

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	From Assessment Tool Responses							Recommended Board Action	
	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition					Relevant Verbatims:
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.5	0	19	1	19	0	1	0	<p>1 The problem with this monitoring report is that the operational definition, the rationale and the supporting data are not segregated in helpful and appropriate ways. For example, the operational definition should identify the data used to assure "fair, equitable and geographically consistent" compensation. It is not included in the operational definition, but is included in part later in the report, sp. no 2 under rationale and in the first sentence under rationale. I believe that the problem with this report is the way it is organized, but fear that the confused organization reveals a careless understanding of the design and function of a monitoring report. Some training might be helpful.</p> <p>2 This policy should be deleted. It is a directive "to provide information," not an executive limitation based on a value or risk.</p> <p>3 Tom: I remain concerned that the data measurement is largely self-reported by the congregations. Without auditing these reports there is no way to be certain the congregations are in compliance. However the policy only states that the information be available and well communicated which I believe it is.</p>	Accept as written
2.7.1	8	11	0	6	3	8	1	<p>1 "Self-explanatory" is not sufficient as an operational definition. There are elements of interpretation that need to be addressed, such as an interpretation of "reasonable planning assumptions" and "reasonable financing and depreciation assumptions." Such interpretations are at the heart of the matter.</p> <p>2 No declaration of compliance; no rationale</p> <p>3 Policy 2.7.1: No rationale was provided. In particular, it is unclear to me whether item C requires a multi-year capital budget. I read the policy as requiring this, but it was not addressed in the report.</p> <p>4 Re: Multi-year plan. I think we need an agreed upon method or system to track commitments to provide more data at a later date. Should these be posted in the Board's planning agenda for a future meeting (in this case, April 2011)? Or does someone see another method, such as placing into the Appdx 3A Monitoring Schedule? I don't want to lose accountability for these commitments.</p> <p>2 This report is qualitatively different than the 2.8 -- I was able to follow and evaluate 2.8 MUCH more easily, and it felt like it addressed my concerns and needs. This report feels incomplete and is hard to evaluate, though my presence on the Finance Committee tells me we are fine with this policy. Not all of us are on the Finance Committee, though.</p>	Accept - Option C. Next reporting cycle we would like to see the operational definition and rationale state more clearly. Accept, Option C. For the next reporting cycle assure that all elements required by Policy 4.4.3 are included in the report.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.7.2	7	10	1	11	1	7	0	<p>2 Use of the word "should" in the operational definition invites the query -- and what if an initiative is not included in the operating budget? That issue is not addressed in the operational definition and it is critical. If the word "shall" were used instead of "should," this questions would be moot. But the wiggle room implied by the word "should" requires further explanation.</p> <p>3 no compliance statement for this sub-policy</p> <p>4 Report acknowledges lack of data and includes plan for report in April 2011.</p> <p>5 standard of clear and comprehensive from the policy is not addressed</p> <p>6 Some elements are missing, and the report is difficult to follow.</p> <p>7 No rationale included in report</p> <p>8 While there was no rationale presented, the operational definition was so straightforward that I didn't see this as a major shortcoming. It would be best to include it, though.</p>	Accept, Option C. For the next reporting cycle assure that all elements required by Policy 4.4.3 are included in the report.
2.7.3	8	11	0	9	4	6	0	<p>1 again meets my good enough level</p> <p>2 For me, it is not acceptable to report compliance or non-compliance for more than one monitoring report at the same time.</p> <p>3 Report is promised for April 2011.</p> <p>4 No rationale included in report.</p> <p>5 The supporting data acknowledges that it would not be appropriate to accept compliance without reservation.</p>	Accept, Option C. For the next reporting cycle assure that all elements required by Policy 4.4.3 are included in the report.
2.8	4	11	3	9	3	6	1	<p>1 Sub-Policy 2.8.15 Operational Definition is vague as to whether it includes staff time; Rationale clearly does not</p> <p>2 No rationale provided.</p> <p>3 Either I'm not understanding some common understanding of what a high-level report should look like, or the Board and the Administration need a conversation toward agreement of the expectations for a high-level report. I find this and others to be a thin introduction to more substantial reporting on sub-policies, rather than its own report. That may be ok, but I'm not sure how to know if it's ok, since I'm asked to evaluate it as if it were meant to be as full as the others.</p> <p>4 The report seems to say that as long as all of the sub-policies are followed, the President can be confident that there are no other conditions that would jeopardize the Association's financial health. If that is accurate, then thereport should include a a rationale to support that conclusion.</p> <p>5 I see no value in a separate evaluation of the overall 2.8 report, given the detail in the subpolicies</p>	Accept - Option C. Recommend that the Monitoring Team add an element to the checklist clarifying reporting at global level and that the assessment tool be modified for the global level statements. It may or may not be true that complying with all of the sub-policies fully defines compliance with the global level policy.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.1	0	22	0	21	0	1	0	<p>1 The operational definition and rationale don't directly provide a way to assess whether there is compliance. They simply define GAAP. That said, using an audit to assess compliance is a reasonable approach (and operational definition), and I am convinced that operations are in compliance.</p> <p>2 There is a typo in the supporting evidence section -- the report of the Auditing firm was not dated 2020, but 2010, I trust. While it may seem minor, when dealing with finances and numbers, this number is not unimportant. Misreporting this number does not build confidence in the veracity of other numbers, which are important in financial statements.</p> <p>3 Note: under "Supporting Evidence" there is a typo for the date of the report to the Board (should be November 1, 2010).</p> <p>4 good work! crisp and clear</p> <p>5 Technically I might put the fact that we hire an outside auditor as part of the operational definition (e.g.: "Compliance will be measured by how an outside auditor views our compliance with GAAP") but that is fairly minor since it is part of the report.</p>	Accept, Option C. For the next reporting cycle assure that all elements required by Policy 4.4.3 are included in the report. We also note that there is a typo in the date of the report to the Board in the response (should be 2010 not 2020).
2.8.5	1	19	1	19	1	2	0	<p>1 The rationale and operational definition do a good job defining what the policy means. But they don't tell me how the president will know whether or not the organization is in compliance. I infer from the supporting evidence that the standard is that there is no increase in such debt on the associations audited financial statements.</p> <p>2 Operational Definition and Rationale are both literal definitions, neither operational, nor justifying</p> <p>3 Observation: in the reports on protecting assets, I usually marked "C," since I didn't find a clear standard within the rationale and operational definition. Here, in the fiscal health policies, I am easily finding the standard within the rationale. Different writers of the reports? Or am I reading differently? Hmm.....</p> <p>4 The operational definition does not declare the standard for assessing compliance. I am inferring that the standard is that an audit will show that no new secured debt has been issued. I am also convinced that we are in compliance.</p> <p>5 Similar to my comment on 2.8.1, I would probably prefer to see the last statement about the auditors reviewing all documentation as part of the operational definition (how does the President know we are following this?) rather than the results.</p> <p>6 It appears to me that debt over \$50K could be secured under this policy, and not be reported to the Board until the annual Audit. But, my expectation is that Policy 2.14 (...not permit Board to be uninformed...) would require the President to notify the Board in a more timely manner of such an exception. Do we need to clarify this further in policy?</p>	Accept as written.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.6	0	20	2	17	1	4		<p>1 The policy calls for an overhead fee of not more than 15%. The Rationale describes best practices for nonprofits sector to be 5% - 40% overhead. The Supporting Evidence does not mention the actual overhead percent of the UUA, but only addresses whether or not the restricted donations were used in accordance with the directions of the donor.</p> <p>2 The supporting evidence reports nothing about overhead fees -- no evidence that the President is in compliance on that part of the policy.</p> <p>3 The rationale and operational definition do not clearly define how the President will know that the organization is in compliance. I infer from the whole report that this will be based on the finding of the auditors, which I think is a reasonable standard. It would help if this were spelled out in the operational definition and then supported by the rationale.</p> <p>4 I do have one question which I hope will be addressed in subsequent monitoring reports on this policy. The policy refers to "all income and appreciation therefrom." I would like to have an explanation as to how appreciation is determined for donor-restricted funds, and whether the auditors test for appreciation. This appears to be more complex to me than meets the eye.</p> <p>5 I agree with referring to outside audit for items which are in fact checked in audit work</p> <p>6 This is exactly the level of detail I would like to see in these reports. Thank you!</p>	Accept, Option C. For the next reporting cycle assure that all elements required by Policy 4.4.3 are included in the report.
2.8.8	0	19	1	17	3	0	0	<p>1 table of reports particularly helpful</p> <p>2 One of the issues that seems to run through all the monitoring reports examined during this round is the observation that "operational definition" and "rationale" are not easily demarcated by a clear understanding about what should be included in each. I think that we need to have some more training, or attention at least, to distinguishing between these two important features of a monitoring report. Furthermore, there is little evidence that there has been any significant effort to determine how other comparable organizations fulfill similar policies, for comparative purposes at the least. My sense is that the preparer's of these reports would appeal to "best practices," as justification for procedures employed in addressing the policies, but there is no information about the sources of "best practices," no standard reference re: best practices except with reference to accounting procedures. I would like to have evidence of more cross-fertilization with other comparable organizations when it comes to financial matters.</p> <p>3 This policy seems to be inconsistent with a Policy Governance approach. It seems to be completely a question of Means. The use of the word "audience" in the policy makes it extremely broad, as reflected in the staff's operational definition. Not clear how this policy reflects Board's governance concerns.</p> <p>4 I was struck that the report made no mention of GA as one of the potential audiences for transparent reporting.</p>	Accept as written. We also recommend that the Board consider removing sub-policies A, B and C. We suggest that the Finance Committee review this and make a recommendation to the board so that a decision can be made prior to August 30, 2011.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.9	0	20	0	20	0	0	0	<p>1 Some of the same issues identified with respect to previous monitoring reports apply here, but all things considered, this is such a significant improvement over the initial reports received regarding the Association's finances, that emphasis should be made on the positive improvement, rather than on some details which still need further improvement.</p> <p>2 When we stated "financial obligations" in this policy, did we mean legal financial obligations? Just need some clarity about the extent of obligations. Much obliged.</p>	Accept as written.
2.8.10	2	17	0	17	1	1		<p>1 The Rationale paragraph isn't a rationale -- it's an organizational statement. The Data paragraphs indicate compliance, but provide no actual data and evidence that the described procedures are actually happening.</p> <p>2 The missing piece for me is that there is no interpretation of "significant variance." I would think that a percentage would be indicated, but there is nothing. Therefore, it is not possible to determine compliance. This is something that will, I trust, be addressed in future monitoring reports. More specificity please.</p> <p>3 Re: Oper Def. => Should "... significant variances..." be reported to the full Board, instead of just the Finance Cmte? Board holism?</p>	Accept as written.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.10A	0	21	0	20	1	0	0	<p>1 The data paragraphs describe procedures rather than providing data describing adjustment smade to ensure compliance with the policy</p> <p>2 The operational definition is a statement of activities, which is useful only so far as it goes. What is most interesting is the phrase in the policy: "make every reasonable effort." That needs interpretation so that, when times are tough, there is a standard against which to evaluate whether a projected deficit is within the policy or not. I hope that in the next monitoring report, there will be a statement about what the President understands "make every reasonable effort" to mean in practice.</p> <p>3 I found this report easy to understand, and just as important, easy to evaluate against the checklist. That made it easy for me to feel I was being accountable to our sources in doing what we said we would do. Thank you!</p> <p>4 I would have liked to see more data rather than just a description of process in the supporting evidence - e.g. what is the current projected surplus for FY2011?</p>	<p>Accept, option C. We ask that the next time this policy is monitored that the President define what a "significant variance" is that would require monitoring.</p> <p>We also recommend that the Board consider a change to this policy that would require reporting of significant variances to be made to the full Board rather than to the Finance Committee. Currently the policy says the President shall not fail to "... make timely reports on significant variances." The President interpreted this policy by stating that such variances will be reported to the Finance Committee. We recommended that the policy be changed to read "... make timely reports to the Board on significant variances."</p>
2.8.10B	0	18	2	18	1	1	0	<p>1 omits reference to Appendix 2.F.4 Jan 5, 2011 5:11 PM</p> <p>2 Does not address App. 2.F.4</p> <p>3 The operational definition defines the policy, which was very helpful, and I am glad that it was included. But it does not provide a standard for declaring compliance or non-compliance. The standard that was used was that the audited financial statements will demonstrate compliance with the policy, and to me this is a very reasonable standard. 4 I would have preferred to see the specific values for Beacon Press budget for the last three years, instead of just reporting that there was no loss.</p>	<p>Accept as written.</p>

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.10C	0	21	0	21	0	0	0	<p>1 The most interesting aspect of this policy is not addressed in the operational definition, namely the meaning of "shall make every reasonable effort." Compliance could be justified with a deficit in the GA budget segment so long as the President made "every reasonable effort" to avoid it. But we have no interpretation of what that would mean, and I trust we will have same with the next monitoring report on this policy.</p> <p>2 Tom: I think the 2012 GA budget is going to be significantly more difficult to project.</p> <p>3 I thought that this operational definition was exceptionally clear - it defined the data that would be used as well as the standard for declaring compliance or non-compliance.</p>	Accept as written.
2.8.10D	0	18	2	18	0	3	0	<p>1 I agree with the president's caveat concerning monitoring of the policy concerning the Investment Committee, therefore, we need to determine how to monitor or who should monitor that portion of the policy.</p> <p>2 I'm not sure I'm capable of understanding this.</p> <p>3 I didn't understand the data that were presented for item 4 (maximum practicable portion of UUAs cash and cash equivalents in short term community investments. How is the program that was described (community investment matching program) responsive to the policy? The operational definition did not explain why the data ultimately presented are relevant. 4 I had a tough time with this one. App. 2.B was a nightmare for me, trying to pull out who would be responsible for what and comparing that to the operational definition, etc. I ultimately concluded compliance but we need to provide more clarity for future boards on who and what will be required and monitored and how. Attaching the appendices to the monitoring reports also would help.</p> <p>5 I think I would need a week or more of study to be able to make sense of this.</p> <p>6 In para 6, under Supporting Evidence, Investment Policy, President notes that they intend to review contracts during the coming year. What are the Board expectations about the reporting of such review? Do we want the reporting loop to be closed somehow? Or will we just assume that the review happens? Are policy clarifications called for?</p> <p>6 The detail about the spending policy will be confusing for future board members who had none of Dan Bordy's tutorials on why we changed the endowment draw. In the future it may be helpful to remind us (again) that the policy is not the responsibility of the treasurer, so you are not reporting on it. So I wonder if all that detail even needs to be in the report?</p> <p>7 This section was the clearest to evaluate</p> <p>8 Would we like to ask the Finance Committee to review the Spending Policy calculation spreadsheet? The monitoring report says that it is available for direct inspection.</p>	Accept, Option C. The supporting evidence presented in item 4 is not responsive to the Operational Definition. Please clarify. Also, the Board needs to determine how to monitor the Investment Committee's compliance with Board Policies - especially the Investment Policy. The Governance Working Group notes that the issue of monitoring accountability to policy extends to the other committees as well.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.10E	0	19	1	19	0	1	0	<p>1 Not address all elements of app.2.A. Some of the missing elements were addressed in the supporting evidence section but not in the operational definition or rationale. I also did not understand the reference to the \$900,000 limitation. That is not in the appendix 2.A posted on the website.</p> <p>2 Same comment as before - attach the relevant appendix.</p> <p>3 This report may have more detail than I need to determine whether or not the policy is followed. It edges towards giving me all the information so I can decide if it qualifies -- most of us are not finance or loan experts, so the most convincing part to me is that we have a committee that is -- and they review everything.</p>	Accept, Option C. The next time that this is reported please assure that all elements in Appendix 2A are covered in the report.
2.8.11	0	20	0	18	0	2	0	<p>1 The difficulty of this report is seen in the lack of adequate reference to the Shared Vision (ENDS). Alignment with the Gift Acceptance Guidelines (2005) and mitigating risk are the easy ones -- but alignment with Shared Ends remains a sticky issue which has not been adequately resolved between the President and the Board. The lack of reference to this Shared Vision in the operational definition is a serious shortcoming.</p> <p>2 The supporting evidence section only dealt with the gifts of tangible or intangible property, stating that there were none in FY 2010 or FY2011. It did not address gifts of cash and how it has been determined that all such gifts were in compliance with the policy.</p>	Accept as written. The Governance Working Group recommends that the policy be changed to read: Policy: [The President shall not] Permit the Association to accept gifts of financial assets, tangible or intangible property that expose the Association to financial, legal, or other risk; that are inconsistent with the Shared Vision (ENDS); or that violate the Association's Gift Acceptance Guidelines.
2.8.12	2	17	1	18	2	0	0	<p>1 The rationale does a good job defending what transactions are subject to this policy. Neither the operational definition nor the rationale define how the president is assessing compliance with the policy.</p>	Accept as written
2.8.13	0	21	0	21	0	0	1	<p>1 the operational definition seems to be missing what the president does other than receive a report from the audit committee</p>	Accept as written

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.8.14	2	20	1	21	1	1	0	<p>1 The rationale provided seems more like data to me -- it demonstrates compliance. It does not defend the selection of the operational definition or the standard that will be used to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance.</p> <p>2 The operational definition needs to describe how compliance or non-compliance will be assessed (in this case an annual polling of the staff). In addition, I am unclear how the data presented address the policy's requirements for the Employee Benefits Trust. This may be included in what was presented, but I am uncertain. I'd like to ask the staff to make this more explicit the next time we see this report.</p> <p>3 I believe the provided rationale would be more suitably called "supporting data."</p>	Accept as written
2.8.15	1	18	2	16	3	2	0	<p>1 Doesn't address staff time</p> <p>2 The operational definition excludes mention of resources like staff-time, which is specifically called out in the policy.</p> <p>3 The rationale and supporting evidence seem limited to "resources" in financial terms, not in terms of staff time. I didn't see the "including staff time" portion of the policy reflected in the report and it seems like this needs to be covered as part of the report.</p> <p>4 Operational definition fails to address staff time, which is specifically named in the policy; so the operational definition is narrower than a full interpretation of policy would be. 5 I have checked option B because it is not clear to me that "staff time" is monitored effectively. While I understand that work products may well be accounted for, it is not clear to me how to monitor "staff time" and there is no assurance that "staff time" was devoted fully to the Association and its mission. And certainly, there must be a bit of wiggle room here -- phone calls to home to manage a sick child, taken during working hours, for example. What are the boundaries here? The whole issue is not addressed.</p> <p>6 my one no was more a question: should we refer to the conflict of interest policy here, or is that more applicable to volunteers and Board</p> <p>7 I am a little troubled by the general treatment of "staff time" when it was held up deliberately in the policy. Still, I conclude it was reasonable to fold that into "resources."</p>	Accept, Option C. The operational definition does not cover all aspects of the policy -- it does not mention staff time.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.10.	7	14	2	9	3	10	0	<p>1 The operational definition is incomplete. There is no rationale. The supporting data needs to be summarized in an appropriate fashion. There is no statement of compliance or non-compliance.</p> <p>2 The rationale and declaration of compliance/non-compliance with 2.10 are missing.</p> <p>3 No statement of compliance or non-compliance.</p> <p>4 There was an operational definition but no rationale. There was no statement of compliance / non compliance. I do not view these as major issues that would require re-working the report.</p> <p>5 Rationale is implied rather than explicit.</p> <p>6 Since all sub-policies of 2.10 are not reported upon at the same time, I cannot say that all elements of 2.10 are addressed. I think this is a procedural or process problem, (and NOT a performance issue), and it needs to be worked out between Board and President.</p> <p>7 Does not address the credibility and reputation of the institution in definition of intangible assets.</p> <p>8 No rationale or declaration of compliance or non-compliance given.</p> <p>9 I sense confusion in how to make a full report for a high-level policy. Or it may be clarity by those who are reporting, and I (the reader) am confused. But this highlevel policy report seemed mostly a light intro the fuller reports of the sub-policies.</p> <p>10 I wasn't sure how to respond on this one as all the data is in the subset monitoring reports.</p> <p>11 What is the value of assessing the highest level policy when the lower level policies incorporate all the elements?</p>	Accept - Option C. Recommend that the Monitoring Team add an element to the checklist clarifying reporting at global level and that the assessment tool be modified for the global level statements. It may or may not be true that complying with all of the sub-policies fully defines compliance with the global level policy.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.10.1	1	19	2	16	0	6	0	<p>1 It seems to me that the President has made a very good first stab at a rationale, but that it needs further development. In particular, there is no cross reference to any other comparable organization -- the rationale is mostly a statement of activities, rather than an explanation of why the activities are appropriate. I am not willing to report non-compliance because of this weakness, but only to request that more work be done on this aspect of the report.</p> <p>2 Not sure what defines best practices for nonprofits. Rationale not clearly identified (for example, as a heading). Could also use a heading for Standard for Success.</p> <p>3 As above, I think that the rationale needs to be strengthened. I am satisfied with the interpretation, but need stronger rationale, not just assertion. I also note that there is no reference to "intellectual assets," and wonder if the President is including "intellectual assets" with "intangible assets." If so, that needs to be stated as such and rationale given.</p> <p>4 Isn't the reputation and credibility of the institution considered an intangible asset? This was not addressed.</p> <p>5 Interesting report with a lot of data, and at least some of the data, albeit interesting, would not have been necessary (i.e.: the report could have been a lot shorter). For example, the board does not need to know all the insurance amounts (what are we comparing them to, anyway?) but rather the statement (which is there) that the amounts are reviewed with a (respected) third party insurance consultant.</p> <p>6 I appreciate the hard work that this report evinces -- it is so much better than previous reports and with a little more work, will suit me just fine.</p> <p>7 This report feels like communication from one partner to another. I am grateful.</p>	Accept, Option C. The rationale in this report should be strengthened to make it more clear why the activities listed are appropriate.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.10.2	2	17	2	14	1	5	1	<p>1 There isn't any data to support or refute 2.10.2, just a couple of examples of trauma situations; not what action was taken.</p> <p>2 This one's difficult. Are we prepared? The Operational Definition requires a plan. We have a plan; therefore, we are prepared. Is that enough? Are we prepared enough?</p> <p>3 Could not find the Standard for Success</p> <p>4 The report is not specific. Words (for example) "From time to time" and "Several years ago..." are vague.</p> <p>5 The only data reported is that we have a plan. Somehow, that doesn't seem like enough, but I'm not sure what other data would be relevant.</p> <p>6 Rationale is not related directly to Operational Definition</p> <p>7 The operational definition was unsatisfactory, for it did not address obvious issues question of what constitutes a crisis or a disaster. For example, when does an event rise to the level of a disaster? What is the boundary between a crisis and an annoyance? How does the Red Cross define a "crisis?" If there is not some clearer understanding of disaster or crisis, then potentially everything that can be construed as negative could become a crisis or disaster. Clarity of definition please and then an appropriate rationale that utilizes the best thinking of those who are professionals in crisis and disaster management.</p> <p>8 Throughout these reports, I have a feeling, I may be consistently marking "C" for the same reason each time: while this report is excellent, I do not see a standard distinct from the operational definition and rationale, and don't know how to see it in those two elements. 2 operational definition and rational seemed softer/vague compared to some of the others, but the data convinced me of compliance</p>	Accept as written. Although several trustees had concerns, they were not so significant that we recommend finding the operating definition unreasonable.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.10.3	1	15	6	15	1	6	0	<p>1 The rationale directly addresses the operational definition, but the operational definition is not broad enough to address all elements of the policy.</p> <p>2 My discomfort is around "most liability claims arise from slip and fall accidents". I am sure this is true, but appears to be focusing on number of incidents rather than severity, i.e.: could one sexual harassment incident incur greater financial risk than 10 slips? The data appears to suggest we do nothing preventative with regard to training employees about illegal practices (sexual harassment, discriminatory behavior, are there laws that Beacon Press needs to follow around libel?) which I suspect is not accurate. A little more rationale under rationale could convince me I don't need to worry.</p> <p>3 excluded from both rational and operational definition are the many sources of potential liability not limited to building safety and security</p> <p>4 Although the majority of claims address physical risk, I saw nothing about avoiding other risks, other than that there are covered by insurance.</p> <p>5 The data includes items that were more detailed than the operational definition, such as employee practices and benefits. Seems like those items should be included in the operational definition.</p> <p>6 I find the data helpful but the rationale confusing. I also do not think this operational definition has been as clearly articulated as others in Policy 2.10</p>	Accept Option C. The operating definition is not reasonable as it is too narrow and omits large categories of potential liability.

Summary of Assessments
January 2010

	Rationale Convincing?			Recommended Disposition				Relevant Verbatims:	Board Action
	No Rationale	Yes	No	A	B	C	D		
2.10.4	1	20	1	18	0	4	0	<p>1 Does not address premature destrustion</p> <p>2 Rationale does not justify operating definition</p> <p>3 As always, I'd like to see a "standard," distinct from operational definition and rationale.</p> <p>4 Is the vault on the third floor of 25 Beacon fireproof? That is where the "essential archives" are stored -- how would we feel if a fire went through 25 Beacon or the basement (with A/V material) flooded? My assumption is that the President/staff have made a cost/risk analysis on these items and believe the risk of fire/flood is outweighed by the cost of more secure storage.</p> <p>5 In some senses, this is the best framed monitoring report to date. The reason is that is recognizes nuances, though it still lacks appropriate supporting data and standards from other organizations, clarity about what constitutes best practices in this area. I am coming to believe that the UUA has functioned for too long in a cocoon, not enough engaged with other organizations of similar size in seeking best practices in essential areas of management and organizational development. Is it because the UUA has been led by ministers, most of whom know very little about organizational management? (This comment is made by a minister.) 6 my 2 no's are on minor issues, e.g. I missed how protection from premature destruction is protected yet this is pretty comprehensive report</p> <p>7 At first I found the operational definition to be confusing -- I wasn't sure what the standard of success was until I had re-read it a couple of times. But in the end I felt it was fine.</p> <p>8 In the section "Confidential Information", "respective deadlines" are mentioned, but not specified. It would be helpful to state the target dates for everyone's understanding.</p>	Accept as written