

AN INTRODUCTORY SEMINAR ON

## JOHN CARVER'S POLICY GOVERNANCE® MODEL

*A NEW STANDARD OF EXCELLENCE FOR GOVERNING BOARDS*

This workshop is intended to change forever the way you see the governing board job and the board-management relationship.

Of all the elements in the management of enterprise, none is less studied and less developed than the governing board. Because governance has rarely been the subject of rational design, boards persistently fall into trivia, CEO-centrism, meddling in—or, conversely, rubber stamping—management's work, and other failings. They do so even when composed of intelligent, experienced, caring members. In North America alone there are millions of governing boards (including nonprofit, corporate, and political, elected ones), each relying on the patchwork, inadequate job design we have all inherited.

The problem is chronic, pervasive, and longstanding. Public and nonprofit boards, frequently in the absence of a market judgment, fail to govern what results are worth what cost. Corporate boards are prone to over-identify with management, seeing themselves more as advisors than commanders, allow unconscionable executive compensation and questionable practices. Even as the practices of management have made great strides in sophistication, governance remains in sad disrepair. These conditions are true worldwide.

The message in today's workshop is not intended for boards in trouble, though they can benefit. It is intended for boards that simply want to reach for a new level of excellence. Our topic is not how your board can solve the problems which keep it from the ideal. *It is the ideal itself that is flawed.* No less than a true paradigm shift is required to set us on a more powerful, more sensible, more responsible track.

Today we will question many of your cherished beliefs about boards and chief executives. Financial oversight, committee work, policy making, planning, accountability, monitoring, board-staff relationships and other important aspects of organization will acquire refreshingly new meaning.

Consider this an adventure in exploring an old topic with new eyes. Welcome to Policy Governance®, a new design for accountable leadership of governing boards!

P.O. Box 13007, Atlanta, GA 30324-0007; Phone: 404-728-9444; Fax: 404-728-0060.  
Email Addresses: [johncarver@carvergovernance.com](mailto:johncarver@carvergovernance.com), [miriamcarver@carvergovernance.com](mailto:miriamcarver@carvergovernance.com)  
Website: [www.CARVERGOVERNANCE.com](http://www.CARVERGOVERNANCE.com)

## THE POLICY GOVERNANCE® MODEL

Policy Governance® is a conceptual model created by John Carver to enable strategic leadership by governing boards. It addresses board job design and the board-management partnership. The board governs on behalf of some identifiable "ownership," deciding the broad values that determine organizational results and behavior.

Written values and perspectives are called policies and occur in four categories: ENDS policies prescribe the outcomes that justify organizational existence. For nonprofits and governmental boards, these are in terms of what benefits will occur for which people at what cost. For equity corporations (for profit), these are in terms of shareholder value. EXECUTIVE LIMITATIONS policies describe the prudence and ethics boundaries on acceptable staff acts, practices and circumstances. GOVERNANCE PROCESS policies clarify the board's own job and rules, including how it connects to its ownership. BOARD-MANAGEMENT DELEGATION policies describe the empowerment and accountability linkage through the CEO. These policy categories embrace all proper board decisions.

Therefore, these categories cover all pronouncements the board legitimately makes. The CEO is empowered *toward* ENDS and *within* EXECUTIVE LIMITATIONS. This approach enables the board to stay out of internal operation, yet control outcomes and the bounds of acceptability. Budgeting, personnel, risk, compensation and all other practices are thus controllable with little board time and very brief documents. Monitoring of CEO performance using the criteria in these policies *is* the CEO's evaluation.

In Policy Governance® the board is proactive, explicit about its values and long range in the majority of its concerns. It avoids both meddling and rubber stamping. Board and CEO jobs do not become confused. Board committees stay out of staff work and, though staff views and knowledge are made known to the board. Due to clear roles, free communication among board and management is no problem. Board-management interactions can be enriching without leading to meddling or to loss of board prerogatives. Board agendas are usually shorter, the deliberation usually on long term ENDS with a mindset of strategic leadership.

John Carver's Policy Governance® model is fully explained in over 200 publications, notably in several Jossey-Bass (a Wiley company) titles by John Carver and/or Miriam Carver: a book, *Boards That Make a Difference*; audiocassette set, *Empowering Boards for Leadership*; DVD, *The Policy Governance® Model: An Introduction by John and Miriam Carver*; a bimonthly "newsletter," *Board Leadership*; a set of monographs, *The CarverGuide Series on Effective Board Governance*; a book, *Reinventing Your Board: A Step-by-Step Guide to Implementing Policy Governance*, a book, *John Carver on Board Leadership: Selected Writings from the Creator of the World's Most Provocative and Systematic Governance Model*; a book, *Corporate Boards That Create Value: Governing Company Performance from the Boardroom* (John Carver with Caroline Oliver); a book, *The Board Member's Playbook* (Miriam Carver and Bill Charney).

*A PERSONAL NOTE: Since 1976, the Policy Governance model has been intended to bring major transformation to governance theory and practice everywhere. Widespread availability of powerful, new concepts required by so ambitious a goal calls for many thousands of persons other than us to carry the message. You may use the concepts, principles, explanatory analogies, drafts and drawings in your own work for better governance. We ask only that you use them accurately--in a way consistent with the Policy Governance® model as a whole--and that you give proper attribution to the source.*

## ENDS - MEANS EXERCISE

*One of the new board skills is the ability to distinguish between organizational ends and means. Before a board can deal with ends and means differently, however, it must be able to make the distinction. This exercise gives you experience in distinguishing organizational ends from means. Though this may seem cut-and-dried, in practice it requires a shift in board members' mentality. Choose whether each of the following six issues is one of ends or means.*

I. Comparable results for disturbed children and 'normal' children are greatly different in cost per child. To what extent in our school system should resources be diverted away from the normal student population in order to achieve more for disturbed children?

ENDS

MEANS

II. Will it be best (a) to pay higher salaries for more skilled staff or (b) to pay lower salaries for less skilled staff but have to invest more in staff development and training?

ENDS

MEANS

III. A three percent cost-of-living adjustment has already been decided. Now the issue is whether to give raises to all staff or only those who have been employed most of the past year since they are the only ones whose initial salaries have "fallen behind" general cost increases.

ENDS

MEANS

IV. Should we insure office equipment and furnishings at full replacement value or a lesser amount, say, 80 percent?

ENDS

MEANS

V. Our global Ends policy calls for a poverty rate less than half the state median. Within that broad mandate, what relative emphasis should be put on adequate housing, job skills, and diversified employment base?

ENDS

MEANS

VI. Should idle funds be invested short-term in investments that are (a) high return but risky versus (b) lower return but less risky?

ENDS

MEANS

This exercise is intended to be used as part of a guided discussion, not as "stand-alone" instructive material.

Because it causes a noticeable withdrawal by the board from practices, methods, and conduct of staff, the Policy Governance approach to “means” may be its most striking feature. Board meetings become different, the board-management relationship changes, many board committees become unnecessary. But withdrawing from direct engagement in staff means only sets the stage for the board to undertake its own work uncluttered by staff work. For a disciplined board, the toughest challenge is not withdrawing from staff means, but defining **ENDS**.

Under the Policy Governance model, a board will spend most of its time gathering wisdom and information, debating points of view, and ultimately deciding upon **ENDS**. As simple as this might sound, it is vastly different from what boards traditionally do. Further, the nature of **ENDS** dialogue may prove quite difficult. **ENDS** dialogue is never about what the organization will do, but what will be the results of its doing. **ENDS** dialogue is never about “us,” but about “them”—that is, *what difference* the organization will make. Notice that design of services, programs, or curricula is a means issue, not **ENDS**. Even the common term *mission*—which Policy Governance avoids—is normally written in terms of what an organization will be engaged in rather than the difference it will make. Consequently, focusing on—or, better still, obsessing about—**ENDS** is as difficult for a board to achieve as it is straightforward to conceptualize.

Below are some broad, global-level **ENDS** statements (with worth components omitted for brevity) that might have been developed by several types of organizations. These are not intended to be the most appropriate for all such organizations, just model-consistent illustrations. After each are a few further questions that a board might choose to pursue in order to give further definition to the **ENDS** desired:

**PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM:** Developing young people have the capability to achieve age-appropriate success for a tax rate comparable to other districts.

Which young adults? What priority relationship between gifted and other children? How young? Capable, meaning what? Which young people? What does success mean in various age groups? How much expenditure is each output worth?

**COMMUNITY COLLEGE:** High school graduates in our county have the capability to enter or advance in gainful employment or institutions of higher education for a state-of-the-art cost.

All high school graduates, or those above some grade point average? “In our county” means legally resident or transient? What kinds of entry employment? Advance to what level? Any institute of higher education, even the most prestigious? How much expenditure is each output worth?

**FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY:** Functional families for a cost comparable to other similar agencies.

What constitutes functional? What dysfunctions will be targeted as priorities? Is this for highly dysfunctional families or just moderately dysfunctional ones? What constitutes a family? How much expenditure is each output worth?

**PUBLICLY LISTED EQUITY CORPORATION:** Economic benefit to shareholders.

What nature and how much of economic benefits? Compounded growth in annual earnings per share? Share price? Compared with other companies in same industry? Of same risk characteristics? Adjusted by years in which market share is growing?

**TRADE ASSOCIATION:** Conditions favorable for members' conduct of business for dues comparable to other trade associations.

What sorts of conditions (member skills vs. economic environment)? Which aspects of member abilities or of environmental conditions (for skills, office operation, investments, personnel)? Conduct of all parts of the business or selected parts? Which members (struggling, successful, urban, new)? How much expenditure is each output worth?

**CITY GOVERNMENT:** A safe and pleasant environment for living and commerce for a tax rate no greater for other cities our size in the state.

Safety from what (fire, toxic waste, burglary, bad water, flooding)? How safe? Pleasant in what ways (trash removal, clean streets, tree-lined avenues)? All aspects of living or selected ones (enjoyment of the outdoors)? Any kind of commerce (odiferous, vulnerable to economic cycles)? How much taxation is each city output worth?

**COMMUNITY HOSPITAL:** Relief from or arrested development of trauma and illness at a cost no greater than the median for the province.

Which traumas (burns, head injuries, psychiatric)? Which illnesses or conditions (severity, type, acuity, chronicity, emergency)? Which patients (age, gender, financial means)? How much is each output worth?

Difficult as is the process itself and the board discipline necessary to persevere in it, the idea is simple: the board's job is to define *what effects, for whom, at what worth* are sufficient to justify the organization's existence. In short, what is the organization *for* (rather than what does it *do*)? What is its "swap" with the world (resources consumed vs. human benefits created)? Notice that the **ENDS** concept is not just about results, otherwise there would be no need for the term **ENDS** to begin with. The concept describes (a) specifically the results that justify organizational existence (rather than internal results like, for example, financial soundness or achieving a competent workforce) and (b) the recipients of those results, and (c) the cost or priority (both are measures of worth) of those results.

So in each case, the **ENDS** work of the board is to determine not only what the broadest **ENDS** policy should actually be, but to further define it. The board task is *not* to work out how to achieve the desired **ENDS**, for those are means left to the CEO and staff. Defining and further defining the results, the recipients, and the worth continues to the point where the board is willing to allow the CEO to use *any reasonable interpretation* of the board's words that he or she chooses. CEO evaluation is about attainment of these **ENDS** and avoidance of the unacceptable means that the board has defined in its **EXECUTIVE LIMITATIONS** policies.

## DEVELOPMENT OF ENDS POLICIES

Ends policies begin with a statement broad enough to cover at a broad level, the *difference* the organization is to make, i.e. *what results, for whom, at what cost*. This pronouncement is tantamount to a mission statement, shown here as the preamble sentence in Policy 1.0. The CEO is bound by these words, but is authorized to use *any* reasonable interpretation of them he or she chooses. If that leaves the matter open to too much interpretation in the board's opinion, then further narrowing of the latitude left to the CEO can be accomplished, such as shown in numbered points 1 - 4 of Policy 1.0.

### BOARD POLICY 1.0

The purpose of Hope Cancer Fund is, sufficient to justify resources used, knowledge for the radical reduction of death by cancer.

1. The highest priority result will be basic area knowledge of the chemical, molecular, and cellular biology of cancer.
2. The second highest result area will be methods to make laboratory findings clinically applicable to treatment and prevention.
3. Delivery technology will be capable of mitigating social, psychological, and economic effects of cancer patients and their families, though at the expenditure of no more than 10% of resources.
4. Lifestyle behaviors will be consistent with the prevention of cancer.

*The expansions in Board Policy 1.0 may still not narrow the desired outcomes enough, so the board might adopt further language. Expansions of sections 1 and 2 of the first policy are shown below. They, too, still leave a range of interpretation to the CEO, but it is a considerably narrower range. Some boards might even go into greater detail than that shown here.*

### BOARD POLICY 1.1

There will be a basic knowledge of the chemical, molecular, and cellular biology of cancer.

1. Understanding why normal cells become cancerous — the priority result before 1999
2. Understanding causes of growth and spread
3. Identification of factors that increase risk — no more than 5% of resources
4. Discovery of genes that can prevent cancer — the priority result during the years after 1999

### BOARD POLICY 1.2

The second highest result area will be methods to make laboratory findings clinically applicable to treatment and prevention.

1. Effective clinical protocols for chemotherapy
2. Effective clinical protocols for radiation — major emphasis
3. Effective clinical protocols for hypothermia

A great deal more specificity will be given to these matters by managers and, in the example shown here, researchers. But that detail need not concern the board except insofar as it can be demonstrated to be a *reasonable interpretation* of the language used by the board in its policies. It is likely that these policies will be given annual scrutiny and re-exploration. Hope Cancer Fund is in the business of producing knowledge for clinical practitioners, other researchers, health educators, and the general public. In using these policy examples, there is no contention that the stated outputs are the most reasonable ones to choose, or even that the level of policy depth is appropriate. Each board must decide for itself. If the policy detail goes beyond what the board members understand, it is certain that an appropriate level of policy detail has been exceeded.

Executive limitations begin with a prohibition broad enough to cover all possible circumstances and activities the board would find unacceptable, such as is done in the preamble statement in Policy 4.0. The CEO is confined by these words, but is authorized to use *any* reasonable interpretation of them he or she chooses. If that leaves the matter open to too much interpretation in the board's opinion, then further narrowing of the latitude left to the CEO can be accomplished, such as shown in numbered points 1 - 6 of Policy 4.0.

## BOARD POLICY 4.0

The CEO will not cause or allow any practice, organizational circumstance, activity, or decision that is either imprudent, illegal, or in violation of commonly accepted business or professional ethics.

1. Paid staff and volunteers will not be subjected to unfair, undignified, or unsafe treatment or conditions.
2. Budgeting any fiscal year (or remaining part) will not deviate materially from board ENDS policies, risk fiscal jeopardy, or fail to be derived from a multiyear plan.
3. Assets may not be inadequately maintained, unnecessarily risked, or unprotected.
4. Actual financial conditions and performance will not incur jeopardy or compromise the board's ENDS priorities.
5. Staff compensation and benefits will not deviate materially from market.
6. Board information will have no significant gaps in timeliness, accuracy, or completeness.

### BOARD POLICY 4.4

Actual financial conditions and performance will not incur jeopardy or compromise the board's ENDS priorities. Accordingly, the CEO shall not:

1. Expend more funds than have been received in the fiscal year to date.
2. Incur debt beyond normal accounts payable in amounts that cannot be repaid within 60 days.
3. Conduct interfund shifting in amounts that cannot be restored within 30 days.
4. Fail to settle payroll and debts in a timely manner.
5. Allow tax payments or other government ordered payments or filings to be overdue or inaccurately filed.

*If expansions 1-6 in Policy 4.0 still do not narrow the proscriptions sufficiently in the board's opinion, the board can adopt further language. Because these expansions are specific to certain topics (e.g. financial condition, asset protection), they might best be dealt with in added pages of policy, such as shown in Policies 4.3 and 4.4. They, too, leave a range of interpretation to the CEO, but it is a considerably narrower range. Some boards might go into even more detail than that shown here.*

### BOARD POLICY 4.3

Assets may not be inadequately maintained, unnecessarily risked, or unprotected. Accordingly, the CEO shall not:

1. Fail to insure against (a) theft and casualty to at least 80 % replacement value and (b) liability losses to staff, organization, and board members to at least \$2,000,000.
2. Unnecessarily expose the organization, staff or board members to claims of liability.
3. Allow unbonded persons access to material amounts of funds.
4. Receive, process, or disburse funds with controls insufficient to meet the standards of the board-appointed auditor.
5. Invest or hold operating capital in insecure instruments, including bonds of less than AA rating and uninsured checking accounts, or in non-interest bearing accounts, except where necessary to facilitate ease in operations.

## BOARD POLICY 2.0

The role of the board, on behalf of the citizens of Jefferson, is to assure that Employment Counseling Service (a) accomplishes what it should, and (b) avoids unacceptable activities and conditions.

1. The board will engage in structured contact with citizens of Jefferson to represent their diversity.
2. The board will define in ends policies what is to be accomplished in terms of benefits, recipients, and their relative priorities. It will define in executive limitations policies those activities and conditions it considers unacceptable. The board will delegate performance on these matters to a CEO.
3. The board will carry out its job with discipline, emphasizing strategic rather than short-term issues, policy rather than single events, and group rather than individual decisions.
4. **The chairperson is charged to make decisions on issues of Governance Process and Board-Staff Linkage within board policies.**
5. Conduct of board members will be consistent with their fiduciary responsibility and with the discipline adopted by the board.
6. **If board committees are necessary, they will assist in the board's job only, never interfere in the direct link between the board and CEO, and never fragment the wholeness of the board's job.**
7. The annual cycle of the board will conclude with re-established ends policies just prior to CEO construction of a new year's plan and budget.

*Governance Process policies, as all others, begin with the broadest statement on the topic. This largest statement is shown here as a preamble that is further defined by sections 1 - 7. Unless further defined, as illustrated in policies 2.4 and 2.6 below, the board chairperson is authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of the board's words. Given the expansion of detail in policies 2.4 and 2.6, the board chairperson is confined to any reasonable interpretation of these more specific policies.*

## BOARD POLICY 2.4

**The chairperson is charged to make decisions on issues of Governance Process and Board-Staff Linkage within board policies.**

1. **The purpose of the job is to see that the board behaves consistently with its rules and those imposed upon it from outside.**
  - A. Meeting content will only be issues which clearly belong to the board to decide, not the CEO.
  - B. Deliberation will be fair and open, but also efficient, timely, and orderly.
2. **The chairperson is authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of the provisions in Governance Process and Board-CEO Linkage policies, except where the board specifically delegates portions of this authority to others.**

## BOARD POLICY 2.6

**If board committees are necessary, they will assist in the board's job only, never interfere in the direct link between the board and CEO, and never fragment the wholeness of the board's job.**

1. **Board committees are to help the board do its job - not to help the staff - ordinarily by preparing policy alternatives and implications for board deliberation. Board committees will not advise staff.**
2. **Board committees may not speak or act for the board except when formally given such authority for specific and time-limited purposes. Authority will not conflict with authority delegated to the CEO.**
3. **Board committees cannot exercise authority over staff.**
4. **Board committees are to avoid over-identification with organizational parts rather than the whole. A committee which has helped create policy on a topic will not monitor performance on that topic.**

# DEVELOPMENT OF BOARD-MANAGEMENT DELEGATION POLICIES

## BOARD POLICY 3.0

The board will link governance and management functions through a single chief executive officer, titled Executive Director.

1. All board authority delegated to staff is delegated through the CEO, so that all authority and accountability of staff - as far as the board is concerned - is considered to be the authority and accountability of the CEO.
2. The CEO is accountable to the board for achievement of provisions of the board's Ends policies and avoidance of provisions of the board's Executive Limitations policies.
3. Monitoring data - those that disclose the degree of organizational performance upon Ends policies and Executive Limitations policies - will be systematically gathered by the board and considered to be the only evaluation of CEO performance.
4. Individual board members may have whatever relationship with the CEO or staff members that is acceptable to the CEO, except that they can never carry the instructive authority of the board, nor can they waive requirements set out by the board.

## BOARD POLICY 3.3

Monitoring data - those that disclose the degree of organizational performance upon Ends policies and Executive Limitations policies - will be systematically gathered by the board and considered to be the only evaluation of CEO performance.

1. A given policy may be monitored in one or more of three ways: (a) *Internal report*: Disclosure of compliance information to the board from the CEO, (b) *External report*: Discovery of compliance information by a disinterested, external auditor or inspector selected by and reporting to the board, (c) *Direct Inspection*: Discovery of compliance information by the board as a whole, or by a board member or committee if duly assigned.
2. Any policy can be monitored by any method at any time the board chooses. For regular monitoring, however, each Ends and Executive Limitations policy will be classified by the board according to frequency and method: (a) *Quarterly Internal reports* for Policies 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, and 4.8, (b) *Annual External reports* for Policies 4.4, 4.9, 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4, (c) *Semiannual Direct Inspection* for Policy 4.10.
3. Each September the board will have a formal evaluation of the CEO, considering this monitoring data.

*Board-Management Delegation policies, as all others, begin with the broadest statement on the topic. This largest statement is shown here as a preamble that is further defined by sections 1 - 4. Unless further defined (as illustrated in Policies 3.1 and 3.3), the board chairperson is authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of the board's words. Given the expansion of detail in Policies 3.1 and 3.3, the board chairperson is confined to any reasonable interpretation of these more specific policies.*

## BOARD POLICY 3.1

All board authority delegated to staff is delegated through the CEO, so that all authority and accountability of staff - as far as the board is concerned - is considered to be the authority and accountability of the CEO.

1. The board will direct the CEO to achieve specified results, for specified recipients, at a specified worth through the establishment of Ends policies. The board will limit the latitude the CEO may exercise in practices, methods, conduct and other "means" to the Ends through establishment of Executive Limitations policies.
2. As long as the CEO uses *any reasonable interpretation* of Ends and Executive Limitations policies there is authorization to establish all further policies, make all decisions, take all actions, establish all practices and develop all activities.
3. The board may change its Ends and Executive Limitations policies, thereby shifting the boundary between board and CEO domains. But so long as any particular delegation is in place, the board and its members will respect and support the CEO's choices. This does not prevent the board from obtaining information in the delegated areas.
4. Only decisions of the board acting as a body are binding upon the CEO: (a) Decisions or instructions of individual board members, officers, or committees are not binding, except in rare instances where specific authorization is given by the board, (b) In the case of board members or committees requesting information or assistance without board authorization, the CEO can refuse such requests that require - in the CEO's judgment - a material amount of staff time, or funds, or is disruptive.

There are more than 200 publications by John Carver and Miriam Carver on management and governance. Article-length items have appeared in a wide array of publications including the (London) *Times Educational Supplement*, *Association Management*, *Leader-to-Leader*, *Nonprofit World*, *Health Management Quarterly*, *Hospital Trustee*, *National School Board Journal*, *Public Management Review*, *Economic Development Review*, *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, and *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*. Here are the book-length, monographs, and electronic products, including other authors where their publications are model-consistent:

*Boards That Make a Difference: A New Design for Leadership in Nonprofit and Public Organizations* (Jossey-Bass, 1990; 3rd edition, 2006). By John Carver.

*A New Vision for Board Leadership: Governing the Community College* (ACCT, 1994). By John Carver and Miriam Mayhew (now Miriam Carver).

*Empowering Boards for Leadership: Redefining Excellence in Governance* (Jossey-Bass, 1992). By John Carver. Audiocassettes in narrative and vignette format.

*The Policy Governance® Model: An Introduction by John and Miriam Carver*. DVD featuring John and Miriam Carver. Ogdensburg, NY: International Policy Governance Association, 2008.

*Board Leadership: Policy Governance in Action*. (Jossey-Bass, 1992 through present). Executive editors John Carver and Miriam Carver. Periodical for the governance dialogue.

*School Board Leadership 2000*. By Gene Royer (Brockton Publishing, 1995).

*The CarverGuide Series on Effective Board Governance*. By John Carver and Miriam Mayhew Carver (Jossey-Bass, 1996-1997). Twelve booklets on fiscal oversight, board responsibilities, board meetings, and other specific governance topics.

*Reinventing Your Board: A Step-by-Step Guide to Implementing Policy Governance*. By John Carver and Miriam Mayhew Carver (Jossey-Bass, 1997; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2006).

*The Policy Governance Fieldbook: Practical Lessons, Tips, and Tools from the Experiences of Real-World Boards*. By Caroline Oliver (Gen. Editor) and others (Jossey-Bass, 1999).

*John Carver on Board Leadership: Selected Writings from the Creator of the World's Most Provocative and Systematic Governance Model* (Jossey-Bass, 2001). By John Carver.

*Corporate Boards That Create Value: Governing Company Performance from the Boardroom*. By John Carver with Caroline Oliver (Jossey-Bass, 2002).

*The Board Member's Playbook: Using Policy Governance to Solve Problems, Make Decisions, and Build a Stronger Board*. By Miriam Carver and Bill Charney (Jossey-Bass, 2004).

### SOURCES REFERRED TO ABOVE

Brockton Publishing: 8326 SW Freeway, Houston, TX 77074 (800-268-7065).

International Policy Governance Association, 1010 Bosque Crescent, Cumberland, ON, K4C 1C3, Canada (877-847-4552).

Jossey-Bass: *In USA and Canada*: 989 Market Street, San Francisco 94103-1741 (415-433-1767). *In Europe, Middle East, Africa, Japan*: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Distribution Centre, Southern Cross Trading Estate, 1 Oldlands Way, Bognor Regis, Sussex, England PO22 NSA (44-1243-779-777); Email: cs-books@wiley.co.uk. *In Australia and New Zealand*: Jacaranda Wiley Ltd., P.O. Box 1226, Milton, Queensland, Australia 4064 (61-7385-99755); Email: headoffice@jacwiley.com.au. *Asia Pacific (except Japan)*: John Wiley & Sons Asia, PTE Ltd., 2 Clementi Loop, #02-01, Singapore 129809 (65-460-4280); Email: enquiry@wiley.com.sg. *Latin America*: Use the US address.