√	6	\$10	\$8 million**	100	C
NAPRA	√	CC PA	14	Max 30	√	4	Levels per capita	\$1.7 million	100	C
ACOTRO	√	CC PA C	10	10	√	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CICA	√	CC PA	14	12	√	N/A	N/A	\$53.9 million	59 %	N/A
Legend										
N/A = Information not available										
*CC - Coordination/communication ** Includes all organization activities										
PA - Policy advocacy										
A - Accreditation										
C – Credentialing										
E – Examination										
***C - Consensus MV – Majority vote										

A review of the findings across the six selected national comparator organizations revealed a number of commonalities which have been clustered by topic including:

Mandate of the Organizations

- Federations serve primarily a communication/coordination and policy/advocacy function with some organizations also involved in professional credentialing, examination and accreditation functions.

Size and Composition of the Board of Directors

- All organizations have large boards (one to three representatives per jurisdiction) to ensure representation from all geographic regions of Canada.

- Representation on each board is related to geography with a number of representatives per jurisdiction.
- The board's function is primarily to set organizational strategic priorities.
- There is representation of all provincial/territorial Registrars on most boards. Where there is no Registrar representation, an informal communication mechanism is in place to ensure that the board of directors and Registrars are constantly in communication and fully aware of issues.

Selection and Nomination of Board of Directors

- All board directors are appointed from their jurisdiction.

Executive Committee

- All boards have an Executive Committee although one organization is phasing this out as it moves to a policy governance model.
- Due to the large size of many boards, frequently the Executive Committee fulfils the function of a board, responsible for overseeing: the work of the organization ensuring strategic priorities are on track; fiduciary and risk management; and administrative activities.
- Executive committees (three to six members) are elected by the board for a term of more than one year to ensure continuity and corporate memory.

Decision-making

- All representatives (Directors) have equal voting privileges regardless of the number of registrants in the jurisdiction.
- Board decision-making is predominantly by consensus as opposed to majority vote.

Fees/Budget

- In most cases organizational operations are covered entirely by membership fees.
- Membership fees are charged per capita of registrants in the jurisdiction.

4.3 Key Informant Interviews

The Chief Executive Officers of four organizations whose perspectives were felt to be relevant to this project were selected for key informant interviews including: the National Association of Pharmacy Regulatory Authorities (NAPRA), Engineers Canada, Federation of Law Societies of Canada (FLSC), and the Federation of Medical Regulatory Authorities of Canada (FMRAC). Background documentation was obtained from each organization's website and as needed this was verified during the telephone interview. In addition, a representative from the Alliance was also interviewed to gain background to the governance history and culture of this organization as well as to provide additional insight into the issues that arose leading to this governance review. Interview questions can be found in Appendix A and a list of Key informants in Appendix B. It should be noted that while the number of key informants was limited, it was felt that during the process of the interviews, a level of saturation emerged in the information provided (i.e., common themes and messages).

The information below in Table 4 represents the common themes and trends that were identified from the key informant interviews related to their organization including what works well, challenges and interesting/emerging practices.

Table 4 Summary of Key Informant Interview Findings			
Element	What Works Well	Challenges	Interesting/Emerging Practices
Mandate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear delineation of organizational roles and responsibilities improves board functioning. 		
Size/ composition of Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of board representatives from jurisdictional boards ensures that directors have a solid understanding of the work of the organization and the current issues. • Board members who are well briefed concerning issues ensure important jurisdictional linkage and input. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The large size of the board hinders decision-making and quick reactions to arising issues. The board doesn't really function as a board, more like a meeting of members. Increased number of board members doesn't necessarily increase the skill set. • Rapid (one year or less) turnover of board members prevents representatives from providing informed contribution to highly complex issues and developing buy-in with the federated organization. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board make-up, i.e., number of representatives, is based on the number of registrants per jurisdiction or geographical area, for example ON 5, QC 4, AB 3, BC 2, rest 1. • Committee Chairs from the organization's diverse activities sit on the board as advisors.
Selection/ nomination of Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board function is improved when it consists of competent individuals who have had experience with board regulatory issues in their jurisdiction. • An extended mandate for board members such as a three year renewable term ensures the development of a strong understanding of the organizational culture and issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The federation may have little control over the competencies, skill set, leadership and engagement of its board members due to appointment process. 	
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A laddering system for the Executive Committee according to a roster of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There can be a disconnection between the decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rotating membership on the Executive according to

Element	What Works Well	Challenges	Interesting/Emerging Practices
	<p>geographical representation provides a clear system of appointment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gradual transitioning of Directors onto the Executive Committee ensures consistency and corporate memory. • Including representatives from largest jurisdictions on the Executive ensures that the largest players sit around the table. • Representatives are on the Executive for four years and once they have attained Vice-President or higher they no longer represent their jurisdictional interests. 	<p>body such as the Executive and the Registrars who are responsible for jurisdictional regulation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-merit based leadership due to specified rotation of individuals through the Executive can have a huge impact on organizational functioning. 	<p>geographical region ensures equity in representation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The membership of larger jurisdictions on the Executive ensures the input of major players in all board initiatives. • Board meetings/annual meetings planned in association with professional education events encourages participation and reduces costs.
Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-making is by consensus – if representatives cannot ‘live’ with the decision more discussion is required before the issue can be resolved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vetoes and pressured decision-making promotes distrust and conflict amongst board members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure the interests of smaller members are protected, identified issues could require a more than majority vote such as 2/3s of members in support.
Fees/Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members are provided a notice of motion of fee increase 18 months in advance of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More revenue needs to be generated through increased fees to sustain and grow the work of the organization – unanimity is required on the part of the members to increase fees, financial restrictions limit activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fee structure that has contribution levels according to number of registrants and is capped at a certain amount is a compromise approach to membership fees as compared to the traditional pure capitation approach.
Board Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of jurisdictional input provides richness to the discussion of issues. • Effective board interactions occurs when there is a strong sense of members working together for the best interests of the organization and the public interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication mechanisms need to be effective and efficient to ensure board members are constantly well informed of Executive activities and emerging issues. 	

Table 4 Summary of Key Informant Interview Findings

Element	What Works Well	Challenges	Interesting/Emerging Practices
	<p>and a sentiment of board congeniality with common goals related to serving the public good.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong leadership on the part of the President and the CEO promotes strong board relationships and trust. • Common understanding that larger organizations must help support the smaller ones “that’s the way Canada works” creates a feeling of unity. • Informal communication mechanisms with the Registrars ensure reciprocal input/feedback regarding jurisdictional issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repetition of meetings/work to ensure that multiple stakeholders are in the communication loop and have voice into issues produces inefficiencies. 	

5. Analysis

The findings from the focused literature review, and the review of comparator organizations revealed congruity in a number of themes related governance practices and are presented in Table 5. **It should be noted that these themes summarize what was learned during this investigation and are not intended as specific recommendations for the Alliance.**

Table 5: Summary of Themes in Governance Practices Identified in this Review	
Governance Practice Area	Themes Identified
Mandate of organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the literature and the key informant interviews suggested that having a clear mandate is useful in identifying the most appropriate governance structure. In other words, “form needs to follow function”.
Size and composition of Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the size of boards in the organizations examined varied considerably (from 10-42 members), the literature suggested a trend toward smaller boards (e.g., 8-12 people). Smaller boards are seen to be more effective, focused, and nimble in decision-making which is important in a constantly changing environment. The desire for smaller boards was echoed in the key informant interviews. The literature suggested that there is no ‘perfect’ size for boards and different boards have different needs. What is important is to achieve a balance between enough members to ensure the necessary mix of skills, experience, and diversity of perspectives, while ensuring the board can function effectively. Ensuring geographical representation on the board is an important consideration. This may not necessarily mean one or more representatives per jurisdiction. While the majority of the organizations examined have at least one representative per jurisdiction, a regional approach to geographical representation was also identified.
Selection and nomination of Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the literature and key informant interviews indicated longer terms for board members assists in promoting collaboration and maintaining focus/momentum. The key informant interviews suggested that board members with experience at the jurisdictional level can help to minimize the learning curve at the federation level and better understand the culture of the organization. The literature and key informant interviews suggested that board member orientation and training are useful in developing effective and committed board members. The literature suggested a collaborative approach to the nomination process to ensure the desired mix of board members (e.g., member organizations making appointments consult with the federation about the skills/experience needed in new board members).
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of the national regulatory federations examined have an executive committee. The key informant interviews suggested that due to the large size of some boards, frequently the Executive Committee fulfils the functions of a board.
Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature indicated that federations benefit from clear decision-making processes based on shared leadership, consensus building and accurate, timely information.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A consensus-based approach to decision-making is used by the majority of the organizations examined. Both the literature and the key informants indicated that decision-making through consensus promotes trust and collaboration.
Fees/Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key informant interviews indicated that ensuring sufficient resources is important to support, sustain, and grow the organization’s activities. • A trend towards organizational operations being funded by member fees was noted in the national regulatory federations examined. Other activities are generally seen to be self-supporting and do not contribute to the operational budget (e.g., credentialing). • In the majority of the national regulatory federations examined, membership fees are charged per capita of registrants in the jurisdiction. To manage discrepancies between larger and smaller jurisdictions, two of the organizations examined indicated they use a sliding scale approach that has per capita contribution levels.
Board Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The literature and key informant interviews indicated that building a culture of shared values, trust and respect facilitates effective board functioning. • The literature and key informant interviews indicated that balancing the interests of the federation with that of the jurisdictions contributes to a positive board culture. • The literature and key informant interviews indicated that effective and efficient communication mechanisms ensure members are well informed.
Role of the Registrars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key informant interviews indicated that Registrars, who are seen to be very knowledgeable about regulatory issues and responsible for jurisdictional implementations, need to have some type of direct relationship with the board. This was attained in these organizations through Registrar membership on the board or via a communication system.

6. Summary and Next Steps

This report has provided an overview of relevant findings from the focused literature review and review of comparator organizations to provide background information for the Alliance to consider during its governance review. Ultimately, an effective and efficient board will provide the foundation for the organization to support and sustain present and emerging activities.

In terms of next steps, as one author notes, “Each federation must consider its history, mission, culture and capacity in order to design the best possible governance structure and processes”.¹⁵ As a result, four next steps are offered for the Alliance’s consideration in moving forward with their governance review including:

1. Determine the present and emerging mandate(s) of the Alliance. The governance structure should have the elements required to efficiently and effectively support and sustain these directions.
2. Gain an understanding of the present governance limitations from all key stakeholders to guide changes or modifications to current elements and processes.

¹⁵ Mollenhauer, L. (2009). A framework for success for not for profit federations revised. Available at: <http://www.theonn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Federations-Framework-for-Success-for-Nonprofit-Federations-November-2009.pdf>.

3. Consider the findings of this paper which highlights themes in governance practices and what works well in other similar organizations to identify elements for a “preferred governance model” which will address limitations identified in the current Alliance governance structure and support future directions.
4. Develop a transitional plan which includes a specific time period for implementation of the new governance structure and a period of time at which the model will be evaluated to see if it is meeting the intended needs.

Statements included in a report prepared for the Alliance during the 2004 Governance Review still hold true and summarize succinctly the challenges around governance review:

The complexities of governance result from a number of issues including; the lack of a common definition of what governance is, the values and experiences that individual board members bring to discussions; the relationships that develop between staff and boards and the accountability processes of the organization. There are no quick fixes to address governance issues. It is said, ‘governance is a journey where the route and destination evolve and change’. Governance changes are also inherent in the growth and evolution of any organization (p.2).¹⁶

¹⁶ The Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators. (2004). Organizational Governance: An Overview. Author, Toronto.

Appendix A Key Informant Interview Guide

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. The purpose of this document is to give you background information related to the interview and provide the interview questions. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes to complete. Please note: The factual information gathered from this interview (Questions 1-6) will be summarized in the final project report. Data from Questions 7 to 13 will be expressed according to common themes and trends with no identifying information attributable to any interview participant.

Background:

The Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators (the Alliance) is currently undertaking a governance review as part of their Strategic Planning initiatives. The objective of this project is to review current models, trends and best practices in governance/funding models for umbrella/federated not-for-profit organizations to gain a better understanding of the pros and cons of each model, as well as lessons learned. The key deliverables for this project include:

- Preparation of a literature review considering models of governance and funding in federated not-for-profit organizations
- Key informant interviews with leaders from selected Canadian organizations to gain information about experiences with various models.
- Analysis of findings from literature review and key informant interviews.
- Preparation of a final report outlining the findings, analysis and recommendations for consideration.

Interview Questions:

1. How would you describe the type of your organization (e.g., federation of associations, regulatory bodies, health charities)?
2. What is the primary mandate or activities of your organization (e.g., policy/advocacy, information sharing, fund-raising, entry-level standards)?
3. What is the size of your membership base (e.g., number of member organizations)?
4. a) What is the size and make-up of your Board of Directors (no. of members and representation)?

b) What process is used to appoint the members of the Board of Directors (e.g., nomination, election)?

c) Do all board members have equal voting privileges?
Probe: Are voting privileges linked to financial contributions in any way?

d) Do you have an Executive Committee? If so, what is the size, make-up and appointment process?
5. a) What is the amount of fees that are charged per member organization?

b) How are the fees charged per member organization are determined (e.g., per capita, per organization)?

6. What is your annual operating budget?
7. What would you say works well with your current governance and fee structure?
8. What challenges do you have with your current governance and fee structure?
9. Have you had experience with other governance and fee structures?
10. If it were possible, what changes would you make to your governance and fee structure?
11. Is your governance model up for review? If so why and when?
12. What recommendations or best advice do you have for the Alliance as it reviews its current governance and fee structure?
13. Do you have any addition comments?

Appendix B
List of Key Informants

Kim Allen
Chief Executive Officer
Engineers Canada

Greg Eberhart
Registrar
Alberta College of Pharmacists

Jonathan Herman
Chief Executive Officer
Federation of Law Societies of Canada (FLSC)

Fleur-Ange Lefebvre
Executive Director and CEO
Federation of Medical Regulatory Authorities of Canada (FMRAC)

Dianne Millette
Registrar
Physiotherapy Alberta – College + Association

Appendix C: Summary of Information from Selected National Organizations

	Comparator Organizations					
Name of comparator	Canadian Healthcare Association	Canadian Cancer Society	Heart and Stroke Association	Canadian Medical Association	Canadian Nurses Association	Canadian Mental Health Association
Reference	http://www.cha.ca/	http://www.cancer.ca/	http://www.heartandstroke.com	http://www.cma.ca	http://www.cna-aiic.ca	http://www.cmha.ca/
Type of organization?	National Organization with partners	National Organization with large divisions based on territory	National Organization with large divisions based on territory	National professional association	Federation of provincial and territorial nursing associations	National Association with regional divisions
Mandate of organization?	Advocacy and the promotion of national healthcare discussion	Eradication of cancer and improving the lives of those with cancer.	Eradication and awareness of risk factors for heart disease and stroke	Advocacy for physicians and for better health care	Advocacy for and the promotion of the nursing profession in Canada	Advocacy organization that works to combat and provide information about mental illness.
Size of membership base?	11 Organizations	170k+ volunteers	140k volunteers	76k members	11 provincial and territorial associations, which represent almost 149k nurses	10,000 volunteers
Size and make-up of Board of Directors?	15 Members (11 orgs plus Chair, CEO, Director-At-Large, and Immediate Past-Chair)	16 (14 regional plus one chair and one past chair)	17 (15 positions with 2 officers. Regions are also represented on board.)	27 (including chair, president-elect, president, immediate past president, honorary treasurer, member at large, and regional, resident, and student representation)	19 (including president, president-elect, past-president, and CEO)	20 (including Officers, Directors-At-Large, the Chair of the National Consumer Advisory Council, Divisional Representatives, and the CEO)

Environmental Scan of Governance and Funding Models for Federated Not-For-Profit Organizations – Prepared for the Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators – April 2013

Name of comparator	Comparator Organizations					
	Canadian Healthcare Association	Canadian Cancer Society	Heart and Stroke Association	Canadian Medical Association	Canadian Nurses Association	Canadian Mental Health Association
Process to appoint board members?	-Board Chair nominated from active members. -Immediate past board chair also has a place on board. -Board members at large are appointed.	Board members are elected.		Each division has one member on the Board of Directors per 6000 members. Directors are elected	-Each jurisdictional member gets one vote plus an additional vote for every 1000 member nurses -Jurisdictional members are appointed by the respective jurisdiction, all other positions are elected	The website specifies that Directors At Large are elected by the members
Do board members have equal voting privileges?		All have equal votes			Each Director has one vote	
Is there an executive committee of the board? If yes how are they appointed?	No Executive Committee	National Board of Directors and regional board of directors	No Executive Committee	Yes	No	
Fees charged per member organization?	Total Member fees: \$674 k	-No member fees.- Contributions come from donations, fund-raisers, and a very few grants	No visible member fees. Contributions come from gifts, grants, fundraisers etc.	\$430 for regular members	Total Member Fees: \$7.97 Million	CMHA Divisional Fees: \$236.5k

Environmental Scan of Governance and Funding Models for Federated Not-For-Profit Organizations – Prepared for the Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators – April 2013

	Comparator Organizations					
Name of comparator	Canadian Healthcare Association	Canadian Cancer Society	Heart and Stroke Association	Canadian Medical Association	Canadian Nurses Association	Canadian Mental Health Association
How fees charged per member organization are determined (e.g., per capita, per organization)?	-Fees are determined per capita on a sliding scale -There are both minimums and maximums			Fixed at the annual meeting	Fixed at the annual meeting	
Annual Operating budget?	\$2.7 million	\$31 million	\$39 million		\$20.3 million	\$377.5k

Appendix D: Summary of Information from Comparator Regulatory Organizations

Name of comparator	Alliance	FMRAC	FLSC	Engineers Canada	NAPRA	ACOTRO	Chartered Accountants of Canada
Reference	http://www.alliancept.org/GovernanceManual2013Bylaws2006-2010	http://www.fmrac.ca/	http://www.flsc.ca/	http://www.engineerscanada.ca/e/	http://napra.ca/pages/home/default.aspx	http://acotro-acore.org/	http://www.cica.ca/index.aspx
Type of organization	Federation prov/ter regulatory bodies	Federation prov/ter regulatory bodies	Federation prov/ter regulatory bodies	Federation prov/ter regulatory bodies	Federation prov/ter regulatory bodies and Canadian Forces Pharmacy Services	Organization of occupational therapy regulators in Canada	Federation prov/ter regulatory bodies
Mandate	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy Credentialing Examination	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy International credentialling	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy Accreditation undergraduate education	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy International credentialling	Communication/coordination Policy/advocacy
Size of membership base	13 prov/terr regulatory authorities	13 prov/terr regulatory authorities	14 prov/terr regulatory authorities	12 prov/terr regulatory authorities	14 prov/terr regulatory authorities	10 prov regulatory bodies	14 prov regulatory bodies and Bermuda
Size and make-up of Board of Directors	2 reps per member	Up to 3 reps per member and three Officers 1 Registrar, 2 nominated	1 rep per member In addition immediate Past President, President and President-elect	21 Directors according to size of jurisdiction (ON-5, QC-4, AB-3, BC 2, rest 1) 1 /20,000 registrants 5 advisors	2 reps per member 1 Registrar and 1 nominated	1 rep /member – Registrar or ACOTRO rep	12 Directors, 2 public, 2 from 4 geographic regions (QC, ON, West and Atlantic) and Chair, Vice-Chair

Environmental Scan of Governance and Funding Models for Federated Not-For-Profit Organizations – Prepared for the Canadian Alliance of Physiotherapy Regulators – April 2013

Name of comparator	Alliance	FMRAC	FLSC	Engineers Canada	NAPRA	ACOTRO	Chartered Accountants of Canada
Process to appoint board members (e.g., nomination, election)?	Appointed	Appointed	Appointed	Appointed	Appointed	Appointed	Appointed
Do board members have equal voting privileges? (e.g., relationship between vote and financial contribution)	Equal vote per member	Equal vote per member Plus officers	Equal vote per member Plus officers	Equal vote per member	Equal vote per nominated member Registrars do not have vote	Equal vote per member	
Is there an executive committee (EC)?	Elected 4 member EC	Elected 6 member EC ON & QC reps consistent	Elected 4 member EC according to geographical representation	Elected 6 member EC, regional representation, being phased out as organization moves to policy governance	Elected 4 member EC	Elected 3 member EC	
Amount of fees charged per member organization?	\$14 per registrant \$400 per organization	\$15 per registrant Nunavut - \$500.	\$25 per registrant	\$10 per registrant	4 payment levels according to number of registrants in jurisdiction		
How fees charged per member organization are determined (e.g., per capita, per organization)?	Per capita Per organization	Per capita	Per capita	Per capita	Levels according to number of registrants		
Annual Operating budget?	\$3.3 million 8.3% from membership fees	\$1.5 million 100%, from membership fees,	\$2 million 100% from membership fees	\$8 million 100% from membership fees	\$1.7 million 100% from membership fees		\$53.9 million 59% membership fees
Decision-making Process?	Consensus driven Majority vote	Consensus driven	Consensus driven	Consensus driven	Consensus driven		