

# CALIFORNIA INDIAN HERITAGE CENTER TASK FORCE

Subcommittee on Governance

February 18, 2004

## Discussion Outline

### I. Summary recap of January 15, 2004 discussion facilitated by Prof. Evelyn Lewis:

Parties with a role in the eventual organizational structure are:

California Indian People

California State Parks

There is a need and a benefit for the two groups to work together as collaborators:

Neither group can develop the Heritage Center on its own

California Indian people provide the authentic, living link to traditional and contemporary spiritual, artistic and cultural beliefs and practices

California State Parks provides some resources, a degree of expertise in developing and operating large projects, and collections

The greatest fear identified by the two groups is the same: failure and its consequences:

Personal embarrassment

Organizational embarrassment

### II. Conclusions from January 15, 2004 discussion:

Neither group has an existing organizational structure that is particularly well-suited to the needs of planning, developing and operating the Heritage Center.

This suggests that a new organizational structure is required, and the need is reflected in statute: PRC 5097.994(e)(5) requires the Task Force to "Develop and recommend to the department [California State Parks] a governing structure for the ongoing operation of the cultural center."

### III. Factors Influencing Form of Governance Structure:

Creation of a new governing body/structure will permit organizational focus on the needs of the Heritage Center, and allow continuity of effort over time.

In designing a governance structure it must be recognized that each group has a need to exert various amounts of control--Walter Gray would prefer to call this influence--over specific areas of the operation that are of primary importance to them.

The question of governance structure will revolve around questions of control--who controls what, and to accomplish what purpose?

A governance structure must be created in order to allow the organization to accomplish its vision and purpose.

A governance structure needs to define the roles and responsibilities of the parties.

If outside (that is, non-state) funds are involved, some form of nonprofit corporation status will be desirable.

A combination of state and nonprofit structures can allow the organization to take advantage of the best parts of both systems.

#### IV. Control vs. Influence Relationships

“Control” relationships are based on the exercise of dominant authority, and typically are seen in terms of zero-sum interactions between those in control and those under control.

These are often described as “power” relationships, where the parties negotiate who has, or does not have, a finite amount of power.

The state tends to like control relationships.

“Influence” relationships are based on degrees of shared influence, which can exist in unlimited amounts.

Influence relationships tend to be higher-performing and more supportive of creativity, but require more work to sustain.

#### V. Review Influence-based Organizational Models.

#### VI. Possible model for CIHC.

#### VII. How would we bring about a new governance structure for CIHC?

Use Cooperating Association model.

Special agreement.

Special legislation.

VIII. What Do We Think?

Comment on what has been discussed today.

Provide some feedback/direction to facilitator.

IX. For Next Time:

Discuss one or more specific scenarios based on guidance provided by committee today.

W Gray 2/04