**CSPP Board Retreat**

**September 3, 2019 10am-3pm**

**In attendance: Carrie Christensen (CC), Mary Daly, Andrew Difiore, Elaine Hunter, Dean Leone, Barbara Marcus, Ellen Nasper, Ryan Ochoa, Mary Pioli, Brianna Pollock, Nancy Sachner, Ann Singer, Wendy Stewart, Susanne Weil**

**Absent: Adna Linden**

1. **Introductions.** 10:15-10:25

CC oriented the group to the guidelines for the day, asking people to please raise their hands to get in line to speak. She noted that the CSPP board uses Roberts Rules of order, and that her goal is to keep to the schedule for the day. Additionally, she noted that the group will use a ballot vote at times, for the good the group.

1. **Impressions of the Consultant’s Report** 10:25-10:50

CC provided some background regarding the purpose of hiring a consultant; she noted that the goal was in part to improve board retention in the wake of losing several new, younger board members.

She invited every member to comment on their impression of the report. Below are brief summaries of people’s comments.

ASinger- I felt it was comprehensive; it called to mind things I hadn’t thought about. I wanted more detail on certain things, however.

NSachner- I loved the history section. The report offers reasonable proposals. I want to think about how things will be implemented though, and I wanted to know where things are with the nominating committee, e.g. it’s composition.

ENasper- I appreciated what it articulated, especially what the purpose of the board is in relationship to the larger organization, and valued the focus on best practices.

EHunter-I agree with what’s been said; I see this as a starting point. There’s one recommendation that we’ve already settled on; I don’t believe we need to reopen the discussion over the venue again. We’ve agreed it’s the best we can do at this point. “We’re not members of the NHLC; we just rent the place. It used to be exclusive, but today anyone can join.”

SWeil- I thought it was great and creates an opportunity for us to better understand how organizations function.

ROchoa- “For the record, I do want to discuss venue.” There are things about the organization of the report that were not so helpful, but the recommendations were good over all. There are a few things that I disagree with, and she may not know what she’s talking about in some instances.

ADifiore- I was amazed that there are people who understand how organizations work; I appreciate the thread about the board’s continuity and the health of the organization in the future.

BPollock- I’m excited to hear that there are opportunities for growth and change in the organization, as well as improvement in the organization.

MPioli- It is a good way to anticipate the future. I like the nitty gritty and the goal of better defining roles is something I hope we can work on.

DLeone- I was surprised by some things and concerned by some of the conclusions that were drawn by the report and I wasn’t sure how many people actually made some of the comments that led to the consultant’s recommendations.

BMarcus- I felt it was well done and is a jumping off point; I hope we can talk about it and not take it whole hog. There are some things I didn’t understand and wish Cindy could be here with us to answer some questions; it’s difficult for a consultant to actually get a handle on what’s going on in an organization. What I felt was missing was the unique role of this organization. It’s different than many non-profits, “we don’t make widgets; we’re educate and transmit psychoanalytic theory”. I think it’s important to allow dissent.

WStewart- I appreciate the report; the devil is going to be in the details; I have a personal feeling of regret about needing to invite an outsider in; I wish we could have solved some of these problems ourselves.

MDaly- I liked the focus on history and the fact that she highlighted the significant growth in the organization.

1. **Term Limits**  10:50-11:30

CC reminded the group that the Goggle Poll tally indicated that everyone voted to tackle term limits today; she read about term limits from the report on pg 6 “**…..they allow long term members to refresh, encourage new members to participate and feel valued**.” CC also noted that the report lifted up that long term members expressed concern about loss of focus and commitment to the mission if term limits were to be implemented. CC then highlighted the recommendation contained in the report about term limits, and asked if anyone one like to make a motion.

 EHunter clarified that CC could make the motion which would move the board to take a vote.

CC stated, **“I make a motion that we implement term limits and follow the specifics of the report’s recommendation. Term limits is a way to address board composition.”**

DLeone asked, “Does the motion apply to elected and appointed positions?” EHunter requested that the motion be clarified. Another person asked, “Is the limit 2 terms?” ENasper asked “If a person is on the board in one position, can they stay on in a new position? CC stated, “The spirit is to create room for new people.”

CC repeated the motion, with a comment about the history: “I make a motion that we adopt term limits as stated in the report; we currently have half of the board members elected, and half are appointed by the president; for the past 30 years we have not had term limits, except for the term of the president.”

**Discussion:**

ROchoa asked, “-If we do term limits, how will it impact diversity? For example, how will it impact the goal of diversity. If we have only a few men and a few people from Hartford and they all rotate off soon, then we’ll lost the balance we’ve been working toward.”

ADifiore asked about people coming off one position after 6 years, and taking on a new position. People clarified that they are required to take a year’s break.

ASinger noted that her situation is unusual. “There are only a few people in the Eastern region-I haven’t found anyone to take my position. I’d like to take a break.”

BMarcus stated that there are positions on the board that might be hard to fill and the absence of someone to fill those positions would be a problem, suggesting that the board would want to make some exceptions for certain roles.

DLeone noted that we have elections every two years so if our terms are 3 years that gets complicated; we’d have to change the time frame. Someone clarified that that would indeed need to accompany the change.

ENasper noted that term limits would push the organization to think about succession all the time, and added that being in a position for 10 or so years allows a person to become insular. She noted that, “we’d have a stronger investment in cultivating people to come on the board”, and that, “it might be better for this to be staggered so that the whole board doesn’t shift the same year.”

EHunter noted two things. “We need to consider having all board members be elected vs. some appointed; in general boards are made up of all elected members. And, second, “We pay Stephanie Kloos to do the newsletter; we might want to pay someone to do some of the things volunteers currently do now—e.g. tech stuff, promoting and outreach, public relations. This is a lot of work, maybe it needs to be a paid position.”

MPioli- “With 2, 3 year stints and a hiatus for a year, it solves the problems we’re having in that we don’t have enough movement on and off the board.”

NSachner- “It’s basically about balance; how do you keep some of the older members with history together with the young and early career people? We don’t want to lose a large group of one or the other; there should be exceptions in case we can’t fill a crucial position.”

SWeil- “I want to emphasize succession planning; we want to work with Ryan to build up the nominating committee.”

MDaly noted that if there are positions that are hard to fill, this may mean the board needs to redefine their responsibilities so that they are not so onerous.

WStewart- “Yes, there’s some anxiety about this change and I think we can work towards a process that works.”

BPollock- “In the few months that I’ve been here I have seen a lot of energy; I discuss the organization with people and lots of outside people don’t know much about this board and the organization; future leadership needs to consider marketing and outreach, and well as communication to the members.”

ENasper- “We need to think about the function of the board. What positions do we preserve that need to be part of the board and how we hold onto functions and roles that we still value that might better do their work off the board.” Ellen noted that the report emphasizes the role of the board in the daily functioning of the organization.

DLeone- Thinking out loud noted that, “for the president a 3year term becomes a 9 year commitment; that might be a problem.”

ADifiore- “With constant turn over there can be a loss of vision and values that can get lost in the day to day functioning of the board.”

ROchoa remarked that the 9 year commitment to the presidency is too onerous. He added that the nominating committee is formed and going to get up and running. He also said, “A lot of the questions we’re asking today may not be able to be answered yet; maybe we need some time for the nominating committee to get to work before we float some names internally before implementing term limits.”

CC added, “we’ve really done well at beefing up our committees; the idea is that these members might be interested in becoming board members.” She shared a list of folks who are on committees and starred the ones who are past board members. (See the list of committees and their members at the end of the minutes.)

EHunter returned to the function of board members; “it seems to me there are certain positions that are essential for our central function, to fulfill the mission of the organization and the financial management of CSPP; we need to think about what roles really need to be on the board.” She gave as an example that the regional reps are not needed for these day to day functions.”

BMarcus said, “I think there is some tension between our desire to open things up and change, along with the importance of succession planning, and the problem of concentrating power in only a handful of people. Limiting the size of the board concentrates power in the hands of a smaller number of inexperienced hands.”

CC remarked that some people feel there’s an imbalance on the board currently and that a small group on the Board has most of the power.

Enasper said, “I think all positions need term limits, meaning that committee chairs and members in leadership outside the board.” She emphasized that the spirit of turnover is what we are embracing.

CC noted, “that’s the point; are we a board that embraces term limits for the board or not?” As she proceeded to take a vote on this motion she asked people whether or not they thought it made sense to use a ballot. People indicated yes, and ENasper said yes.

The result of the ballot vote was 12 Yes, and 1 No.

1. **Size of Board 11:30-12:15**

CC noted that this is the most complex issue of the day and read from page 5 of the report; the current bylaws allow for board not to exceed 20; the report recs 9-11 and notes that a committee system allows other functions to be carried out, and there’s a model for how to do it. CC noted that she doesn’t have a proposed model; her idea for the board composition is in the report addendum, and she invited other ideas about composition.

BOchoa- I’m currently president elect and nominating committee chair.

 EHunter passed out a proposal that stated CSPP’s mission and its execution; Specific changes she recommended include the chair of the long range planning committee become an elected position. Additionally, her proposal suggested that the number of people on the board be limited to 10, all of whom have direct responsibility for fulfilling the mission of the organization and its daily operations. Finally, among these 10, there would be a new position for a communications director who would oversee website management, face book management, the newsletter, and media outreach.

ROchoa- I appreciate your ideas Elaine; I worry about how this translates into how we set our priorities; for example, early career is a priority for us, and that committee chair should be on the board, and the newsletter chair should also be on, and then there can be a reassessment later.

BMarcus-I agree with what Ryan has said; we have 2 cost centers, the newsletter and the scientific conference committee; and the newsletter person should have their finger on the pulse of the organization.

WStewart- I’m completely in favor of size reduction; Elaine did you really mean clinical conference chair should not be on the board? Elaine cleared up the misunderstanding; she does think the clinical conference chair needs to sit on the board.

BPollock asked for clarification, “What do you mean by the rotation of people coming to meetings? Bri thinks it might be odd for regional reps to come in and out.

EHunter- We may want to hear from certain people at certain times.

MDaly- The newsletter editor is an example of a role that may not necessitate board membership; their job is to share news and not have a stake in one issue or another.

CC- I think the past president should not be on the board; they’ve served and they can be an advisor to the president, but they need to move out of the way.

ENasper stated, “if the primary function of the board is planning clinical and educational activities I think regional reps should be on the board.”

ASinger- I see regional reps, and some others as being a PRN, and coming occasionally.

NSachner- During my tenure Elaine used to meet with regional reps and to coordinate with them; it would obviate the need for them to be on the board.

MPioli- In thinking about early career, what I’ve heard that resistance to joining the board has to do with time; many of them are setting up practices etc., so coming in occasionally would help with this problem.

EHunter agreed that each president needs advice and maybe this could take the form of an ad hoc committee.

ROchoa- I keep thinking about what the organization is going to look like a few years down the road, with regional groups doing more activities. I think there may be a shifting emphasis from the large meetings to regional activities and so we need to make sure the board reflects this shift.

Then people discussed their opinions about whether regional events make money or if they would ever charge for their events. There was some tension expressed about whether the clinical conference would lose focus.

 CC extended the discussion by 15 minutes.

NSachner; could we vote to reduce, and then decide which positions are no longer essential for the daily functioning of the organization? She made a motion.

**I propose that we reduce the size of the board from the maximum of 20 in the by-laws, and then decide what the number will be when we get clearer on the needs of the organization.**

CC took a vote:

1 abstained, 1 no

11 in favor

CC then introduced another model for reduction using the **addendum** from the report. She stated, “It is a model of thirds; so over a three year period folks leave the board after 1, 2, and 3 years so that we stagger the movement off the board. This is a model, or it could be combined with what Elaine is proposing.”

Clarification; yes; the president elect is the chair of the nominating committee.

CC- how to people feel about the proposal?

EHunter- I agree; I will go off the board; I don’t think my position needs to sit on the board.

WStewart- I agree; and I will go off after a year. I’m concerned about whether this will feel like enough change for the people who want change right away? Is this enough?

EHunter: I want to make sure that we take the opportunity to create a new board position.

ENasper, looking at the addendum, tried to clarify which group rotates off in the 1,2,3 plan.

EHunter suggested that we also stagger elections to facilitate this change. There were many affirmative nods.

MPioli- Why not say, come June all of these people come off the board at once, and we start doing the 1,2,3 on top? Why are we slowly phasing out these positions? We’re still going to be in contact with them.

DLeone- There’s also the option of this bottom group, pointing to the list, going before June; there’s a lot of pressure to reduce the size of the board soon; it is possible not to wait until June?

BPollock- Regardless of how we do it, June gives transition time.

EHunter- I need to wait til June; I’ve been on the board for 12 years; I wasn’t ready for that.

CC- Is there a motion?

ENasper- I move that we vote for the bottom list folks to no longer serve as board members as of June.

BMarcus- I don’t have a problem with that; I think we’re not clear about what positions will be on the board. The manner of how people are treated as they leave the board is important.

CC- Does anyone second Ellen’s proposal?

EHunter- What are we voting on?

**ENasper amended the motion, “that people who will no longer be on the board will leave no later than June; this group will be determined. We have yet to determine if the people in the bottom list will be leaving. The key point here is June.**

NSachner- We need to determine if the regional reps are going to be on the board.

CC- **A yes vote means that you’re saying yes to when the board shrinks; no means you’re not agreeing to the date of June.**

**Yes 13**

**No 0**

**LUNCH 12:15-12:45**

1. **Code of Standards 12:45-1:00**

CC moved the group into this discussion by reading from pg 5, recommendation 4.

Let’s take this in 2 steps. **I propose we adopt a code of standards as created by an ad hoc committee.**

**ENasper seconds.**

Is there discussion?

ROchoa remarked, “the ad hoc would help to develop the standards, and are we deciding who or what entity would have oversite of the standards over time?”

12 in favor

1 abstain

CC asked for volunteers to work on the committee. EHunter, NSachner and WStewart volunteered. This led to further discussion.

ADifiore asked if outside folks can be on this committee in light of list serve tensions.

DLeone clarified, “this is specifically talking about board member behavior, and therefore people who are not on the board should not have input.”

ENasper noted, “let’s make sure people who left the board are asked for their feedback about poor conduct on the board.”

NSachner noted, “We know why people left the board, so I’m not sure we need to go to them again; let’s take what we know and move ahead.

SWeil noted, “the new code should be aspirational in terms of how we want to be.”

ADifiore- I agree that with Dean’s perspective, but I still think we ought to consider opening it up.

BMarcus remarked, “With Cindy’s experience we might want to ask her for some guidelines.”

ENasper remarked, “One of the reasons to have a smaller board is to decrease conflict.”

NSachner said, “Since it pertains to board behavior, I’d like to make sure a younger board member join the committee.”

CC- the committee will report to the board Dec. 7; I think we should hold off on the oversite of the committee until another time.

1. **Location/Venue Board Meetings 1:00-1:45**

CC read from pg. 6 of the report to review the recommendation and proposal suggesting that the board meetings be held at separate times from morning of the clinical conference meetings.

NSachner noted, “If we go ahead with having 3 of the board meetings on Saturday, would it be before or after the conference?

CC clarified, “No- it would no intersect with the conference meeting at all.”

ENasper asked, “What did we conclude about this last year?”

People couldn’t recall. Maybe there was one after and one on another day.

EHunter said, “I’ve always felt that doing it before the conference is exhausting; I feel a bit fried by the conference.”

BPollock noted, “for me, coming from Hartford, it would be a challenge to come to NH for both the scientific meeting and the board meeting.

ASinger- asks about having the scientific meeting earlier and then the board meeting would not be so late.

People seemed to think this wouldn’t work.

ENasper Stated, “I would ask us to consider not changing the time of the clinical conference; we’ll have a smaller board and there will be fewer people involved.”

EHunter suggested that having a meeting in each region seems fair.

BMarcus said, “They are all good points; we’re a volunteer board, and people are so generous, so we are asking a lot more of them in terms of travel time to separate them.”

WStewart said, “Since we’re only talking about people in this room, we should ask people who are here.”

MPioli notes that if folks are already in NH, going an additional place could be logistically tough.

MDaly noted that Saturdays are key family time, and I wonder about the need for providing childcare.

ROchoa made a motion, **“I propose to keep it the same, meeting before the clinical conf.”**

 ADifiore seconded this motion.

BPollock added, “In the future, the board meetings will be less stressful, and smaller.”

BMarcus- “I found the board meetings to be energizing. Maybe we can do Zoom.”

NSachner- “I’d like to amend or make a different proposal from Ryan’s in which we would consider meeting after lunch.”

ROchoa reiterated his motion, and proposed that we leave this the same.

BMarcus asked “Does this mean the board meets wherever the clinical conf is held?

Group- yes.

Vote was unanimous in favor of keeping meetings the same.

1. **Expansion of the Diversity Committee 1:45-2:30**

CC read from pg 3 of the report, noting the many concerns people raised about diversity, and page 6. This speaks to the make up the committee as well.

ROchoa- I guess what she’s saying makes sense, but what is the role of this committee? Don’t other committees fulfill this goal?

M Daly added, “We need a committee that can do higher order thinking on this; other committees have specific functions and hopefully attend to diversity, but it is not their primary task.”

DLeone asked MDaly, -“Can you speak to what makes this such a complicated issue?”

MDaly said, “We’re embedded in a racist society and we’re a function of it. …..Even if a person is white and sees all white clients, they need to attend to their own internalized racism and be prepared to explore racist statements, feelings etc. that their clients express.”

BMarcus- “I think we need to stand for something in terms of how and where we conduct our practices. We need to think about a range of issues.” A lot of us work in settings outside of private practice.

CC- In response, sited the website and the diversity principals. She also pointed to the committee list, noting that we have a very small number of people of color in the organization, but we have a number of people of color doing committee work and they will ready at some point to join the board.

SWeil asked, “Would it make sense to engage ourselves in some training with a very high level professional?”

ENasper stated, “I would welcome having a consultant. Many of the younger members may not know that there was a D&I com that worked together for several years; what I discovered in the course of that work was how difficult it was for white people in that group to think about their own internalized racism and it made me think less about our goals and to focus more on my own internalized racism. My colleague M Olivia is leading a group on CMHC on dialogues on difference; we’ve begun to talk about doing something like that here. There are people of color who come to our meetings and who don’t feel particularly welcomed.”

EHunter “ I’ve appreciated all the work you and your group did, and I appreciate the suggestion about an ad hoc committee that decides what to do about it, and goes into detail about how we can bring psychoanalytic ideas beyond our lily white world.”

ASinger mentioned the speaker from last year who talked about doing psychoanalytic work with homeless people in Philadelphia.

BPollock noted, “ I have a lot of feelings about this; I feel we need to engage with folks who have less privilege than we do and I think we need to engage them; we need to see where we can meet people on their terms.” Discussion about combining psychoanalytic theory with other theories.

ADifiore added, “I remember the first board meeting I attended when this was discussed; we can talk all we want, but we have to do something about it. One of the best things we white people can do is to shut up and listen. Psychoanalytic ideas are pretty universal and allow us to connect with people who are working in a variety of settings using a variety of theories.”

DLeone added, “ I just want to reiterate that part of lack of success in this area is that we haven’t identified the obstacles; we don’t know what we’re up against. He recalled that Loretta asked, “why are you doing this?” Why are we moving toward being a more diverse org?”

ENasper responded, “We err if we think we’re bringing our talents to people of color; the question is, ‘how to we become more engaged with clinicians of color?’”

BPollock articulated the importance of noticing the need to connect with people by listening to their perspectives and seeing where there are connections.

WStewart said, “I’d be open to having a consultant.”

ADifiore added, “Psychoanalysis has ideas on culture and identity and art that are helpful to us in moving along and we can be using psychoanalysis for in- reach.”

SWeil, said, “I keep going back to the idea of having a consultant come in.”

CC- “I worry about not having an action plan; we can do our inner work, but we’ve gotten feedback; people of color don’t want to be on the board. I think we need to make a plan.”

ENasper- “I’d like to propose a conversation on difference. When we say programming, what a we thinking about?”

DLeone, In response to what Andrew said stated, “we can reach out to members of our organization to hear what’s uncomfortable for them.”

BMarcus- “I think it is important to return to Loretta’s question: why are we doing this? I know for myself; social justice is the right thing to do. In response to ADifiore, I’m not going to shut up and I think we need to do stuff differently.”

MPioli said, I think there is a value to slowing down and working with a consultant before we dive in. Let’s take a moment and be strategic, to see our blindspots.”

MDaly.- “I think we can do both.”

ADifiore, commented, “ to what end, the demographics in the country are changing; that’s to what end. Barbara- I didn’t mean to put you down; our problem is that we focus on being so woke, but we need to listen.” (Barbara and Andrew talk about their misunderstanding.)

BMarcus tried to make the point that CSPP members do not talk about all that they do in the community, outside their private offices.

ASinger added, “My feeling is that if we don’t go out into clinics etc. to find out what people are doing and what we can learn from them, we’re going to miss out.”

ENasper- “For as long as I am clinical conference chair please tell me; we need new ideas.”

EHunter- Refers to an earlier suggestion regarding hiring a clinical consultant for members who are working with muslim patients; she says maybe we could have a list of people who can help us.

BPollock commented, “ I think a consultant should help us talk about inner and outer work; we could just end up on a hamster wheel if we are only exploring our inner issues.”

SWeil made a motion. **“I propose that we research having a consultant who could work with us, and that we do the inside work and outside work together.” Ryan seconded it.**

The vote was unanimous.

CC asked, Who will do the research? MDaly volunteered.

1. **Next Steps/Wrap Up 2:30-2:45**

CC clarified for the group what was decided today, reviewing the approved 6 motions. These are the motions that were made during the meeting; they all passed with a significant majority, as noted above.

**“I make a motion that we implement term limits and follow the specifics of the report’s recommendation. Term limits is a way to address board composition.”**

**I propose that we reduce the size of the board from the maximum of 20 in the by-laws, and then decide what the number will be when we get clearer on the needs of the organization.**

**“I propose that people who will no longer be on the board will leave no later than June; this group will be determined. We have yet to determine if the people in the bottom list will be leaving. The key point here is June.**

**I propose we adopt a code of standards as created by an ad hoc committee.**

**“I propose to keep the board meeting time the same, meeting before the clinical conference.”**

**“I propose that we research having a consultant who could work with us, and that we do the inside work and outside work together.**

CC also lifted up the unfinished business of the board size. She suggested an ad hoc committee be formed to work on the size of the board. Ellen, Elaine and Carrie will form this ad hoc committee. There are a few more hours available from the consultant who will be tapped to help with this.

Ellen- let’s think about how we communicate this to the membership; I think it should come in a statement from Carrie. Also, let’s have more open board meetings.

Carrie- Let’s have an open board meeting in January.

Wendy- Let’s make sure we report it as a work in process.

**CC invited the group to check in with each other before leaving.**

Closing comments were overwhelmingly positive and forward looking, and key quotes are listed below.

People were impressed with the immense amount of work the group had done over the past year, and noted how that yielded a productive and collaborative process today.

Many noted that the day went well, and thanked the younger people chiming in and participating.

Others noted the meeting was forward moving, and refreshing.

Another highlighted the thoughtful deep discussion and listening among members.

One member expressed great relief and happiness about the depth of listening among the members during the day.

There were several very personal and heartfelt thanks to Carrie for her thoughtful and steady leadership, and work with the consultant.

And, notably, there was an awareness of and an expression of sadness as mention was made of leaving the board in June after years of meaningful service.

**CSPP BOARD COMMITTEES (2019-2020)**

E-Communications Committee

Elaine-Chair (website)

Kathryn White - (website)

Carla Baker- (Facebook)

Nancy Sachner- (Listserv manager)

Early Career Committee

Donna Dicello – Co-chair

Dean Leone – Co-chair

Ryan Ochoa

Ashley Clayton

Ellen Nasper

Mary Pioli

Long Range Planning Committee

Carrie Christensen

Ryan Ochoa

Nancy Sachner - Chair

Dean Leone

Wendy Stewart

Elaine Hunter

Barbara Marcus

Clinical Conference

Ellen Nasper - Chair

Mary Daly

George Hagman

Maria Olivia

Ingi Soloman

Nomination Committee

Ryan Ochoa – Chair

Mickey Silverman

Denzel Hunter

Jian Shen

Susanne Weil

Mary Pioli

Finance Committee

Adna Linden – Treasurer/Chair

Dean Leone

Liz Goggin

Douglas Rau

Lynn Sussman

Diana Congdon

WNEPS Liason Committee

Barbara Marcus - Chair

Angelica Kanter

Mickey Silverman

Dean Leone

Lynn Yaonik – (WNEPS member only)

Jill Delaney

Membership Committee

Mary Pioli – Chair

Wendy Stewart

Jill Delaney

George Hagman