



Y Buckeye Bulletin

A Newsletter for the Ohio Alliance of YMCAs

Inside this issue:

The Great Resignation	1
Great Miami Valley New CEO	2
When It Comes to Boards, "Who" Matters	2
Arguments Over Ohio Redistricting	3
Russo Next House Minority Leader	9
Ohio YMCAs Upcoming Meetings	9

The Great Resignation

"The Great Resignation" got its name in 2021 when the number of US workers leaving their jobs hit an all-time high. As the year progressed, the resignations kept on growing. As we finally enter 2022, the question on every employers' mind is this: Will The Great Resignation finally come to an end?

Data from 1,019 full-time US employees points to an inconvenient truth. The Great Quit is still with us. Yet, as much as organizations may want to point to COVID and work arrangement uncertainty or the push for higher-paying jobs as influencing factors, we found that's not the case. In fact, classic issues of workplace appreciation, collegiality, and the ability to be oneself are the big culprits.

Key Themes

- The Great Resignation Is Not Over.
- It's Not Just The Young Employees You Have To Worry About.
- Flexible Work Arrangements Won't Solve Resignation Problems.
- Rigid Workplace Cultures Drive Employees To Leave.
- A Little Appreciation Goes A Long Way.

For the full report go to <https://planbeyond.com/about/original-research/great-resignation-market-research-report>

WELCOME NEW OHIO CEO

Great Miami Valley YMCA New CEO



The Great Miami Valley Board of Directors has selected Mike Bramer as their new CEO. Mike began his new role on February 1, 2022. As the Director of the Regional Louisville/Cincinnati Service Delivery Hub, Mike is a familiar face and voice to many in Ohio.

Mike started his 31-year Y career as a Childcare and Summer Camp Group Leader and was quickly promoted to Youth Sports Director at the Northeast Family YMCA. He credits these early experiences and the leaders he worked with as the foundation and inspiration for service with the YMCA.

In addition to his responsibilities in Louisville, Mike has worked closely with the YMCA of the USA, serving as an Activate America Facilitator and leading his Association in the Gulick Initiative. The included training in the Institute for Healthcare Improvement process. He credits this experience as instrumental in helping the Louisville Y establish a culture of experimentation and learning that continues to this day. From this experience, Mike's interest in understanding health equity and the social determinants of health remains a passion.

Mike is a graduate from the University of Louisville with a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration. He has taught 6 am cycling, two days a week, for the past 23 years at the YMCA. In addition, his wife Stefanie and four grown children have participated in various YMCA programs over the years. His goal is to work with engaged volunteers and a passionate staff team to help those we serve reach their full potential.

BOARD GOVERNANCE TIPS

When It Comes to Boards, "Who" Matters

It should be obvious that "who" is doing a job or playing a leadership role informs how the job is done. Who we are as people — the experiences that we have, the skill sets and perspectives that we bring, the communities and contexts we call home — all of these things matter in terms of the way that we show up in leadership roles. It should be obvious. But it often isn't — at least when it comes to how nonprofit boards think about their own composition.

That's why the findings from CEP's recent study, *[Foundations Respond to Crisis:](#)*

BOARD GOVERNANCE TIPS

Lasting Change?, are so striking. In a study designed to explore how real and sustained foundation commitments to racial equity might be, CEP found important evidence about the relationship between “who” the board is and “what” it is doing in terms of its commitment to racial equity. The report states:

“Foundations that have boards with more racial diversity tended to adopt more practices to support grantees and the communities they serve.”

More specifically, leaders who indicated that their board was comprised of at least 25% people of color, were more likely to:

- Change their grant application and/or selection processes to reach more nonprofits serving communities most affected by systemic inequities.
- Direct more funds to organizations serving communities of color, lower-income communities, and undocumented immigrants.
- Plan to increase funding directed to organizations serving Asian American, Black, Latino, and undocumented immigrants once the pandemic is contained.
- Make new efforts to support Asian American, Latino, and Native American women, as well as lower-income women.
- Have mechanisms for tracking demographics of the communities they support with their grant dollars.
- Have approaches for determining whether an organization is led by individuals from the community or communities served.
- Collect demographic information on the board members, executive leadership, senior leadership, and staff at grantee organizations.

Now, it is important to note that the authors of the report are careful not to claim that the board’s composition *causes* these actions; they are simply highlighting that the data documents a relationship between those boards that are more racially diverse and those boards that have adopted these practices. BoardSource’s own research revealed similar relationships. In our most recent *Leading with Intent* study, we found that *boards that include people of color are more likely to have adopted diversity, equity, and inclusion practices than boards that do not include people of color [1]*.

This documented relationship between the “who” of the board and the “what” of the board and the organization’s work is unsurprising but significant. Unsurprising because, of course, “who” matters — we see it every day in our work, our relationships, and our communities. But significant because so many resist this idea. They insist that it shouldn’t matter who the board is, that it’s about what they do and how they lead. They argue that critiques of board composition that isn’t diverse,

BOARD GOVERNANCE TIPS CONTINUED

connected to community, and informed about the organization's work are unfair, misguided, or politically motivated. That "it shouldn't matter" who you are if you're a "good board member."

But — what this research demonstrates so clearly, is that these things can't be separated. The "who (of board leadership)" is related to the "what (the board does)" and the "how (the board does it)." And — from a directionality or causation standpoint — it doesn't really matter if it is the "who" that informs the "what and how" or if the "what and how" informs the "who" (and I'd be willing to bet it's a both/and here).

What matters is that the relationship between board diversity and board action is real. Full stop. So let's stop having conversations about board composition as though this is up for debate. Let's be intellectually honest. Let's name that boards that are choosing to be all white — or allowing themselves to remain so — are also choosing to reduce the likelihood that their work will advance equity and better serve communities of color. Our sector is structured in a way that allows boards to make that choice. But let's be honest about the choice that's being made.

[1] Notably, 19% of the nonprofit boards in BoardSource's sample and 27% of the foundation boards in CEP's sample reported that they are all white or zero percent people of color.

Anne Wallestad is president & CEO of BoardSource. Follow her on Twitter at [@AnneWallestad](https://twitter.com/AnneWallestad).

CAPITOL BRIEF

Arguments Over Ohio Redistricting

The Ohio Supreme Court, now twice, struck down the new General Assembly and Congressional district maps adopted along party-lines by the Ohio Redistricting Commission and gave the commission 10 days to come up with a new plan.

The first 4-3 decision saw Republican Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor join with the Democrats on the Court in declaring the new Ohio House and Senate maps invalid based on a violation of Article XI, Section 6(A) and 6(B), which state that the commission "shall attempt" to draw maps that correspond with the voting preferences of Ohio voters over the last 10 years.

The 146-page decision included two concurring opinions and two dissenting opinions that further debated what "shall attempt" means, and whether the Court itself had

CAPITOL BRIEF CONTINUED

jurisdiction to decide the constitutionality of a four-year map adopted by a simple majority of the commission.

Further, two justices -- O'Connor and Justice Jennifer Brunner -- suggested Ohio voters may want to take another stab at reforms based on the results of the latest round of redistricting. The majority opinion, authored by Justice Melody Stewart, and Brunner's concurring opinion, also took issue with how the process played out.

All sides of the three lawsuits challenging the map generally agreed that Democrats over the last 10 years had captured about 46 percent of the vote in statewide races, and Republicans received about 54 percent of the vote. The commission, however, adopted a statement in support of the adopted plans that noted that Republicans had won about 81 percent of the statewide races, and said voter preferences could be construed to support Republicans by a margin between 54 and 81 percent. Senate President Matt Huffman (R-Lima) said further at the end of the process that the adopted plan favors Republicans in 62 seats in the House and 23 seats in the Senate.

Stewart's opinion, which was joined by O'Connor, Brunner, and Justice Michael Donnelly, argued the commission did not attempt to comply with the standards in Section 6(A) or 6(B), noting testimony from the mapmakers that they were told to focus on the other sections of Article XI when drawing the districts. She also argued that the provisions refer to the total votes cast for each candidate in the statewide races, not the winners.

She said that the section doesn't require success with the attempt to align with statewide preferences, but rather that the commission try. She said the section acknowledges that there might be circumstances that make it impossible for the commission to meet the standards of Section 6 while also following the map-drawing requirements of other sections, and it clarifies that the standards are subordinate to the map drawing requirements.

Stewart also rejected arguments by Huffman and Cupp that Section 6 is aspirational, saying it gives direction and the commission shall attempt to achieve the standards of that section. While Section 6 contemplates that the standards set forth in it may not come to fruition, it nevertheless requires the commission to try to achieve them, she wrote.

Stewart highlighted issues with the process of creating the maps, which saw commission members Secretary of State Frank LaRose, Gov. Mike DeWine, and Auditor Keith Faber complaining that they were left out of much of the mapmaking, and attempts to achieve a compromise ran into a wall with the legislative members refusing to budge. She said that although accounts vary about the sincerity of the negotiations, most commission members testified that between Sept. 9 and 15, they

CAPITOL BRIEF CONTINUED

met with other members of the commission with the goal of compromising to adopt a 10-year bipartisan map. The negotiations centered mostly around the acceptable number of Democratic and Republican leaning seats in the House of Representatives.

O'Connor said in a concurring opinion that readers of the Court's opinion "should understand they have the power to again amend the Ohio Constitution to ensure that partisan politics is removed from the drawing of Ohio Senate and House districts that takes place every 10 years."

"Having now seen firsthand that the current Ohio Redistricting Commission -- comprised of statewide elected officials and partisan legislators -- is seemingly unwilling to put aside partisan concerns as directed by the people's vote, Ohioans may opt to pursue further constitutional amendment to replace the current commission with a truly independent, nonpartisan commission that more effectively distances the redistricting process from partisan politics," she wrote.

Brunner made a similar argument for an independent commission. Brunner also argued that she believes the adopted plans also violate Article XI, Section 3(B)(2) of the Ohio Constitution, which requires the maps comply with the federal and state constitutions and federal law. In addition, she maintained the plan violates Article 1, Section 2 of the Ohio Constitution, which gives the people "the right to alter, reform, or abolish" the government "whenever they may deem it necessary."

In a dissenting opinion joined by Justice Pat DeWine, Justice Sharon Kennedy argued that the Constitution gives the Court a limited role in reviewing a General Assembly-district plan. She argued that the majority "finds the constitutionally imposed limits unduly constraining, so it chooses to disregard them."

Kennedy said the Court can't invalidate a plan based on a Section 6 violation alone. She said Article XI, Section 9(D) explicitly limits the Court's authority to invalidate a plan. Under Section 9(D)(3), the Court can order the commission to amend a General Assembly-district plan or adopt a new one if the plan "does not comply with the requirements of Section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 7" of Article XI, which describe the neutral map-making requirements, and all applicable provisions of the state and federal constitutions and federal law, she noted.

If the Court could invalidate a plan that fails to comply with Section 6(A) or (B), "one would naturally expect Section 9(D) to say so. But that language is conspicuously absent," she wrote. Article XI distinguishes the provisions that are mandatory and enforceable by a court (Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7) from provisions that are directory, such as Section 6, she said.

Kennedy also argued the majority disregarded the meaning of "attempt" and says that the attempt required by Section 6 must be successful. There is competing evi-

CAPITOL BRIEF CONTINUED

dence to demonstrate that the commission did attempt to draw a plan that does not primarily favor or disfavor a political party, she said.

Justice Patrick Fischer wrote a separate dissenting opinion arguing the Constitution limits the Court's ability to review the maps when a four-year map is passed.

In part by Hannah

Russo Next House Minority Leader

House Democrats this month backed Rep. Allison Russo (D-Columbus) to be the next House minority leader, succeeding Rep. Emilia Sykes (D-Akron), who resigned at the end of last year.

Rep. Thomas West (D-Canton), Russo's top rival for leader, will serve as assistant minority leader. Rep. Jessica Miranda (D-Cincinnati) is the new minority whip, while Rep. Richard Brown (D-Canal Winchester) will continue as assistant minority whip.

Russo last year ran for the 15th Congressional District, losing to Mike Carey in a special election to replace Steve Stivers. Russo said she would run for re-election to her Ohio House seat.

Ohio Democratic Party Chair Liz Walters congratulated Russo, releasing a statement saying, "We look forward to working closely with her and the entire caucus to fight for working families in Ohio and put our state back on the right track. We're grateful also for the leadership of Rep. West and look forward to his service as assistant minority leader. Together, we'll push for policies that put Ohioans' interests – not special interests – first."

Hannah

OHIO YMCAS UPCOMING MEETINGS

Virtual & In-Person CEO Neighborhood Meetings Northeast & Northwest

In-Person (Location TBD):

NE - April 19 - 10 am -12 pm

NW - April 20 - 10 am -12 pm

Virtual (Click to join Zoom):

[NE - August 9 - 10 -11 am](#)

[NW - August 9 - 11:30 am -12:30 pm](#)

Virtual (Click to join Zoom):

[NE - December 6 - 10 -11 am](#)

[NW - December 7 - 11:30 am -12:30 pm](#)

OHIO YMCAS UPCOMING MEETINGS (CONTINUED)

Virtual & In-Person CEO Neighborhood Meetings Northeast & Northwest

In-Person (Location TBD):

NE - April 19 - 10 am -12 pm

NW - April 20 - 10 am -12 pm

Virtual (Click to join Zoom):

[NE - December 6 - 10 -11 am](#)

[NW - December 7 - 11:30 am -12:30 pm](#)

Virtual (Click to join Zoom):

[NE - August 9 - 10 -11 am](#)

[NW - August 9 - 11:30 am -12:30 pm](#)

Virtual & In Person CEO Neighborhood Meetings Southeast & Southwest

In Person (Location TBD):

- SE - April 26 10 am -12 pm

- SW - April 27 11 am -12 pm

Virtual (Click to join Zoom):

- [SE - December 7 10 -11 am](#)

- [SW - December 7 11:30 am -12:30 pm](#)

Virtual (Click to join Zoom):

- [SE - August 10 10 -11 am](#)

- [SW - August 10 11:30 am -12:30 pm](#)

Statewide CEO Meetings

In Person Meeting

June 17 - 10 am - 2 pm

(Location TBD)

Annual CEO Conference

September 29 - 30 (Tentative dates)

In Person (Location TBD)

CEO/CVO Meetings

Statewide Virtual Meeting

February 18 - 9 am—12 pm

[Click to join Zoom](#)

In Person Meetings (Location TBD)
Northern Ohio

November 10 - 10 am - 2 pm

Central/Southern Ohio

November 17 - 10 am - 2 pm

OHIO YMCAS UPCOMING MEETINGS (CONTINUED)

Leadership Conference	2022 National Meetings
<p>March 30-31, 2022</p> <p>Renaissance Hotel, Downtown Columbus</p> <p>REGISTRATION NOW OPEN!</p> <p>http://www.ohioyleaders.org/</p>	<p>National Advocacy Days</p> <p>February 15-16 (DC)</p> <p>NAYDO</p> <p>April 6-9 (Tampa)</p>
Quarterly/Monthly Statewide Peer Community Virtual Meetings	
<p>February 16</p> <p>Childcare 1-2 pm</p> <p>Financial Development 2-3 pm</p>	<p>March 16</p> <p>Childcare 1-2 pm</p> <p>Financial Development 2-3 pm</p>
<p>April 20</p> <p>Childcare 1-2 pm</p> <p>Financial Development 2-3 pm</p>	<p>May 17</p> <p>Aquatics/Swim Team 10-11 am</p> <p>Resident Camp 11 am-12 pm</p> <p>Membership 1-2 pm</p> <p>DEI 2-3 pm</p> <p>Caregiver Network 3-4 pm</p> <p>HR 4-5 pm</p>
<p>May 18</p> <p>COOs 10-11 am</p> <p>Property/Facility 11 am - 12 pm</p> <p>Child Care 1-2 pm</p> <p>Financial Development 2-3 pm</p> <p>Branch Executives 3-4 pm</p>	<p>June 15</p> <p>Childcare 1-2 pm</p> <p>Financial Development 2-3 pm</p>

OHIO YMCAS UPCOMING MEETINGS (CONTINUED)

Quarterly/Monthly Statewide Peer Community Virtual Meetings (Click to join Zoom meetings. Schedule subject to change.)

July 19

[Aquatics/Swim Team 10-11 am](#)

[Resident Camp 11 am-12 pm](#)

[Membership 1-2 pm](#)

[DEI 2-3 pm](#)

[Caregiver Network 3-4 pm](#)

[HR 4-5 pm](#)

August 17

[Childcare 1-2 pm](#)

[Financial Development 2-3 pm](#)

October 18

[Aquatics/Swim Team 10-11 am](#)

[Resident Camp 11 am-12 pm](#)

[Membership 1-2 pm](#)

[DEI 2-3 pm](#)

[Caregiver Network 3-4 pm](#)

[HR 4-5 pm](#)

November 16

[Childcare 1-2 pm](#)

[Financial Development 2-3 pm](#)

July 20

[COOs 10-11 am](#)

[Property/Facility 11 am - 12 pm](#)

[Child Care 1-2 pm](#)

[Financial Development 2-3 pm](#)

[Branch Executives 3-4 pm](#)

September 21

[Childcare 1-2 pm](#)

[Financial Development 2-3 pm](#)

October 19

[COOs 10-11 am](#)

[Property/Facility 11 am - 12 pm](#)

[Child Care 1-2 pm](#)

[Financial Development 2-3 pm](#)

[Branch Executives 3-4 pm](#)

December 21

[Childcare 1-2 pm](#)

[Financial Development 2-3 pm](#)