****Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached**

Resolution 203: Establishing the National Union of ADA Employed Dentists (NUAED) to Promote Workplace Protections, Ethics, and Professional Support

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports establishing the National Union of ADA Employed Dentists (NUAED) as a voluntary, ADA-affiliated union to protect employed dentists' rights, ethics, and professional well-being.

This resolution directs the ADA to create a legally compliant, self-sustaining structure for employed dentists to access workplace advocacy, legal and contract review, ethical support, and—where permitted—collective negotiation of employment terms. It ensures no employer is required to hire union members and that no ADA dues fund its operations.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote keeps the ADA without any formal system to protect employed dentists from unethical directives, workplace retaliation, or contract abuse. It continues the pattern of inaction while other professions already provide union protections for their members. Rejecting this resolution leaves younger and employed dentists disconnected from organized dentistry and weakens ADA membership growth.

SUMMARY

This resolution creates the National Union of ADA Employed Dentists (NUAED), a voluntary organization for ADA member dentists working in DSOs, community health centers, or other employee settings. It would operate independently but under ADA oversight during setup to ensure compliance with federal labor and antitrust laws. After implementation, NUAED would be self-funded and governed by its own elected board.

The union will serve as a benefit-driven support system for employed dentists, offering legal, ethical, and professional protections while maintaining neutrality toward employers and avoiding interference in private practice ownership.

Board of Trustees — Thank You for the Referral

We Trust the ADA Agencies Will Act Promptly

The Board voted to refer Resolution 203 for further study, citing questions about potential conflicts, cost, and governance structure. The Board's referral acknowledges the concept's merit and confirms the need for specialized legal and member input. We appreciate this recognition and expect ADA legal and policy teams to proceed quickly in forming the framework for implementation and reporting progress to the 2026 House of Delegates.

TALKING POINTS

- The ADA cannot represent all dentists while ignoring the needs of employed members.
- This union is voluntary, ADA-affiliated, and self-funded, with no risk to ADA finances.
- NUAED creates value for early-career and employed dentists, helping rebuild ADA membership.
- Legal counsel will ensure full compliance with labor, antitrust, and association law.
- The Board's referral confirms the idea's merit, and the House should ensure timely action.
- This proposal aligns with ADA's mission to promote ethics, professionalism, and member support.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 204: Restoring Budgetary Oversight to the House of Delegates and Establishing Transparency for Major Expenditures

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports restoring final budgetary authority to the House of Delegates and requiring transparency for major ADA financial decisions. This resolution amends the ADA Bylaws so that the House, not just the Board of Trustees, adopts the Association's annual budget and maintains oversight of large expenditures, including property sales and strategic investments. It ensures that the House once again serves as the fiduciary voice of members and aligns spending with the Strategic Forecast approved by the House.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote leaves all budgetary power with the Board of Trustees, continuing the current system where the House has no vote on how members' dues are spent. It accepts ongoing multimillion-dollar deficits, failed technology investments, and major asset sales—such as the 2024 headquarters building sale—without prior consultation with the House. While the Board had legal authority to sell the property, given its symbolic and financial importance, consultation with the House would have been prudent and consistent with transparent governance. A NO vote defends a system that excludes delegates from key financial oversight.

SUMMARY

This resolution restores the House of Delegates' historical role in approving the ADA budget and mandates that major expenditures be transparent to members. It amends the Bylaws so the Board must propose, not finalize, the annual budget, giving the House the final vote. The measure also reinforces ethical standards for financial disclosure and accountability in accordance with IRS nonprofit guidelines and best practices followed by other professional associations.

Why the Board Is Wrong

The Board voted NO on this resolution. Their claim that this reform reduces "agility" ignores the real issue: loss of oversight has already led to failed initiatives, leadership instability, and declining reserves. Financial agility without accountability is not efficiency—it is risk. The House is the elected body entrusted with fiduciary authority. Restoring its budgetary power does not slow progress; it ensures responsible governance. The Board's objection to a 90-day budget notice is minor compared to the value of restoring transparency and rebuilding member trust.

TALKING POINTS

- The House must control the ADA budget—it controls dues and represents members.
- Restores checks and balances between the Board and House.
- ADA's recent financial losses and the failed Salesforce/Fonteva rollout happened without House oversight.
- The Board had legal authority to sell the ADA building, but consultation with the House should have occurred due to its magnitude and symbolism.
- Aligns ADA policy with best practices of the AMA and nonprofit governance standards.
- Transparency and accountability strengthen trust and protect member resources.
- A YES vote restores the House's rightful fiduciary authority and ends governance by exception.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

****Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached**

Resolution 205: Fiscal Responsibility and Modernization of ADA Governance Operations

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports creating a Task Force on Governance Efficiency and Travel Oversight to study modernization of ADA governance and fiscal responsibility.

It directs the ADA to:

- Review five years of Board retreat travel and meeting expenses.
- Recommend cost-saving strategies based on best practices from other associations.
- Adopt a remote-first model for councils, committees, and Board meetings.
- Ensure in-person gatherings are justified by clear cost-benefit analysis.
- Require hybrid participation and remote voting rights wherever feasible.
- Conduct a delegate census to ensure fair apportionment.
- Standardize travel policies and adopt a “save-first” mindset to protect member dues.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote supports continuing expensive Board travel and meetings in tourism-heavy destinations. It accepts business as usual—spending member dues on retreats and travel that could be replaced by virtual meetings. Voting NO keeps outdated systems in place and ignores proven cost-saving and inclusion methods already used by other national organizations.

SUMMARY

This resolution calls for transparency, accountability, and modernization in ADA governance. It requires an evidence-based review of meeting costs, promotes hybrid participation, and ensures the ADA models fiscal responsibility consistent with its mission and values. It establishes a seven-member Task Force that will meet virtually and report findings to the 2026 House of Delegates.

Thank You for the Referral

We Trust the ADA Agencies Will Act Promptly

The Board voted Yes on Referral. While the Board recognizes the need for governance review, it seeks to defer all related resolutions to a future study. However, delay only extends the same inefficiencies and lack of fiscal accountability this resolution was designed to fix. The cost to members continues every year the Board postpones reform.

TALKING POINTS

- ADA must lead by example in fiscal responsibility and efficiency.
- Remote and hybrid governance works—it increases inclusion and saves money.
- Every dollar spent on unnecessary travel is a dollar taken from member priorities.
- Governance reform cannot wait for another 12-year study cycle.
- Transparency and accountability strengthen trust in our Association.
- The Task Force meets virtually, with minimal cost and high return for members.

DIGAC

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 207 – Amendment to the Manual of the House of Delegates: Representation and Reapportionment of Delegates

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports the action requested in the resolving clauses.

This resolution updates the ADA's Manual of the House of Delegates to ensure fair and proportional representation by basing delegate allocation on active membership only, using a ratio of one delegate per 700 active members. It also reduces the minimum number of delegates per constituent from two to one, limits ASDA representation to a maximum of five delegates (or 1.5% of the House), and calls for reapportionment every three years instead of four. The goal is to modernize representation, reflect current membership trends, and uphold fiscal responsibility.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote keeps the current outdated allocation system in place. That means representation would remain tied to inflated membership categories, including retired or inactive members, rather than the active dentists who fund and serve the ADA. It would also delay reform until a future study, allowing disproportional influence and stagnant governance to continue unchecked.

SUMMARY

This resolution brings ADA governance in line with peer associations like the AMA and AAUP by adopting an equitable, membership-based apportionment formula. It reduces the overall House size proportionally to active membership, maintains protection for small constituents, and preserves a fair but limited role for ASDA. The proposal strengthens fiscal discipline, modernizes delegate representation, and aligns ADA governance with present-day membership realities.

Board of Trustees — Thank You for the Referral

We Trust the ADA Agencies Will Act Promptly

The Board of Trustees unanimously recommended referral, stating that governance reform should be reviewed comprehensively as part of the upcoming governance study. While referral ensures future evaluation, this issue is urgent and central to ADA accountability. The resolution's principles—representation based on active members, fairness, and fiscal responsibility—must not be delayed.

TALKING POINTS

- ADA delegate numbers have not decreased despite a 25% drop in active membership since 2005.

- This resolution corrects the imbalance by tying representation to active members only.
- Aligns ADA with national peer organizations that use membership-based representation formulas.
- Ensures smaller states and federal services retain guaranteed seats.
- Protects the integrity of proportional representation and member trust.
- Limits ASDA's voting share to maintain balance and fairness in the House.
- Encourages fiscal responsibility by right-sizing governance to match membership levels.
- Reflects ADA's commitment to modern, data-driven governance.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

**Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 208: Strengthening Financial Oversight and Accountability of the ADA Board of Trustees

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports the action requested in the resolving clauses.

This resolution directs the ADA to strengthen financial oversight by limiting discretionary Board spending, holding virtual meetings to reduce costs, and commissioning an independent forensic audit of the last five fiscal years. It amends the ADA Bylaws and Governance Manual to add virtual sessions of the House of Delegates and restrict in-person Board meetings to two per year. It also requires quarterly public financial reports and pre-approval for high-cost travel or expenditures.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote keeps the current system where the Board of Trustees manages its own travel, meetings, and spending with limited oversight. Voting NO accepts the ongoing decline in ADA reserves, repeated expensive retreats, and lack of forensic transparency.

SUMMARY

This resolution responds to a major drop in ADA cash and reserves—from $205 million in 2022 to $63 million in 2025—by restoring fiduciary accountability. It modernizes governance to include virtual meetings, mandates stricter travel controls, and seeks an external forensic audit. The goal is to rebuild member trust and ensure the ADA meets nonprofit financial standards by reducing waste and increasing transparency.

WHY THE BOARD IS WRONG

The Board unanimously voted NO, claiming this reform would cost too much and should wait for a future "governance study." However, the ADA has already lost over $140 million without any forensic review. The Board's argument delays action, protects the status quo, and ignores the urgency of restoring fiscal discipline now. The House of Delegates, not the Board, holds ultimate fiduciary authority. Waiting until 2027 for another internal study risks further erosion of reserves and credibility. Immediate action—especially an independent audit—is the only responsible course.

TALKING POINTS

- ADA reserves have fallen from $205 million to $63 million in just three years.
- The resolution establishes mandatory quarterly financial reporting and forensic auditing.

- Virtual Board and House sessions reduce unnecessary travel, hotel, and retreat costs.
- Strong oversight aligns ADA governance with national nonprofit standards.
- A YES vote restores trust, transparency, and fiscal responsibility to member leadership.
- A NO vote defends unchecked Board spending and delays reform for years.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 209 – Ending Unproductive Spending on FDI and Reinvesting in Member-Focused Priorities

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports discontinuing all ADA funding and participation in the FDI World Dental Federation starting in Fiscal Year 2026. It requires that any future proposal to rejoin FDI must be approved by the ADA House of Delegates and backed by a financial report of prior FDI spending. It also redirects the freed funds toward strengthening ADA programs, improving member services, and advancing strategic priorities that deliver measurable value to members.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote accepts continued high-cost spending on the FDI World Dental Federation, even though it has shown little measurable return for ADA members. It supports ongoing participation in an organization whose programs and policies have not been integrated into ADA priorities or communications and maintains an unproductive allocation of funds that could otherwise serve members directly.

SUMMARY

This resolution ends ADA's financial and operational involvement with the FDI World Dental Federation beginning in FY2026. It ensures accountability by requiring any future re-engagement with FDI to receive House approval. The goal is to eliminate spending that does not provide measurable member value and to reallocate those funds to strengthen ADA's domestic programs, advocacy, and strategic priorities aligned with mission-based budgeting and member outcomes.

WHY THE BOARD IS WRONG

The Board's defense of continued FDI spending overlooks the fact that the ADA's own mission-based budgeting model demands measurable member benefit and accountability. The Board admits that FDI costs have reached $700,000–$800,000 per year and only recently dropped to $560,000, yet no evidence has been provided that this spending produces quantifiable value for ADA members. Claims about "global influence" and "networking" do not meet the ADA's new standards for measurable outcomes. The ADA already has ample opportunities for global collaboration without paying excessive dues to an external federation. Continuing this expense violates the spirit of fiscal discipline and transparency set forth in the Treasurer's Report and Strategic Forecasting framework. According to the 2024 House of Delegates Report of the Treasurer (pages 9–11), measurable value is defined by alignment with the ADA's Strategic Forecast, financial sustainability, and documented impact on advocacy, engagement, or member services.

TALKING POINTS

- ADA has spent over half a million dollars annually on FDI without any documented return on investment.
- No ADA reports show measurable benefit from FDI programs or policies.
- Mission-based budgeting requires that every dollar advance the ADA's Strategic Forecast and deliver value to members.
- Reallocating FDI funds will strengthen domestic programs, advocacy, and member services.
- House approval for any future FDI re-entry ensures accountability and protects against unapproved international spending.
- A YES vote prioritizes transparency, fiscal responsibility, and measurable value for every ADA member.

DIGAC

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition
https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 210 – Addressing Food Insecurity Among U.S. Dental Students

Author: Dr. Spencer Bloom, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports creating an ADA-led national program to address food insecurity among dental students. The resolution asks the ADA to establish a support program modeled on the Massachusetts Dental Society's direct-action initiative led by Dr. Abe Abdulwaheed, which funds on-campus food pantries and emergency meal programs. It also calls on the ADA Foundation to help sustain this effort through fundraising and grant distribution.

A YES vote means the ADA takes leadership in solving this national problem, rather than leaving it to local societies with limited resources.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote accepts the Board's weaker substitute version, which only "encourages" others to take action instead of establishing an ADA program. It leaves responsibility to state and local groups without the ADA's national coordination or resources. A NO vote allows the ADA to acknowledge the crisis while doing nothing meaningful to address it.

SUMMARY

This resolution declares food insecurity among dental students an urgent threat to the wellbeing of future oral health professionals. It directs the ADA to establish a national support program for U.S. dental schools, modeled on the proven Massachusetts Dental Society initiative created by Dr. Abe Abdulwaheed, which has already launched food pantries and emergency meal support at all three Boston dental schools. The program would provide startup and operational grants, emergency meal vouchers, and awareness campaigns, in collaboration with the ADA Foundation for sustained funding and nationwide implementation.

Why the Board Is Wrong

The Board of Trustees introduced a substitute (210B) that strips out the ADA's leadership role and replaces it with vague encouragement for local action. This undermines the purpose of the original resolution, which is to have the ADA itself lead a coordinated national effort.

The Board's edits also attempted to remove references to Dr. Abe Abdulwaheed, despite his documented leadership in Massachusetts and his model's proven success. There is no ADA policy or procedure prohibiting recognition of a dentist's name in a resolution, and erasing it diminishes the transparency and integrity of the record.

The Board's approach shifts responsibility downward to state societies and schools, many of which lack the funding, staffing, or infrastructure to act on their own. A national program backed by the ADA Foundation can leverage national donors, sponsorships, and institutional partnerships to reduce local burdens and ensure consistent access to food support for students everywhere.

TALKING POINTS

- Food insecurity affects nearly one in four dental students, impacting clinical readiness, academic performance, and mental health.
- The Massachusetts Dental Society's program—created by Dr. Abe Abdulwaheed—has already proven that this model works.
- The ADA must take the lead, not defer to local societies with limited capacity.
- There is no rule preventing recognition of Dr. Abdulwaheed's leadership; attempts to strike his name are arbitrary.
- A national ADA program ensures equal support for students in all accredited dental schools.
- The ADA Foundation can sustain and expand this effort through grants and philanthropy.
- Voting YES means the ADA leads. Voting NO means letting others handle it alone.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 211 – Amendment to the Manual of the House of Delegates: Strategic Forecasting Committee

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports rebuilding the Strategic Forecasting Committee (SFC) into a streamlined, accountable, and transparent standing committee of the House of Delegates. This resolution amends the ADA Constitution and the Manual of the House of Delegates to restore proper oversight, give every district a voice, and ensure the House monitors alignment between ADA strategy, budget, and operations. It replaces the current 14-page, overly complex SFC structure with a simpler, more effective version that strengthens communication between the Strategic Forecasting Committee, the Board of Trustees, and the ADA councils. The SFC will serve as a year-round liaison between these entities and the House of Delegates to ensure coordination, accountability, and responsiveness to member priorities.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote keeps the existing Strategic Forecasting Committee system in place—one that has failed to identify major financial and governance risks. It accepts the current structure that allowed $142 million in ADA reserves to be spent between 2022 and 2025, including $53 million on a failed software project, without early warning or corrective action. A NO vote means continuing a system that is too bureaucratic, disconnected, and unable to provide real oversight on behalf of the House.

SUMMARY

This resolution restores the Strategic Forecasting Committee as a true liaison between the House of Delegates, the Board of Trustees, and the ADA councils. It gives each of the 17 districts one voting delegate, adds limited Board participation, and defines clear duties for monitoring alignment between strategy, budgets, and operations. It ensures that the SFC has access to timely financial and operational data, authority to issue findings, and independence from Board suppression. By improving cross-communication and coordination, the new structure allows information to flow effectively among the House, Board, and councils, ensuring unified governance and transparency. The goal is to strengthen communication, accountability, and trust so the House—not the Board—remains the governing body of the ADA.

Why the Board Is Wrong

The Board of Trustees voted No, calling the resolution “premature.” That position ignores the urgent need for reform. The Board’s own July 2025 open letter confirmed $142 million in reserves were depleted, with no warning from the current SFC. The failures of the existing system are already documented. Saying reform is premature is an excuse for inaction. Rebuilding the SFC is not premature—it is overdue. If we delay again, the same structural gaps that allowed these losses will remain. The House has both the authority and responsibility to act now to prevent further financial and governance breakdowns.

(According to ADA News, July 10 2025: "ADA Board provides information on finances, association management system.")

TALKING POINTS

- YES vote empowers the House to oversee ADA strategic alignment year-round.
- The current SFC failed to flag $142 million in spending losses—proof it is broken.
- The new structure gives every district a voting seat and direct voice.
- Strengthens communication between the SFC, Board of Trustees, and ADA councils.
- Establishes SFC as a liaison to the House of Delegates for ongoing accountability.
- SFC gains independence to access data without Board approval or suppression.
- Protects member dues by identifying inefficiencies early and ensuring transparency.
- Reforms the system without adding cost or bureaucracy.
- The House must reclaim its oversight role—the Board cannot monitor itself.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 212 — Optimizing the House of Delegates Structure and Operations

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports the action requested in the resolving clauses.

This resolution directs the ADA to modernize House of Delegates operations by transitioning ceremonial and non-governance activities to digital formats by 2026, limiting speeches to four minutes, and updating nomination and election procedures to allow pre-recorded video submissions instead of live floor nominations. The goal is to reduce travel, cost, and paper waste, align with ADA's digital strategy, and improve accessibility for working dentists.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote keeps the House bound to outdated and costly traditions. It accepts current Board behavior and resists reform that would make the ADA more efficient, sustainable, and accessible to members. Saying NO means continuing unnecessary ceremonies, excess travel, and paper waste when practical, modern alternatives are available.

SUMMARY

This resolution strengthens the House of Delegates as ADA's supreme governing body by focusing its time on policy, not ceremony. It replaces non-governance activities with digital recognition, shortens speeches, and updates the Manual and Standing Rules to allow video nominations and speeches. These changes respect tradition while saving time, cost, and environmental impact.

Board of Trustees — Thank You for the Referral

We Trust the ADA Agencies Will Act Promptly

The Board agrees governance reform is needed but recommends referral to the upcoming governance study, now accelerated to 2026 instead of 2027. While the Board's recognition of urgency is appreciated, the House should ensure these improvements are not delayed or diluted. Referral is acceptable only if followed by swift, transparent implementation reflecting the members' directive.

TALKING POINTS

- Modernizes HOD operations for fiscal responsibility and efficiency.
- Reduces travel, cost, and environmental waste through digital tools.
- Keeps the House focused on its true role: policymaking, not ceremony.

- Enhances access for working dentists through shorter, hybrid meetings.
- Implements technology already available and tested since 2012.
- Upholds ADA's fiduciary duty to members by cutting wasteful practices.
- Encourages transparency and accessibility in officer nominations.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition

https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 213 — Growing ADA Membership Through Transparent and Accessible Governance

Author: Dr. Spencer Bloom, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports the action requested in the resolving clauses. This resolution calls for the ADA to develop and share voluntary model policies that open leadership to more members based on skill, readiness, and interest, not seniority. It asks for a national pilot to test new leadership pathways such as open nominations, merit-based appointments, and short-term project roles. It also urges limits on closed sessions and requires an annual report to the House on progress toward modern, transparent governance.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote accepts the status quo and supports the Board's view that current internal programs are sufficient. It keeps leadership tracks slow and inaccessible for many qualified dentists and continues allowing governance sessions to remain closed to members. This position risks further disconnecting the ADA from its membership base and reinforces barriers that discourage new leaders.

SUMMARY

This resolution aims to grow ADA membership by strengthening trust and transparency in leadership. It seeks to modernize outdated officer ladders that block participation and to make leadership more accessible to early-career and busy dentists. By supporting voluntary model policies, pilot projects, and annual reporting, the ADA can demonstrate that it values inclusivity, accountability, and member-driven leadership—key factors in reversing declining membership.

Why the Board Is Wrong

The Board voted NO, claiming similar work is already being done by the Council on Membership and other programs. However, those efforts are limited in scope and lack House oversight. This resolution gives the House a role in shaping leadership reform and ensures accountability through annual reports. By rejecting this resolution, the Board preserves an opaque system that deters participation and erodes member trust. True transparency means sharing all governance manuals, reducing closed sessions, and opening leadership to all qualified members—not just those who can wait years in officer pipelines.

TALKING POINTS

- ADA membership has dropped below 53 percent, signaling a crisis of confidence.
- Outdated leadership ladders discourage younger members from serving.
- Open nominations and project-based leadership attract new voices.
- Transparency in governance builds trust and engagement.
- Annual progress reports keep the House and members informed.
- This resolution costs nothing and strengthens member connection to the ADA's mission.
- Saying YES supports accessible leadership, trust, and growth.
- Saying NO supports barriers, opacity, and continued decline.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition
https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 214 — Adoption of Mission-Based Accounting Framework

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports the action requested in the resolving clauses. This resolution directs the ADA Board of Trustees to formally adopt a mission-based accounting framework, beginning with phased implementation by department. It calls for transparent reporting of how each dollar supports the ADA's mission and strategic goals. It requires a 2026 implementation plan, annual milestones, and future budget summaries that show what percentage of ADA spending advances mission-aligned programs.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote accepts the Board's decision to reject mission-based accounting and to continue relying on older "direct cost" methods that obscure how funds connect to the ADA's mission. It defends the same opaque system that has failed to show members how programs and investments serve their interests. This choice maintains confusion, weakens accountability, and undermines trust in financial stewardship.

SUMMARY

This resolution ensures that every ADA expenditure can be tied to mission impact. It responds directly to past reports noting that the ADA "focused on accounting for reams of paper, but not our mission." By establishing clear metrics, transparent reporting, and phased implementation, this policy would align the ADA's financial system with its stated mission—helping dentists succeed and improving public health—while rebuilding trust in leadership.

Why the Board Is Wrong

The Board voted NO, arguing that past experiments in mission-based accounting were too complex. But complexity is a management challenge, not a reason to reject transparency. Delegates and members deserve to know whether ADA spending actually advances the mission. The Board's current "simplified" approach hides program costs and limits oversight. Mission-based accounting does not require bureaucracy—it requires commitment. A phased rollout, department by department, ensures both accuracy and accountability. This resolution restores the House's authority to demand mission alignment, not just financial balance.

TALKING POINTS

- The ADA Treasurer’s 2024 report admitted leaders “didn’t know” what programs cost or if they advanced the mission.
- Mission-based accounting links every dollar to a clear strategic purpose.
- Transparent budgeting builds confidence among members and delegates.
- The system can be phased in without major cost increases.
- Annual milestones and public reporting keep leadership accountable.
- Saying YES means measurable mission impact and restored trust.
- Saying NO means continuing confusion and weak oversight.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition
https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac

Official House Resolution and Board Comments Attached

Resolution 216 — Establishing a Standing Committee on Oversight of ADA Communications and Public Trust

Author: Dr. Steven Saxe, Delegate

IF YOU VOTE YES

A YES vote supports the action requested in the resolving clauses. This resolution creates a permanent Standing Committee of the House of Delegates to oversee all ADA-controlled, non-scientific communications and ensure alignment with adopted policy and member values. It charges the committee with monitoring ADA publications, advertising, and social media for misinformation or brand misuse, and coordinating corrective action with the Board of Trustees. The resolution explicitly excludes scientific and peer-reviewed content and focuses only on communications, branding, and public trust.

IF YOU VOTE NO

A NO vote supports the Board's position that existing committees can manage communications oversight without new structure. It preserves a system where vendor advertising, promotional content, and non-scientific editorials can appear under the ADA name without consistent review. This approach risks continued reputational damage, member distrust, and public confusion about ADA endorsement standards.

SUMMARY

This resolution safeguards the ADA's credibility and restores member trust by creating a formal governance mechanism to oversee ADA-branded communications. The proposed Standing Committee on Oversight of ADA Communications and Public Trust would monitor advertising, editorial content, and public messaging for consistency with ADA policy and ethics. It ensures transparency, rapid response to misinformation, and alignment between ADA leadership, members, and the public.

Why the Board Is Wrong

The Board voted NO, citing concerns about cost and "censorship," but those arguments miss the point. This resolution does not censor scientific work—it ensures accountability in public communications. The Board's alternative, Resolution 218, merely "encourages alignment" and lacks the authority or structure needed for true oversight. Without a standing committee, the ADA risks further erosion of trust from members who expect ethical consistency and brand protection. A $150,000 annual investment is minimal compared to the cost of reputational damage.

TALKING POINTS

- The ADA's credibility is its most valuable asset.
- Member trust declines when ADA media promotes unvetted CE or vendor content.
- Oversight ensures ADA communications align with adopted policy, not personal opinion.
- The resolution excludes peer-reviewed science and protects editorial independence.
- The House—not staff—should safeguard the ADA brand and public trust.
- A small, defined annual cost yields long-term transparency and stability.
- Saying YES supports accountability, consistency, and professionalism.
- Saying NO leaves reputation and policy alignment to chance.

Prepared by Dentistry in General Advocacy Coalition
https://dentistryingeneral.com/digac