

Task Force on Association Improvement and Reorganization (TFAIR)

2006-2007 Report and Recommendations

September 2007

TFAIR Members:

Louise Anderson, Glen Bartlett, Leatrice Berman-Sandler, Diana Conti (ISC Liaison), Howard Eng, Elsie Eyer, Nell Gottlieb, Christopher Kochtitzky, Andrea Kidd-Taylor, Paul Locke, Lisa Maldonado, Celia McGillivray, Diane Rowley (part of year), Marvin Rubin, Andrew White (Chair).

APHA Staff Liaison: Natalie Raynor

Task Force Values:

Transparency, Fairness, Accessibility, Inclusiveness, Respect

Introduction

This report has five (5) parts:

- Summary of TFAIR activities in 2007
- Suggested Activities to be Undertaken by TFAIR in 2008
- Appendix 1 – TFAIR's activities in 2001-2006
- Appendix 2 – Summary of Points Generated during TFAIR's 2005 Roundtables
- Appendix 3 – Fact Sheet on Multi-Unit Membership
- Appendix 4 – Motion for continuation of TFAIR in 2008

Summary of TFAIR Activities in 2007

TFAIR was reauthorized for 2007 by a motion of the Governing Council in November 2006. Keeping to the tasks assigned in the motion TFAIR continued a regular schedule of monthly teleconference meetings (held the last Thursday of every month, beginning in March and continuing through October 2006). The Task Force also held a day and a half in-person meeting on July 26-27, 2007 at APHA headquarters in Washington, DC. Subcommittees were continued or revised to work with other APHA bodies and the staff to address issues surrounding implementation of the motions passed in 2004 and 2005.

Building on the feedback obtained at the GC Round Tables in 2005, TFAIR devoted its July in-person meeting to discussing the bigger structural issues related to TFAIR's original mandate. In the process, some specific possibilities for targeted change came to its attention.

What follows summarizes TFAIR's 2007 work on motion implementation, specific issue identification, and progress toward a plan for arriving at and implementing larger basic structural changes in APHA's governance.

Update on TFAIR Motion Implementation

Motion to Strengthen the Relationship Between APHA and the Caucuses - At the 2005 GC meeting, in response to the TFAIR motion to establish a memorandum of understanding between APHA and the Caucuses, the GC adopted the motion and tasked the EB with the responsibility to enter into negotiations with the Caucuses to prepare a memorandum of understanding that defines the mutual responsibilities and expectations of APHA and the Caucuses. In 2007 the EB and Caucuses (aided by the TFAIR subcommittee and staff) finalized a memorandum of understanding and submitted it to the Caucuses for signature. This year, APHA staff, Caucuses, and TFAIR representatives met twice via teleconference and developed tentative options for further discussion of Caucuses participating in the GC. The Caucus working group is now sharing its initial models with key APHA governance bodies, such as the ISC and the COA. The ideas include allowing caucuses to run for unaffiliated seats, adding ex-officio seats, and some combination of both. Caucuses are concerned about any possible loss of autonomy. To enhance communications, APHA staffer Fran Atkinson is using an Internet questionnaire to get the governance bodies' feedback.

Motions Concerning the redefinition of APHA membership Units, i.e., Sections and Special Primary Interest Groups (SPIGs) and Creation of Forums – At the 2005 GC meeting, in response to TFAIR motions to clarify the relationship between sections and SPIGS and to create a new membership unit called a Forum, the GC adopted the motions and tasked the EB to implement them. The ISC and its steering committee worked with a TFAIR subcommittee to help EB implement the clarification and define the Forum. The ISC and staff have assessed the status of existing SPIG's and forums in light of the new clarifications. ISC has

reviewed several applications for SPIGs and Forums and made recommendations to the EB. There is a pending application for Section status. The EB and staff are continuing to implement these motions and the issue of what options SPIGs will have after they have been in existence for a maximum of three years.

Motion Regarding More Frequent Governing Council Meetings – At the 2005 GC meeting in response to the TFAIR motion to provide the option for more than 2 meetings per year of the GC, the GC adopted the motion and charged the staff with the logistics of implementation. As a result, the GC did hold a mid-year teleconference in 2006 and 2007. The latest of these meetings dealt with proposed constitution and by-laws changes, in part a consequence of the TFAIR motion passed in 2005 by the GC to institute multiple-unit memberships (for a 2nd and 3rd primary section membership). The utility and effectiveness of periodic GC meetings via teleconference is still being evaluated.

Motion Regarding Membership in More than One Section or Special Primary Interest Group (SPIG) – At the 2005 GC meeting in response to the TFAIR motions to institute multiple-unit memberships, the GC adopted the motion and tasked the EB and staff to implement it. All needed constitution and by-laws changes required to accommodate multi-unit membership took place in 2006. Analysis of the implementation steps and the cost impact of multi-unit membership were completed in 2007. The staff contacted TFAIR to give its input as they identified and made needed changes to data processing and office procedures to implement multiple memberships. The EB has determined that such memberships will require a fee for those who are interested in joining additional units. TFAIR has monitored the progress and all needed administrative changes should be in place to allow a 2008 implementation. See Appendix 3, Fact Sheet on Multi-Unit Membership, which describes the rationale and benefits to the Association, its members, and member organizations.

Motion Regarding Setting Clear Expectations and Time lines for APHA Task Forces and Ad-Hoc Committees – At the 2004 GC meeting, in response to a TFAIR motion to set clear expectations and timelines for APHA advisory groups, the GC adopted the motion. It has come to TFAIR's attention that no formal review and implementation of this motion has yet taken place. If reauthorized, TFAIR hopes to help the EB to formulate annual or ongoing review processes to fully implement this 2004 TFAIR motion.

Suggested Activities To Be Undertaken By TFAIR In 2008

New Opportunities for Targeted Changes

EB-GC Accountability and Communications - At its 2007 in-person meeting, TFAIR determined that many of the issues surrounding accountability between the EB and GC relate to more frequent, transparent, and strategic communication between these governance bodies throughout the course of the year. If reauthorized, TFAIR proposes to work with the EB to develop a communication plan between itself and the GC and to submit the process for GC approval at a future GC meeting.

Member Engagement – At its 2007 in-person meeting, TFAIR determined that member engagement might be supported by the development of a periodic membership survey aimed at obtaining consistent feedback on member satisfaction, needs, and ideas. If reauthorized, TFAIR proposes to work with the EB and staff to develop such a survey tool, assess the ability of APHA to support it, develop recommendations for its frequency and a dissemination plan for the results of such surveys to the membership and membership organizations. The final plans and recommendations for such a survey would be submitted for GC approval at a future GC meeting.

New Opportunities for Larger Changes

At its 2004 and 2005 Roundtables and throughout its 2007 deliberations, TFAIR began to come to grips with the larger, more difficult organizational changes that have the potential to remove procedural, structural, and perceived barriers to the smooth and timely operation of the Association to meet its mission. Both the 2004 and 2005 Governing Council Roundtable participants indicated a strong desire to improve APHA's governance and recognized that more effective governance would enhance APHA's ability to serve its members and further its goal of improving public health. At the 2005 GC Roundtables members engaged in a detailed discussion about APHA governance as Councilors discussed the motion of a Practice Board and the Four Board proposal. Although membership voiced concerns about these reorganization schemes, members' remarks made it clear that APHA members want a structured, transparent, and open exchange of ideas about larger issues of governance at APHA. TFAIR is prepared to develop a plan for the Association to have such a discussion, which will take on these issues in a way that engages APHA members and membership units.

In 2007, TFAIR follow-up on these concerns about transparency and governance and reviewed the literature on association reorganization success stories to learn from what others have gone through. Stressing the need for transparency and constant communication and feedback among APHA's many parts (elected and appointed) in order to have a productive dialogue about governance and reorganization, TFAIR is conducting Roundtables at the 2007 annual meeting to begin (and continue) this dialogue. The Roundtables will focus on 1) the roles and relationships of (and between) the GC and EB; 2) the structure and function of these governance bodies; and 3) member engagement and participation.

Accordingly, if reauthorized for 2008, TFAIR would focus its activities on providing a forum the Association to continue this dialogue and formulate either a guide (or possible "roadmap") for completing it or produce a "white paper" on governance refinements and potential reorganization. The rationale underlying such a process is to: (1) position APHA as an effective leadership organization in future Public Health crises, debates and activities; and (2) reduce real or perceived structural and functional inefficiencies, opaqueness, and frustrations for the members (volunteers) themselves who carry out APHA functions.

Appendix 1: Historical Summary of TFAIR Activities: 2001-2006

TFAIR's activities: 2001 - 2003

The Task Force on Association Improvement and Reorganization (TFAIR) was created by Governing Council (GC) motion at the American Public Health Association (APHA) 2001 annual meeting. During 2001 – 2002, TFAIR made progress in defining, prioritizing and discussing the critical governance issues facing APHA. In 2002 – 2003, TFAIR established a process to engage APHA members in a continuing discussion about APHA governance and proposed 3 incremental but critical improvement steps. The 2002 – 2003 TFAIR committee stressed (1) the need for better internal communication and quality improvement; (2) the need for greater transparency in governance, with more opportunities for member input and feedback; and (3) the need to conduct an in-depth assessment of APHA's organizational structure and the nature and relationships among organizational units.

TFAIR's activities: 2004 - 2005

During the past two years, TFAIR has identified more specific challenges to APHA governance. As the basis for our work we used the APHA strategic map, which was developed by the Executive Board (EB) and vetted at the 2003 APHA annual meeting; the APHA Policy and Procedures manuals (available on-line to APHA members); and other documents that reflect and define APHA's organizational mission and goals and its governance processes.

During the 2004 APHA annual meeting, TFAIR offered for consideration, and the Governing Council passed, 2 motions aimed at making APHA governance more effective. These motions covered:

- Restructuring the Student Public Health Caucus; and
- Setting clear expectations, and time lines, for APHA advisory groups.

During the 2005 APHA annual meeting, TFAIR offered for consideration, and the Governing Council passed, 6 motions aimed at making APHA governance more effective. These motions covered:

- Establishing a memorandum of understanding between APHA and the Caucuses, aimed at strengthening the relationship between APHA and the Caucuses;
- Creating the opportunity for APHA members to join more than one Section or Special Primary Interest Group (SPIG) with full membership rights;
- Clarifying the relationship between sections and SPIGs, setting out a path for section and SPIG formation;
- Providing the option for more than 2 meetings per year of the Governing Council; and
- Creating a new membership unit, called a Forum, to expand options for involvement of APHA members in important, crosscutting public health issues.

By motion from the Governing Council floor, TFAIR was tasked with working with the Caucuses to discuss issues associated with, and the feasibility of, providing Governing Council representation for Caucuses. At both meetings, the Governing Council also passed motions extending TFAIR's activities and mandates through January 2007.

TFAIR Meetings and Activities: 2006

TFAIR established a regular schedule of monthly teleconference meetings (held the last Thursday of every month, beginning in May and continuing through October 2006). In addition, subcommittees were created to address issues surrounding implementation of the motions passed in 2004 and 2005, including:

- APHA's relationship with Caucuses;
- Interaction with APHA's Constitution and By-laws committee;
- Interaction and coordination with APHA staff regarding motion implementation; and
- Interaction with the ISC and other groups to address membership unit changes.

2006 Progress On Motion Implementation

Motion to Strengthen the Relationship Between APHA and the Caucuses - At the 2005 GC meeting, the GC tasked the EB with the responsibility to enter into negotiations with the Caucuses to prepare a memorandum of understanding that defines the mutual responsibilities and expectations of APHA and the Caucuses. In 2006 the EB and Caucuses (aided by the TFAIR subcommittee and staff) engaged in productive discussions and drafted a memorandum of understanding for discussion.

Motion Concerning Sections and Special Primary Interest Groups (SPIGs) - The ISC and its steering committee carried out a comprehensive and thoughtful analysis of this motion, concentrating in particular on its responsibilities and the benefits and burdens to sections and SPIGs. Its final report was presented to the APHA membership and the EB in the fall. In addition, members of TFAIR, the ISC and APHA met on July 31st to discuss the report, motion implementation and remaining unresolved issues. ISC and TFAIR are discussing what, if anything, should be offered to SPIGs that cannot attain section status after 3 years and what options should be available to sections that can no longer meet section criteria. TFAIR endorsed the ISC report as a platform for implementing the intent of this motion.

Creation of a Forum - With assistance from the ISC and APHA staff, TFAIR worked to start a process with staff and the EB to determine the status of existing membership units and their intentions if any in the new structure. A process is now underway to discuss membership unit status with existing SPIGs (there are seven).

Motion Regarding Governing Council Meetings - This motion provided the option for APHA's GC to meet as many as four times per year. It also stated that, beginning at the in person 2006 Governing Council meeting, APHA consider and approve a schedule of additional meetings, and propose items to be considered. During 2005, APHA did not take advantage of the opportunity to hold additional GC meetings. In 2006 GC attempted to hold a teleconference meeting and met with some difficulty in moderating and conducting votes.

Membership in More than One Section or Special Primary Interest Group (SPIG) - Limited progress was been made in 2006 implementing this motion due to competing staff priorities. Of great interest to the membership, the motion allows any member of APHA to join as many as three sections, SPIGs or a combination of sections and SPIGs, as a full primary member. APHA's internal infrastructure was undergoing alterations to accommodate the changes necessary to implement this motion. Furthermore, the Constitution and By-laws of APHA required additional changes so that this motion could be implemented. These changes were passed in a motion at the 2006 GC meeting.

Motion regarding Feasibility of Caucus Representation on Governing Council - Progress was made in 2006. APHA staff, Caucuses and TFAIR representatives met twice via teleconference to discuss caucus representation, outline issues of concern, and plan for additional conversations.

Appendix 2: Summary of Points Generated during TFAIR's 2005 Roundtables

- (1) Facilitate debate in the development of strategic APHA policy and direction;
- (2) Facilitate a more effective, substantive GC policy role and expand the diversity of voices having input, e.g., provide more substantive reporting at quarterly and annual meetings;
- (3) Give purpose and relevance to GC role:
 - (i) improve communication among GC members and staff and Boards (e.g., more reports, develop an EB newsletter to GC; hold more frequent GC meetings (*already implemented*));
 - (ii) provide more substantive input for GC and limit passive reporting and process reports (e.g., discuss APHA progress and achievements in the context of the strategic plan; discuss how well APHA improved the public's health in a given year as part of national program demonstrations which APHA sponsors or supports; measure APHA's policy effectiveness in any given year; highlight the special contributions made by membership units (sections, SPIGS, Forums, Affiliates) in the past year; discuss APHA's policy and political priorities for the coming year and with whom APHA should work; foster even more discussion, debate and guidance from GC on policy direction;
- (4) Make APHA more efficient, e.g., maximize the alignment between APHA's organizational structure and its strategic planning goals; update the charge and/or sunset current task forces, working groups and committees (*as already approved by GC*); streamline GC functions (is GC too large? are membership terms and is participation effective? should there be term limits? how should SPIGS and caucuses be represented? are reports to GC meaningful?);
- (5) Simplify APHA structure, e.g., streamline task forces and standing committees and realign functions for efficiency; strengthen ISC and COA for efficiency of input to APHA; continue to outline fresh and dramatic organizational approaches to APHA organizational and governance structure for GC critique;
- (6) Improve effective advocacy, e.g., design and fund a Policy Center to
 - (i) provide timelier and more frequent analysis of health issues from the public health perspective;
 - (ii) hire more staff to achieve critical mass in policy analysis, lobbying and coalition work;
 - (iii) be more aggressive on the policy front;
 - (iv) disseminate policy more frequently to local affiliates and other organizational units (*continue current practice of frequent policy alerts, development of tools*);
 - (v) cultivate more affiliate and section involvement in policy development and implementation;
 - (vi) structure APHA so that it can respond more effectively to regional issues, (involve GC members at the regional level, hold regional meetings and otherwise advance regional issues);
- (7) Align the roles of EB and GC to achieve greater efficiency and accountability;

(i) foster more frequent communication, e.g., begin a monthly or quarterly newsletter from EB to GC;

(ii) refine the intended roles and the intended relationship between GC and EB (is EB the steering committee for GC or is it a separate branch of APHA governance? does APHA have (or intend) a bicameral governance structure and, if so, does GC need a steering committee to harness and implement its work?

(iii) who should evaluate overall APHA efficacy, is GC effectively involved and functioning and how do EB and GC overlap in this regard?

Appendix 3: Fact Sheet on Multi-Unit Membership

{Note: Below are draft contents developed by TFAIR in 2007 in conjunction with APHA staff. It was intended to be a start on materials that would accompany the Multi-Unit Membership option in 2008. It may or may not survive in its current form.}

Over the past two years, the APHA office has had a full plate. Now, having completed a major overhaul of headquarters IT, launched a newly formatted website, and reorganized to deal with staff turnover, we have tackled the complex changes in our membership, accounting, and communications systems needed to implement multi-section membership. The Governing Council passed an initiative in November 2005 allowing members to join and participate in the activities of up to three sections (and/or SPIGS). The feedback we have received about this new option is overwhelmingly positive, and members have expressed a desire to make it happen as quickly as possible.

APHA members enjoy a one-year national membership period renewing annually on the anniversary of the month they first joined. A single section membership is also renewed with the member's national membership.

To avoid a large one-time spike in costs and demands on staff, the new multi-section option will be phased in over twelve months, starting in MONTH YEAR. Members up for renewal each month will receive instructions that include optional multi-section membership (up to 3 sections).

As you know, membership in one section is included in your national dues. An analysis of the costs of operating the multiple-section option has led us to set the annual dues for second and third sections at \$xx.xx per section. *{Note: the actual cost will be inserted after GC approval of the amount.}* Three dollars (\$3.00) of the dues will be passed on to the additional section(s) joined (APHA passes this much along now to the first section from the national dues of each member).

The Governing Council passed the multi-section membership option with a three-year evaluation period. As well as modifying our databases and staff processes to accommodate this new member benefit, the staff has identified how our regular management and financial reports need to be adapted to allow for this evaluation. The changes have touched a surprising number of our operations including communications. It is important that members be billed properly, receive proper voting materials, and get all section communications whether they belong to one, two, or three sections.

For additional details, please read the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) below.

FAQ

Why will it take up to 12 months for me to have the option to join a second and/or third section?

As we analyzed the impact of members joining up to three sections, it became clear that the method of rolling out this benefit for current members could create a huge bottleneck in processing if we tried to do it for all 30,000 plus active members on a fixed date. It would also require even more extensive one-time reprogramming of our membership, accounting, and communications software. Therefore, to keep disruption and costs down, it will be offered to members on their regular annual renewal date. Renewing members will be given the opportunity to add, delete, or rearrange their membership in up to three sections. Thereafter, members may make changes in their section membership profile once a year at their renewal anniversary. This will cover the entire membership in twelve months.

What about new members just joining APHA?

New members joining APHA will also have the option of electing up to three sections. Their national dues cover the costs of joining one section and they may elect to join one or two additional sections and pay additional section dues. They will then have the option to rearrange their section membership profile once a year on the anniversary of their initial membership.

Can I change my section membership profile as often as I want?

No. To keep the workload manageable and avoid confusion, you may only change your section membership profile once a year on your annual renewal date. If you have paid in advance for multiple years' membership, you will still have the opportunity to adjust your section membership profile once a year.

Will I be able to vote in all of my sections' elections?

Yes. You will receive ballots and election material from up to three sections (if you have joined by February 1 when the mailing file is transferred to the election services company).

Will I be able to run for and hold office in more than one section simultaneously?

Yes, with limitations. (See next FAQ).

Are there any limitations to my participation in section activities if I join multiple sections?

Yes, no APHA member may hold the office of chair, chair-elect, governing councilor or section councilor (or any combination of two or more of the above) simultaneously in one or more sections (MAY NEED TO BE VERIFIED IN NEW DRAFT OF BY-LAWS); and no APHA member may hold office as chair, chair-elect, or governing councilor (or any combination thereof) of any section or sections continuously for a combined time of more than six (6) consecutive years. (MAY NEED TO BE VERIFIED IN NEW DRAFT OF BY-LAWS).

What led to this change to allow members to join multiple sections?

It began as a discussion in the ISC moving to involve TFAIR. An examination of the issues raised, including concerns about silos and built in disincentives to cooperation, helped TFAIR identify the need to propose change to the system. Our historical structure has had the unintended consequences of fostering the expenditure of large amounts of members' energies on section and association politics instead of towards developing new multidisciplinary solutions to public health problems and approaches to public health in general. Witness the evolution of SPIGs and Caucuses to allow members to address emerging issues and problems that don't neatly fit within the section silos. Also, smaller sections representing disciplines and expertise critical to public health were unintentionally becoming marginalized by the structural restriction of having to choose to affiliate with only one section.

In discussing solutions, the ISC and TFAIR realized that many members already operate within the domains of more than one section's disciplines in their careers, and it would be a valuable service to members to operate the association to reflect this reality. TFAIR and ISC both found that member support for this change was high.

TFAIR also examined several national associations with distinct sections where members aren't limited to a single section membership. In every case, there were benefits to the members and the associations and no obvious shortcomings.

TFAIR then proposed the initiative adopted by the Governing Council in November 2005.

What about constitutional issues?

The Governing Council adopted the initiative in November 2005, and the minor required changes in language in the constitution and by-laws were approved by a vote of the membership in November 2006, and the Constitution and By-Laws Committee has made all the needed changes.

How will this affect the membership requirements for forming or dissolving sections?

The number of memberships will be the count used to meet minimum size requirements for section formation and devolution. This topic was extensively discussed by the ISC over several years. As well as providing a valuable benefit to the individual APHA member, it is hoped that the multiple membership option may alleviate some of the pressure on the smaller, more technical and specialized sections as they have faced an historic trend of declining membership (in part due to the artificial requirement to affiliate with only one section). We have already lost our oldest section (Laboratory Methods) and would like to stem the tide devolving our smaller but vital sections and open the door to the formation of new sections providing a focus of member energy on important new areas without robbing membership from the present sections. By lessening the structural inertia of our historical structure, the multi-membership option could provide a mechanism where the array of sections and patterns of members' affiliations might gradually evolve to keep pace with public health issues and the direct interests of the Association's members.

How will this affect section representation in the Governing Council?

Prior to the implementation of this initiative, each section was given two seats on the Governing Council out of 120 total seats and the remaining seats were apportioned according to the number of members in each section. With rounding to whole seats the final number is occasionally higher than the 120-seat base. When this initiative begins, each section will be given two seats on the Governing Council and the remaining seats will be apportioned according to the number of memberships in the section. At first there will be little or no difference in allocations. Noticeable differences are expected to be small and develop slowly. If or how any change may occur will depend on the patterns and extent of the membership's adoption of the multi-section option. This is something that will be documented in the evaluation. An analysis of these patterns may yield valuable new information about the emerging multidisciplinary patterns in practice.

How will this affect a section's allocations of sessions at the annual meeting?

Similar to the allocation of seats on the Governing Council, the annual meeting session allocation formula will be based in part on the number of memberships in a given section. Additional factors include number of submitted abstracts and average attendance. This could tend to move the session topics in a more multi-disciplinary direction. This will also be carefully monitored during the evaluation.

Are there other potential benefits of allowing multiple memberships?

Yes. Intended as a new benefit for individual members, it could have additional benefits by raising some revenue for sections and attracting new Association members. Member feedback on this new option has been overwhelmingly positive, and the most frequent comments have been, why hasn't this been implemented yet?

What else will be measured in the evaluation?

The Association's membership, accounting, and communications systems will automatically track many things: the number of members exercising the options, membership counts in the sections, impact on communications, Governing Council, the annual meeting, patterns of section officership, advocacy actions from multi-section members.

How many members do you expect to take advantage of the multiple membership option when it is first offered to them?

Our best guess is that about ten percent (10%) of our approximately 18,000 Regular members may take advantage of the option to join multiple sections. We assume that 15 percent would join a second section and that half of those (5%) would also join a third section. So we based our workload and cost estimates on processing records and maintaining extra section services for approximately 2,700 members. This is only a guess. We could be wrong in either direction. Hence the importance of careful monitoring during the three-year evaluation period.

Appendix 4: Motion for the Continuation of TFAIR

Rationale: During the past year, the Task Force on Association Improvement and Reorganization (TFAIR) has successfully completed its work by presenting to the Governing Council a report concerning its activities and efforts to review the implementation of the motions passed by the Governing Council and beginning to plan a larger process by which APHA might reinvent itself to be as effective as possible in serving members and the public health interests of the nation. TFAIR has indicated to the Governing Council that it desires to continue to look for ways to maximize APHA effectiveness. As this report notes, there remains additional work to be done. TFAIR believes that its continued existence will assist in improving APHA governance and identifying additional areas in which improvement can be sought.

TFAIR requests that the Governing Council support TFAIR by adopting the following motion, or a similar one:

1. The Governing Council accepts the 2006 – 2007 TFAIR report and extends TFAIR until January 1, 2009.
2. Current TFAIR members are hereby reappointed with Dr. Andrew White continuing as TFAIR chair.
3. The Governing Council charges TFAIR with the following tasks for 2007 – 2008:
 - a. TFAIR shall continue to assist APHA, especially APHA staff, the GC, and the EB, with the implementation of the motions introduced by TFAIR and passed by the Governing Council, in 2004 and 2005;
 - b. TFAIR shall to work with the EB to develop a communication plan between itself and the GC and to submit the process for GC approval at a future GC meeting;
 - c. TFAIR shall work with the EB and staff to develop a periodic membership survey aimed at obtaining consistent feedback on member satisfaction, needs, and ideas; assess the ability of APHA to support it; and develop recommendations for its frequency and dissemination plan for the results of such surveys to the membership and membership organizations. The final plans and recommendations for such a survey will be submitted for GC approval at a future GC meeting.; and
 - d. TFAIR shall continue to explore the issue of how APHA should be structured and organized. In particular, TFAIR shall undertake an exploration of the larger issues confronting APHA governance, seek broad input from the membership and governance bodies, and attempt to producing a plan with recommendations to guide APHA through a transparent and inclusive discussion of reorganization to better meet the needs of members and improve APHA timeliness and effectiveness in the field of public health.
4. In addition to holding meetings via teleconference, TFAIR shall meet for two days as a committee at APHA headquarters in Washington, DC in July or August 2008. APHA shall allocate the resources necessary for this meeting.
5. TFAIR shall report to the GC at the 2008 APHA annual meeting or an earlier GC meeting, describing its activities during the 2007 - 2008 year and offering suggestions for change in governance, if appropriate, in the form of suggested motions, resolutions or otherwise.