

WILPF US National Board Meeting  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
April 12-14, 2012

**Summary of meeting decisions:**

**DECISIONS REACHED (by consensus unless otherwise noted)**

Friday:

**Recording of meeting:** This Board meeting will be recorded and the recording will be destroyed after the minutes receive final approval.

Saturday:

**Decision Rule:** Beginning April 14, 2012 and until April 30, 2013, the WILPF board will adopt on a trial basis the following decision rule:

1. A proposal is made to the board.
2. Try for consensus in good faith with every voice heard.
3. If unsuccessful, representatives of differing sides meet to try to agree on a new proposal.
4. Issue is brought back to the board within the agreed upon timeframe.
5. If unanimity still cannot be reached, a decision can be made by approval of at least 75% of board members present.

Sunday:

**Executive Session Decisions:**

**Tanya Henderson annual review** was approved. While we cannot afford to offer Tanya a raise, we will offer the cost of living increase as well as paying for one week of her special leave this summer, during which she will be providing training in Lebanon.

**Ellen Schwartz's offer to officially fill one of the empty Program Co-chair positions.** The Board decided to invite Ellen to continue as interim Program Co-chair up to the next Board meeting, and invite her to formally apply for the position. We will continue to advertise the two Program Chair positions. Also decided that, in this interim period, Ellen can be on the Board list.

**Open Meeting Decisions:**

**Practicing Peace:** committee is granted a 6 month extension to finish their work and make recommendation.

**National Director's Workplan for 2012/13:** affirmed and approved.

**Director of Operation's Workplan for 2012/13:** affirmed and approved with the caveat that neither the UN Practicum or Local2Global programs have been reauthorized for 2013.

**Local2Global:** We will have a steering committee meeting in 3 weeks to discuss reauthorization of Local2Global program. (Steering committee meeting #1)

**Fall Board Meeting:** If we have an in person fall board meeting, it will be in Boston on November 9-11. Tanya volunteered to take responsibility for planning racial justice/internal racism segment of meeting.

**1213 Race Street Savings:** \$100K will be invested in 18-24 mo. CD; \$27K will be added to Pax Investment Account/Reserve (fund will contain 3-months operating expenses); \$47K total will be added to bequest savings account at Eastern Bank and subject to existing bequest savings policy (\$27K available for deposit immediately; the other \$20K to be deposited when the LEF Fund check arrives).

[consensus with JAPA standing aside]

[note: During the discussion it was clarified that approving the motion would abolish the category of the Race Street fund. See Sunday minutes for details]

**Program Co-chair:** Majority acceptance of the continuation of the interim appointment of Ellen Schwartz as Temporary Program Co-Chair until the next National Board meeting in November, 2012. Ellen will not be serving as a Board member, but she will have access to the US Board list serve and will make the same commitment to confidentiality as members of the Board.

**Steering Committee Meetings:** Steering meetings shall be convened by the President, Requests for Steering meetings should be e-mailed to the President, if no response, phone and follow-up with a second email. If no response still, contact other members of the Steering Committee. [If urgent, please call the President.]

- **Decision: Staggered Terms Bylaw Proposal [Nancy Munger and JAPA stand aside].**

## **DECISIONS DEFERRED**

1. Preparing pros and cons for membership (suggested process: proposal will be circulated to board for consensus via email)
2. From Agenda: policy proposals numbers #3, #4, and #5. They are
  - a. Responding to member correspondence and calls
  - b. Limiting number of committees on which a board member may serve
  - c. Limiting outside employment of WILPF full time employees.(suggested process: discuss at steering meeting #1, email recommendations to board for approval)
3. Next steps in utilizing membership data (suggested process: discuss at board virtual potluck #3 with new D.O. and N.D. attending)
4. Who convenes board meetings? (suggested process: discuss at steering committee meeting #2; recommendation sent to board for approval via email)
5. Do we need a new conflict resolution process that we will respect and use?
6. Does executive staff need board consensus to act?
7. What should have been the process in deciding to raise funds for WILPF Pakistan members to attend AWID conference? (suggested process: discuss at virtual potluck #3)
8. Appointment of additional members to ad hoc by-laws committee (suggested process: discuss in executive session of steering committee meeting #2)
9. Appointment of additional members to nominating committee
  - i. (suggested process: discuss in executive session of steering committee meeting #2)

10. Appointment of additional members to Mini-grant committees: Do members of the Allocation and Monitoring Committees have to be approved by the Nominating Committee and then by the Board? Darien said there is no written policy regarding that. Ellen formally asked the Board to provide a policy outlining the process for adding members to those two committees.
11. Appointment of U.S. Section representatives to the UN (suggested process: discuss job description on steering committee meeting #2, discuss appointments during executive session of same)
12. Basis on which international assessment will be made (proposal is being circulated for adoption by email consensus)
13. Is the bylaws committee fulfilling the mandate by which it was established? (suggested process: discuss at steering committee meeting #2)
14. Bylaw change to restrict participation of president in decision making on committees (suggested process: put on agenda for fall board meeting)
15. Process for convening General Informational Meetings: Suggested process for decision: As this would be a change to Board Policy, address this at the Steering Committee level and forward via e-mail to the Board members.)
16. Operational Proposal on handling Pro and Con arguments for proposed bylaws changes: Members of the Board should review and if consensus can be reached take a position on proposed bylaws changes that are to come to an all member vote. Also a need for an online forum to obtain points of view pro and con on the members-only part of the website announced in E-News and on the website. Pros and cons should be published in “Peace and Freedom” with word limit and deadline determined by the “Peace and Freedom” editor, and written by an Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Board, or appointed by the Bylaw Committee. This was not hammered out. The Board agrees that the content of the language chosen by the Pros and Cons Committee shall not be changed beyond minor grammatical and spelling changes, by anyone without consent of the Pros and Cons Committee.
  - i. (Final written proposal was to be emailed to the Board, to act within 7 days)

### **OUTCOME OF FRIDAY AFTERNOON PRIORITY DISCUSSIONS**

Three priorities were chosen on Friday afternoon and small groups (8 Board members plus Ellen, who were committed to carrying out the goals) met to develop implementation plans on these goals:

- multi-year strategic fundraising plan,
- ability to respond rapidly and trust each other on emerging issues and opportunities in program,
- resolve the relationship with JAPA.

**Minutes**  
**WILPF National Board Meeting, Pittsburgh, PA**

Friday, April 12, 2012

**Present:**

Laura Roskos, President  
Laurie Belton, Director of Operations  
Barbara Reed, Secretary  
Nancy Munger, Past Co-President  
Robin Lloyd, Development Committee Chair  
Joan Bazar, Personnel Committee Chair  
Tanya Henderson, National Director  
Darien De Lu, Nominating Committee Chair  
Eva Havlicsek, Treasurer  
Mary-Louise Jackson-Miller, At-large Board Member  
Sandy Silver, Co-President of JAPA  
Judith Joseph, Co-President of JAPA  
Linda Belle, Executive Director of JAPA (Arrived late, during goals and priorities exercise)  
Catia Confortini, IB Representative, as noted, via Skype connection

**Absent:**

Rita Jankowska-Bradley, At-large Board Member

**Also Present:**

Ellen Schwartz, Temporary Program Committee Co-Chair;  
Edith Bell, WILPF member, Pittsburgh Branch

**NOTE: before the meeting was formally convened, Laura read a message from the remaining Program Co-Chair, Georgia Pinkel, who had been on a 3-month leave of absence, announcing that she was not returning to the Board.**

**Morning facilitator: Eva Havlicsek**

Discussion regarding audio taping the Board meeting. Consensus reached (see decisions).

**Decision:** This Board meeting will be recorded and the recording will be destroyed after the minutes receive final approval.

**AGENDA REVIEW**

Darien requested that the board look at the 2007 strategic plan, assess whether it is still relevant. A related suggestion was made to have that discussion after the Board meeting, after the Board develops a document with current goals, then address how it relates to the strategic plan. Darien accepted that, as long as it actually would be done, could be a conference call with appropriate preparation, and perhaps that could be planned within this meeting.

Darien also suggested a discussion of what our relationship is with the U.N., what we really want from our UN Representative. The UN Rep job description had been rewritten in 2010 and no one

had yet actually served under that description. Darien agreed to leave this until after the priority discussion.

Darien also brought up discussing Peace & Freedom/ eNews editing, editorial policies (that will be on the decision grid discussion) and use of listservs (this discussion will be under the “crash report” agenda item).

Ellen asked about a discussion of virtual meetings. Eva said it would probably come up “when we talk about money.”

Finally there was some discussion with Barbara about the location(s) and timing of the decision grid discussion(s) within the agenda.

### **FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT (Eva Havlicsek)**

Eva handed out charts: Cash flow for 1Q 2012, and (unaudited) Profits & Losses (P&L) for 2011, P&L for March 2012, and balance sheet.

Eva pointed out that the cash flow report was established to make it easier for us to understand exactly where we are. This is to make sure that our bills are paid and to set a trigger point for the Director of Operations to contact the Finance Committee of foreseeable financial difficulty.

Eva explained that we’re trying to set up a reserve account to cover three months of total operating expenses. Present reserve account covers three months of salaries only. There is also an employee retirement fund, and there are several other things that will be discussed again on Sunday morning.

### **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT (Robin Lloyd)**

Development Committee is working on:

- Capacity Building, relating to the 100-year celebration. May not get the 100 sponsors we had intended. Tanya added that capacity building also includes attracting new members with activities and events.
- External Funding – we’re still waiting for ARCA; we did get the funding for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year for Local2Global, which will be discussed Sunday in more detail
- Internal funding.

### **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE REPORT (Joan Bazar)**

Personnel Committee is interviewing people for the D.O. position. Joan emphasized the importance of the decision grid discussion because staff still has a problem of not knowing when they can take initiative, how the process works so they don’t feel second-guessed, and so they don’t “spend energy on something that the Board isn’t behind adequately.” The Personnel Committee is also looking for new members, ideally people with experience in interviewing and supervising.

### **INTERNATIONAL BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT (Catia Confortini)**

WILPF International has hired a new communications person. Also, International has received several grants, mainly from the Norwegian government, so office is in a better financial situation, even though the grants are restricted for use on Program. One grant is for the MENA (Middle East North Africa) conference this June.

Catia reminded us that WILPF International has sent us an invoice for dues owed to WILPF International; for 2012, we owe 36,500 Swiss francs [note: 1 Swiss franc is approximately

equivalent to \$1USD]. Tanya said that the calculation was made without consulting US Section on current membership numbers. Laurie is going to send out a corrected number. There was a brief discussion about what constitutes a member, what criteria.

This will be discussed further under Laurie's Membership report.

### **PROGRAM COMMITTEE REPORT (Ellen Schwartz)**

Ellen reported that most of the committees aren't sure what their financial situation is.

There seemed to be confusion as to whether members of the mini-grant Allocation and Monitoring Committees had to be approved by the Nominating Committee and then by the Board. Darien clarified there is no written policy regarding that. Ellen formally asked the Board to provide a policy outlining the process for adding members to those two committees.

She reported that the Program Committee had discussed the UN proposed Women's Conference. The committee favored a global conference on women, but voiced the same concerns as had come from International about whether to support such a conference if organized by the UN.

She said a question that comes up over and over again from members is "who decides Program?" She reminded us of a suggestion earlier that big money projects should be approved by the Program Committee, but it is unclear what exactly is "big money". She also had a question of who makes up the official Program Committee? She noted that in terms of listserv size and representation the Program Committee itself was in "fairly decent shape" but the issue committees, actually carrying out the Program work, don't all have chairs even though they have people working on program. She feels the Program Committee needs to address how we carry out Program, needs to talk about process even though the members would rather talk about political positions. She also noted that the End Wars issue committee had some serious concerns.

### **NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT (Darien DeLu)**

Nominating Committee is very busy trying to find people for the Personnel, Program, Congress and the Mini Grant Monitoring Committees. People are not terribly interested in the National opportunities that we have for them. Before everything suddenly needed urgent attention, the Nominating Committee had started discussing the need for more paths for leadership development within National WILPF. In terms of finding candidates for Program Chair, people they approached have expressed that it's way too much work, especially people who are interested in Program are not generally all that thrilled about process and being on the Board. Darien and Marie-Louise, together, probably approached 20-40 people for the Program positions. Several people who were approached said that they were not interested in being on the Board at this time because of the amount of conflict on the Board, so we can only hope that that will improve. Darien urged the board to leads with full contact information, especially for Nominating Committee members. It would help to have people with a broader experience of WILPF in other geographic locations, and to have more help doing the actual contact work.

### **JAPA REPORT (Judith Joseph)**

Judith reported that JAPA funded two 2 young women from Pakistan to go to the AWID Conference and one young women from the UK is applying to do the Geneva International Board meeting next year. Sameena Nazir was informed about the Kay Camp fund. The applications came in late and there were six of them. That raised questions to the Kay Camp fund about some kind of policy guidelines on how many a year and how many from the same section. By October JAPA expects to be able to present policy guidelines. The hope of the Camp family was to see the fund last for decades, funding as large numbers as possible.

## QUESTIONS ON THE REPORTS

Laura asked Darien for a list of people that the Nominating Committee had approached about the Program Chair position.

She also had a question about the merging of the End War and DISARM Issue Committees, how we treat them administratively. Ellen and Laurie explained that there is now no End Wars committee; at Joan Ecklein's request, all people from "End Wars" have been added to the DISARM listserv.

Ellen then explained that Joan Ecklein and Marge Van Cleef, the former chairs of the End Wars Committee had felt that the committee had become "untenable." They felt they were thwarted. They had worked for 3 months on a statement in February of 2009 opposing the presence of our troops in Afghanistan.

According to Marge and Joan, Laura, or Laura and Nancy had some objections to it, and the perception is that they were never able to find out what the objections were. When the statement was finally published, it had some elements of their statement, but some of their points, particularly that we should be negotiating with the Taliban, had been removed, and it included a lot of new text about violence against women and SCR 1325. Their intention was that the statement should focus on the fact that we were ramping up the war in Afghanistan, and what they say now is that while looking at things through the lens of human rights is a good way of looking at things, what it takes away is some of the political and economic context; you need to look through more than one lens. This lens had been narrowed, to look much more like women's rights, and that hadn't been their main concern. But still, they didn't disband the committee in 2009. Then, for the South Asian conference in Washington, much more recently, they attended as representatives of WILPF, they wrote a report. It was supposed to be in *Peace and Freedom*, and they were told that there wasn't any room in *Peace and Freedom* for it because they already had one article in there. There had to be room for some other articles, so they were asked if it could be published as an E-News, which does not go to as many people. They agreed, but they said they didn't want any changes made to it, and they were told that if it wasn't going to be edited, then just to make sure that it just stayed exactly the same, it would be done as an attachment to the E-News, rather than embedded in it.

Tanya explained at this point that it was published as a rollover page, because it was a three page long article, so everything they sent was in the E-News, but you had to click "Read more here". It was not edited at all, even for grammatical corrections.

Another problem Marge and Joan had reported as that they had prepared a resource list that had been posted on the website for a long time and then disappeared.

LR and Tanya confirmed that the last time the website crashed, we lost a lot of documents.

Finally, Ellen reported that Joan and Marge expressed a concern is that we're not doing enough on the issue of ending wars, even as we are in more wars than ever. DISARM is primarily Carol Urner, and Carol's interest is the Weapons of Mass Destruction-Free Zone in the Middle East, but that's a long term thing and it's not the only place we're having wars, so Marge and Joan are really concerned about our lack of attention to actual military conflict.

Laura mentioned that we've been encouraging Issue Committees, as they grow, to form subcommittees to take on different aspects of their areas of concern. She asked if there has been discussion of End Wars forming a subcommittee under the umbrella of DISARM. Also, she pointed out that Issue Committee chairs have to be more than issue experts; they must be organizers within WILPF. Another observation was that we as WILPF need to be careful about

who gets to speak for WILPF. Being a member does automatically grant a right to get published in our official publications.

Eva suggested that the person who writes a proposed article needs to be contacted and shown the revised version, and explained why certain items need to be taken out.

Darien recalled that in around 2004 the Board came up with Guidelines for Issue Committees, but did not address subcommittees. As subcommittees take on a greater role, she wondered about communication between subcommittees, particularly the 1325 subcommittee as mentioned in the Program report, and the larger committee, AHR.

Tanya answered the second half of that question. AHR had not been meeting regularly. But Rose Daitzman has been on all the 1325 subcommittee calls. That doesn't mean communication is getting out to the full issue committee. Tanya had been trying to work with Joan and Marge on the editing issues. She and Theresa now have a policy that as soon as they get a draft of the whole E-News, a copy of the draft goes out to every person that submitted a submission, to make sure that people at least get to look at before it gets published.

Nancy Munger brought up the guidelines for Issue committees, what is required to be a committee in good standing. The document is on the website on the page listing the Issue Committee chairs.

Nancy apologized for the problems with the Afghanistan statement, accepting full responsibility for the "screw up" with the 2009 statement and clarifying that she already apologized to Marge and Joan. She had objections with the original statement but did not follow up in a timely manner. However, the final statement was approved by the committee as posted. Nothing was posted that committee members didn't approve.

Ellen: Reminded everyone that Building the Beloved Community Issue Committee developed a survey for branches to fill out, and reminded board members' branches to do so.

Ellen had a question about the Cash Flow statement from the Finance Report, regarding money from bequests. Laurie explained that money from bequests shows as income at the time it is received. The part that goes into long term savings shows on the Cash Flow statement as an "expense" because it's not money available to us. If any money comes out of long term savings, into our operating fund (none had been moved this year) regardless of when it was deposited it will show up in the cash flow statement as income. The portion of the bequests that got moved into long term savings does not show on this particular cash statement because Laurie didn't do it until April.

Darien asked about the 3% that should go into employee retirement. Shouldn't that be prorated for employees such as Laurie who are not here for the whole year? Tanya replied that it is done that way, it's based on hire date, and any portion of a year will be credited.

Judith asked about the capacity of the issue committees, number of members. Ellen replied there is wide variation. On average about 4-5 active; Earth Democracy has about 10-12 active people meeting on monthly calls, but the listserv is much larger.

## LUNCH BREAK

## SESSION RESUMES



Laura introduced this session by explaining that there had been at least informal agreement among the members of this Board for several months that we would function better with some clear goals and priorities. To facilitate that, she circulated an Organizational Goal Worksheet to the Board members in advance of the meeting, and transcribed the organizational goals in each area onto newsprint. The idea is to read through them, look for synergies among them, contradictions, and then using “nominal group process” use little dots to vote and see which ones come out on top. [Note: ”nominal group process” is having a group think about and then “nominate” events that would be most helpful to their organization in the future. The nominees are then discussed and a process developed for implementation of the final selections.]

The plan was we would then break into smaller groups to work out how to achieve those goals. After that we could get agreement on three things as our priorities for at least the next 9-12 months. There was some discussion on whether JAPA representatives and other WILPF members should participate in this exercise. At the end Sandy, Judith, Laurie (would had already announced that she would be leaving WILPF for a different job), and Nancy (whose term on the board was about to expire) opted out of the process. Those who were not part of the decision process remained present during the brainstorming and goal selection, but were asked to leave once the participants divided into small groups to discuss implementation.

Laura asked for additions to each sheet of suggested goals (see below). The group looked for synergies, redundancies, contradictions among them, and open discussion would follow.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Partner with other WILPF sections to focus on improving women and girl’s human rights as a means of improving human rights for all people;
- Upgrade the IT consultant position to a fulltime Communications Director;
- Complete and publish Branch Organizing Manual to support the formation of at least two 2 new branches this year;
- Create a Membership Committee to engage current and new members;
- Create a more positive relationship with JAPA;
- Increase membership and branch national/international communications.
- -To create a space, place, a place or space for people to use their passions in working for a better world;
- To empower and support initiatives to grow the organization’s vision;
- To resolve relationship with JAPA;
- To maintain and develop fair and equitable pathways to participation in WILPF;
- Clear and functional guidelines based on written bylaws and policies;
- Younger, new members surviving and thriving;
- Develop new member’s leadership and skills;
- We will talk to each other openly, and thereby loosen the iron grip of defensiveness, and allay the fear of the loss of face that has emerged in our recent standoffs;
- Recognize and celebrate WILPF’s history, influence, and accomplishments in turning political attention toward investing in peace and sustainable communities.

#### ADDITIONS TO ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Develop more buy-in for the hundredth anniversary.
- Greater use of technology to communicate our programming message, so webinars using you know a greater increase in social media.
- Reevaluate the framework in which we do Program.

- We need swag. (Promotional materials.)
- To actually speak respectfully and civilly to each other and support each other.
- revisit and evaluate the strategic plan.

Laura then asked for people to speak for or against any of these as potential organizational development goals for the next 9 to 12 months.

There was a lengthy discussion in which all could participate. Laura noted that this was to identify our favorite goals in this section, then go into small groups. The small groups would come up with an idea of how to get there, including financing.

*Linda Belle joined the meeting at this point, participating as a resource person (as with Sandy and Judith).*

#### FINANCIAL POSITION

- -Build up National awareness of WILPF to allow expanded membership and donations;
- Develop a fundraising plan that encourages Board members and members to increase their giving;
- Solid membership financing;
- Ability to pursue external finance as needed;
- More interaction between Board and members exploring creative ways in which we can all contribute to the financial wellbeing of WILPF;
- Create a campaign to promote monthly pledging with a goal of increasing it to an amount that will cover the monthly office expense;
- Increase external fundraising, grants etc to 20% of the budget;
- Increase number of pledging members by 50%;
- Establish a final operations reserve fund with 3 month's salary and operating;
- Bring in new members to fund our operations in political initiatives;
- Support all reasonable grant writing initiatives of staff to cover operating class and fund program initiatives;
- Build membership by supporting WILPF leadership existing structures and each other;
- Study other nonprofits to better understand how to identify appropriate donors and underwriters who might support our educational activities;
- Project an inclusive and visionary future.

#### ADDITIONS TO FINANCIAL POSITION:

- get a creative and strategic development plan, with targeted goals and steps in different levels so Phase I might be focused on pledging. Phase II might be a strategic multiyear fundraising plan. The one year goal would be developing the plan.
- get the JAPA planned giving legacy campaign going: In the next nine months get it launched.

#### POLITICS AND PROGRAM

- Strengthen branch participation and Issue Committee work;
- Increase funding for Issue Committees;
- Determine if our program is Board driven, member driven, or staff driven, and act accordingly;
- Reflect WILPF values in our words and work together;
- Celebrate WILPFers individually and our collective successes;

- Be able to respond to time sensitive issues;
- Define program priorities as a Board;
- Establish guidelines for rapid decision making on opportunities with short term overtime for implementation;
- Work on regional, national and global campaigns, especially to get corporations and private contractors out of government;
- Human rights, 1325, and CEDAW;
- Support and critique international institutions;
- Not tie ourselves to the familiar; brainstorm a full spectrum of possibilities in our mission;
- One half of all Issue Committees working on two-year SMART Plan that actively involve members and result in policy change;
- Foster the formation of two new Issue Committees opening space for emerging leaders;
- Further build the conversation starting with the survey, what does security mean to you;
- Learn from and support the program initiatives of WILPF International;
- Work in coalition with likeminded groups;
- More yes, less no.

#### ADDITIONS TO POLITICS AND PROGRAM

- Having at least one Issue Committee project get scaled up to a National campaign.
- We really need to figure out a way for the Issue Committees to be more successful structurally, process wise, organizationally.
- a Board goal for Board members to be aware and speak to members about linkages among Issue Committees
- to develop guidelines for making agreements with coalitions.
- 

Then the suggestions were argued for and against, for example:

Speaking on the suggestion “Define program priorities as a Board”, Nancy Munger said most of our work comes up from the bottom, respects the autonomy and work of the Issue Committees and branches; as long as they’re following WILPF’s mission, she didn’t see that it’s the business of the Board to be determining program, specific program initiatives, other than that they can be suggested from the Board level because Board members are members.

#### 15 MINUTE BREAK –

During the break, the people who had committed to the process (Joan, Ellen, Barbara, Robin, Tanya, Eva, Marie Louise, Darien and Laura) indicated their choices with green dots, the highest priorities for the coming 9-12 months. **The people who would not be continuing with the process (Laurie, Linda, Sandy, Judith, Nancy) were asked to leave and return at 4:30.**

Laura explained that the next section, was about taking 3 or 4 of the things on the wall and turning them into SMART goals.

#### **SMART Goals should be:**

**Strategic** – will have the most impact right now on our organization.

**Measurable**, that is formulated in such a way that we can tell when we’ve accomplished it.

**Achievable** with the real human resources we have.

or **Agreeable** – people are comfortable with it, we have or can get buy in.

**Relevant** for us right now.

**Time Bound** – these are our goals for the next year; may envision a next step, but this is the piece we are biting off now.

We organized into three groups of three people to discuss the goal areas that people had indicated most preference for with the colored dots for “work on this year.” (This included looking for interconnected goal suggestions.)

The goal areas selected were:

- multi-year strategic fundraising plan;
- ability to respond rapidly and trust each other on emerging issues and opportunities in program;
- resolve the relationship with JAPA.

A second test of agreeableness was identifying who was willing to work on these.

Groups retired to different rooms to work on their strategic areas

Fundraising: Tanya, Marie-Louise, Robin

Rapid Response: Laura, Ellen, Joan

JAPA: Barbara, Eva, Darien

BACK FROM GROUP WORK (participation still limited to those listed above)

The Fundraising and JAPA groups reported that they had come up with a SMART plan; Rapid Response had not but did develop specific actions.

Laura asked that each group write the things they want to share with everyone on a piece of newsprint for discussion Saturday, then we had a verbal report-back.

**Laura reported on the results of the “rapid response” group**, recognizing the difficulty of the task. The group suggested that over the next 12 months, the Program Committee design a process and define participants to create a one page document that articulates our vision of the connections between our many issues. This would provide us with a lens and some readymade texts from which to respond to any number of situations in the outside world in (the example of PeaceWomen was brought up). In addition to this lens there is a need for a WILPF screen that can be applied to opportunities and crises in the World to help us decide whether the issue is something that WILPF needs to take leadership in; something in which WILPF needs to have a distinct voice, but not necessarily be in the lead; something in which it’s ok for WILPF to be a part of a coalition where somebody else leads; or something we should just sit out, crisis we just sit aside for.

The groups talked about developing a list of members who are experts/up-to-date on specific things, and developing some strategic alliances with organizations on sort of those peripheral issues where we might want to be part of a coalition so they’re sure to invite us. The group also argued for a contingency fund in the budget so that our Program people and our N.D. have some resources with which to respond. Those are the four action points, but the group didn’t develop them into a SMART plan.

**Marie Louise reported on the Fundraising group**, describing a goal of a three year multi-level development plan, thinking about doing this as a “relay race,” a strategic plan relay. Beginning in April to June for the first three months of this relay we would gather the revenue stream information, and ask two to three additional Board members to work with us. From July to September we would analyze this data and set goals of how to increase the income at all levels by at least 15%,. From October to December, the Board will develop the implementation plan to roll out in January 2013.

Tanya: The other idea was that 2-3 Board members take each leg of those three month segments, so all the Board members have a full understanding of our revenue stream, and the areas where we can increase that revenue stream and then come up with the strategic plan.

**Darien reported from the “resolve relationship with JAPA” group** which was helped by knowing that an anonymous donor has already offered \$5,000 for a meeting of representatives of JAPA’s Board, the WILPF Board, and Heather (to help us with facilitation) to get together, and try to resolve things (Laura noted that the money had already been given).

The group came up with proposing a meeting that should be planned before the end of June or July. The outcome would be a written agreement to cover a 2-3 year period of time. Some of the discussion items at this meeting could be the benefits of our two organizations existing and working together, the possibility of a WILPF 501c3, and perhaps talking about having a meeting with lawyers about Race Street.

Break----- [those who had left the discussion returned to the meeting]

## **DECISION GRID**

Facilitator: Barbara Reed

Barbara started with the WILPF mission statement: **WILPF works to achieve through peaceful means world disarmament, full rights for women, racial and economic justice, an end to all forms of violence, and to establish those political, social, and psychological conditions which can assure peace, freedom, and justice for all.**

The participants discussed the decision grid from the perspective of projects that had worked in branches, some of which had been scaled up, and to look at the process both within the branch in in the process of scaling up. Projects were placed on the decision grid so we would have an outline of decision-making in that area.

We then discussed what numbers to put in boxes on the grid to show steps in the process of developing successful program initiatives. Everyone participated, had examples of successful projects they knew of, which could be scaled up to national projects, and the process that made it successful. We placed numbers based on where the ideas had originated, how were the decisions made, and what resources were needed to make them successful.

Tanya offered the example of the DC Branch mini grant project to create DVDs that can be distributed to all the branches; they have it as part of a speaking tour. She also highlighted Earth Democracy’s mini grant allocation involving doing a speaking tour. Both of those look like projects that could be potentially scaled up Tanya then explained her process: she keeps them in mind and then starts paying attention to funds that could be good matches. If they start being successful, she finds funding. That’s when she goes to the board and mentions the possibility of a grant for project support. Someone asked if Tanya saw the Board as the final decision maker in

terms of what is going to become a National program out of one of these Issue or branch ideas. And Tanya said, “Absolutely.”

Darien said she would like to see the Program Committee as a committee involved in scaling up, so that it can begin to get accustomed to the idea of thinking strategically, so that when there’s something that looks good to scale up, it goes to the Program Committee so they can at least talk about it. That doesn’t mean that they are a decider, but they could be consulted.

**BUDGET ITEM:** Linda wondered about something that becomes a National program, it takes on a different life than the branch program or the Issue Committee, and wondered, is there staff time, is there funding for it? LR explained: that when the board built the budget for this year, we put in this unspecified project money that was an income line (she thought) of \$50,000. It’s an expense line of \$40,000 plus 20% overhead to allow for Tanya’s time. So the expectation of \$50,000 in project-related support already included Tanya’s salary.

Darien raised the question of what to do in case we had competing scalable projects. How would we decide which one to prioritize and scale up? If there are four scalable projects, all of which would need to apply for grants of \$20 to \$40 thousand, how do we decide which ones are the ones that get scaled up? Darien observed that that seems like a Board decision or at least an item that the Board should be consulted on.

Eva discussed the 1325 consultation, observing that they grew out of an Issue Committee, and all of a sudden ballooned into a National thing. She said she sensed that that’s where Board members may have felt like they were left out of that decision. And perhaps that’s what’s being addressed here: how big does something needs to get before the Board as a whole needs to be consulted, even more than just informed.

## **SESSION: RACIAL JUSTICE ISSUES DISCUSSION**

Facilitator: Marie-Louise Jackson-Miller

Questions raised:

--What does it mean to work in coalition with people concerned about racial, economic and social justice issues locally, nationally and internationally?

--If we can learn how to make internal decisions more smoothly, peacefully and rapidly, it will create a safer place for new activists within WILPF, and will allow us to be clearer, better, more timely partners with other organizations, so it could have positive impact.

--A lot of stuff about commitment to racial justice works itself out at the branch level.

--There was some discussion about putting out petitions on racial justice issues on Care2 to reach new audiences with our issues and our names, so that we can bring them back to our website, and hopefully get them on our supporter list, people we’ve never heard of. We could also have our own petition site and link it to our Facebook page, using Salsa, which we already have.

--Building the Beloved Community has really been trying to work with the other Issue Committees, and then sent out this survey recently, to help all of us to be looking at the work we are already doing, but through a racial justice lens. For example, how fracking impacts communities of color. It is low income communities that are taking the brunt of the environmental impact, so an organization like WILPF ought to be able to use that lens and bring that up.

--In our community we have a very large Hispanic population, and I'd love to see some of the literature that we have in Spanish if at all possible. That's a great idea. I know it's costly, but it would be very helpful.

--Some asked about our outreach to Occupy: Barbara observe that she took the whistle blowing campaign to her Occupy group with great success. Darien explained that the Sacramento branch, was working with Occupy to do teach-ins on topics that WILPF selected. That is a way to reach a younger audience, but they're pretty much a white movement.

-- Laura mentioned that we had all been very excited last Fall about the Occupy Movement; it was used as the trope for the last annual appeal, and how energizing people had found it to interact with the Occupy encampments. But she had heard that the Occupy encampments were pretty white, and asked how much of our energy do we want to give to using that connection as our recruiting site; if we know it's mostly white, is that where we want to be putting our energy in terms of making new allies and connections? She noted that we have a lot of political alignment with the Occupy people, but we also have a huge commitment to racial justice and to working as allies with people of color. What does it say about our commitment?

--Sandy said she'd want people to join our organization even if they are white. She'd prefer having more people of color, but sometimes we just don't appeal to some of their issues. In Santa Cruz, one of their members is on the Board of the NAACP, and WILPF members go to their meetings. They are more comfortable if we go to their meetings rather than them coming to our meetings.

--Judith brought up the question of sexism in Occupy. Maybe we need a national level analysis of what it means to work with the Occupy Movement to help us choose priorities about our work.

--Marie-Louise noted that Occupy Boston did have a whole women's march when they were encamped, and WILPF participated in it. Tanya wondered why we aren't attractive to organizations or people of color.

--Darien felt we're not attractive because we're white and there are some people of color who would feel ok about going into a room full of white folks, but it is a really difficult thing, like being a "temporary minority", a white person going to a meeting of all people of color. Also there are cultural issues, economic issues and all other kinds of things that come up, so that the approach should not be an individual approach of outreach, but something that is more group focused or somehow would be more a recruitment of multiple people. Most WILPFers are if not actually middle class, grew up as middle class, so if you are trying to reach out to people who are lower working class or poorer, there are huge cultural differences that become a concern. With Occupy, she believes there is a very tangible reason why people of color aren't involved. They see the people "beating the hell out of" white Occupy people, and they just know they are going to get killed if they get involved. But Occupy does represent issues of concern to people of color, and it can be a movement we work with, and seek to influence toward issues that we think might be more specifically related to racial justice. Linda noted that this is the question we've asked for years, even when we had two or three women of color on the Board. Betty Burkes was a President in the past. When we had a large staff in Philadelphia, there might have been other people of color in staff, but Pam, a black woman, was there 35 years. The questions were still being asked because even with that, it was really hard to retain them. She doesn't know if she has ever heard a really clear answer to this.

--Laura noted that the pattern of women of color representation on the two Boards she served on was that the attrition of women of color paralleled precisely the attrition of younger women from those Boards.

--Sandy noted that we are a minority politically, and there are all kinds of religious and cultural things (such as our position on abortion) that make us not attractive to some people. It's not just color, it's all kinds of cultural things. The young women, they have their own group, and they aren't surrounded by a bunch of white white-haired women, they've got their own culture, too.

--Marie-Louise said when they did the consultation with the Cape Cod branch there was amazing diversity, There were a lot of people who were concerned about their legal status, and so they couldn't come forward, and we have to be ready for people who are wanting to connect with us, and don't want to voice it so loudly.

End of minutes for Day 1

Minutes by Barbara Reed, Summary by Ellen Schwartz



WILPF US National Board Meeting  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
Saturday, April 14, 2012

**Present:**

Laura Roskos, President  
Laurie Belton, Director of Operations  
Barbara Reed, Secretary  
Nancy Munger, Past Co-President  
Robin Lloyd, Development Committee Chair  
Joan Bazar, Personnel Committee Chair  
Tanya Henderson, National Director  
Darien De Lu, Nominating Committee Chair  
Eva Havlicsek, Treasurer  
Marie-Louise Jackson-Miller, At-large Board Member  
Sandy Silver, Co-President of JAPA  
Judith Joseph, Co-President of JAPA  
Linda Belle, Executive Director of JAPA  
Catia Confortini, WILPF International Board Representative, as noted, via Skype connection

**Absent:**

Rita Jankowska-Bradley, At-large Board Member

**Also Present:**

Ellen Schwartz, Temporary Program Committee Co-Chair  
Edith Bell, Member, Pittsburgh Branch  
Linda Belle, Executive Director of JAPA

Darien opens the session by reading a poem written and sent to the board by Rita. Laura mentioned the basic rules of the meeting, and Nancy read the list of “basic agreements” – Listen with respect and complete attention; speak one at a time; in discussion times no one speaks twice before everyone has a chance to speak once; feelings, appreciations, and encouragement, affection, and mistakes are welcome; No interruptions, crosstalk, personal criticism, blame, put downs or personal advice; participate fully, openly, and honestly; remember that my sharing helps myself and others; each person and the entire Board is responsible for the success of the Board; respect and think well about myself and all others; gently and firmly remind each other that we agree to whatever; in consensus each person is responsible for stating if asked the specific reasons for her position, and to being open to changing her position in response to further discussion; no use of electronic communication toys, tools, whatever, (and definitely not war toys); exchange time listening to each other between Board meetings; and be aware of body language.

**Agenda Review**

Laura noted that a number of items from Friday, e.g. issues around the editorial decisions and proofreading in “Peace and Freedom”, an issue about who sets the Steering Committee meetings, the U.N. Representative job description, discussion of the proposed partnership with UNITAR, and concern with finances around for example the donation to WILPF Pakistan. At least some of these were to have been covered in the decision grid discussion Friday afternoon, and didn’t come up there.

The question of who calls Steering Committee meetings, and the U.N. rep job description are loose ends, with the Steering Committee meetings matter and the Decision Rule being policy items for discussion during that agenda point.

### **Director of Operations Report – Laurie Belton**

Laurie Belton announced that over lunch we are going to preview the new website. Questions about her report included:

1. Discussion of how the Practicum has been staffed and operated in recent years, role of staff and others.
2. Website redesign. Board decided in October 2011 that hiring of developer was to be a staff decision. A focus group will be convened shortly.
3. Coverage of office in the event of staff illness –contingency plans for signing checks. Laurie is writing a Director of Operations manual for her successor. In January/February Laura was the only one who could fill in during Laurie’s absence. Others can sign checks. Laurie said Laura and Eva both have all the passwords to the bank accounts, Theresa and Laurie have all the passwords to the computers internet, IT. The only thing that only Laurie has a password to is her personal email account.
4. Online donations problem as DIA and SALSA ended relationship with each other. There was a period of time where neither DIA nor PayPal were functioning. But SALSA set up a backup merchant gateway, a company called Democracy Engine, and so we didn’t lose any payments.
5. Membership drive (after not being able to do on in previous two years): Any plans for evaluating the drive?
6. An extensive discussion took place around the situation of pledgers whether the online system was keeping accurate track and whether pledgers were being acknowledged by the office.
7. Laurie led members through the **printout showing branch membership and renewals, and other data for 2011**. She identified 57 active branches (having contact persons). Within those branches 831 people became new members or renewed their dues (by stating specifically that they were renewing dues). Life pledgers cannot count in the renewals, but pledgers who are not life members cannot be counted.  
“Santa Cruz had 70 people who either renewed or became new members, and Los Angeles had 71.” These two and Detroit are the branches which are updating their own records online.
8. The branch mailing was in two packets: These included a \$2 rebate for each membership paid up in the year, the manual for updating member records online, and other materials.
9. “Branches (with under 10 members) have to be notified that this is where they are but I think that we can offer them support in growing their numbers.” Discussion followed on what branches get – rebates, help with membership drives, eligibility for mini-grants. Tanya adds: Two-way communication, communication with other branches. They can also put things in *Peace and Freedom* and the eNews.
10. Return to discussion of number of members: dues-paying members in branches is 831, plus at-large members and 347 life members (of whom only 102 donated in 2011) for a total of 1046 making contributions.
11. International assessment: Previously has been based on number of contributors 1046, (whether or not designated as dues-paying). The new number (dues-paying) is lower, thus lowering the assessment (based on \$15 per capita).

At its fall meeting the Board will on an annual basis consider the possibility of making additional payment to International.

Eva noted it costs us about \$30.00 per member just to maintain (\$15 to international, \$15 for P&F).

Ellen urged pledging as better than life membership.

### **Discussion of calculating the number for International assessment**

Donations and dues are recorded in two different ways. People who specify that their money is a dues payment have it recorded as dues, people who send money that is unrestricted or is a restricted donation that is classified differently. Laurie asked for a decision on how to calculate our membership for the International assessment (this also has implications for the size of our delegation to the International Congress). Do we only want to include life members and dues payers, or do we want to include that larger number of people who aren't paying dues, but may make a donation to the annual appeal. There were "a whole bunch of people" who donated to WILPF Pakistan who had not been heard from before.

Linda proposed setting our membership at the smaller number of members, the "true count", and then making up the difference with a donation, but use the smaller official number to provide credibility with International, for them to understand that we're struggling. This discussion was chart-padded for later discussion. Joan asked that the discussion of making an additional donation to International be delayed to the Fall board meeting when we'll have a better idea of our finances.

### **National Director's report – Tanya Henderson**

**Excerpts:** This is my first year, so I have had a huge learning curve to accomplish this year, on top of a tremendous amount of exciting WILPF work that went on as well, programmatically. . . . In November and December, I was on every Issue Committee call. . . . Whenever we had to kind of put out a statement (I had) to really make sure that I really understood WILPF's nuances, programmatic areas and our work . . .

I really feel so encouraged by the regeneration of Building the Beloved Community, and though they feel like they are very small, they started putting out this racial justice survey, they had an article in "Peace and Freedom", they've had an article in E-News, they are writing another article for next year's "Peace and Freedom" and are working on a statement.

Last summer we kind of re-strategized as to how to make development more effective.

At the end of each month the Board will receive a brief report from me, a one pager, just kind of articulating what happened that month, highlighting weaknesses, kind of questions, just so that you can kind of feel more regularly informed. With the DO and Nominating Chair I'm hoping that we can really look at the job descriptions, and make sure there is a working job description for your Board positions.

Webinars -- Ellen and Chris were able to have that first, to have that first trial run, focusing on capacity building, and I was really excited that the webinar was successful. . . . All our Issue Committee women know these issues better than the majority of people in the field, I think. Nancy Price during the CSW did a webinar, a state call with the CSW students, and I heard it was just a fantastic success. My goal is to have at least a trial of two national calls or webinars

this year out of program. . . . it would be fantastic if we could start doing them monthly or every other month, and that also reaches out to members beyond WILPF.

This past year has been about learning for me, it's been about learning WILPF, and immersing myself in WILPF program. As much as I know that the 1325 project had its own controversies within, I have to tell you myself being able to have that opportunity to learn, to see something go from an Issue Committee to having it get significant external funding to rolling it out to a national campaign . . . The experience taught me that well I know how to do that now right, and maybe it wasn't the ideal for a WILPF issue, but it also means I know what worked, I know what didn't work. . .

Supporting branches: DC Branch (has been revitalized partly due to) a few new young WILPFers that were former Practicum students that now had jobs in DC. The branch started getting more organized, and it was largely around the Whistleblower action. Isabel McDonald who does the depleted uranium project, wrote a mini grant application. In the last 5 months they've reorganized their entire branch, they have a membership chair, they have two co-chairs, they've got 6 different leadership positions in the branch. They're doing an outreach and have requested a program intern to support this DC Policy Group.

**[Linda Belle noted we need to talk about money that comes through JAPA that's being used in DC and is about lobbying.]**

Tanya: (Regarding her job description):

Number 1 – Provide US WILPF the political programmatic leadership . . . in consultation and cooperation with Board Program committee, and other WILPF Issue committees, WILPF branches and field organizers, and that my position summary is to in collaboration with the Board and relevant Board committees to lead the development and implementation of WILPF's program and fundraising plans and proposals, and so, I'm bringing this up now, because one of the things that has been a challenge for me is that when these questions have come up in terms of decision making, which I think are important questions, I don't know that I've always felt fully, I haven't felt fully confident that it was my job to do this, and so having to pull this out again and being reminded that this is what I was hired to do, was affirming for me, and I would, and it would be helpful to me, , to really, to have our Board understand that this is what I was hired to do, and so when the questions arise externally then that can be affirmed as well. So that is what my job description is going to be.

The National Director is the public face of WILPF US and in collaboration with the Board and relevant Board committees leads the development and implementation of WILPF's program and fundraising plans and proposals.

Well in the 1<sup>st</sup> part of the position summary it says in collaboration, and number 1 says in consultation and cooperation.

**[Extensive discussion of development.]**

Tanya: I've felt like part of this next year has to be really institutionalizing these on paper, creating these best practices where they don't exist, or pulling them out where they did exist, and people don't know about them, and making them more known because of what you just said. There are a number of practices that when I came on, in addition to my job description, I was trained to do, and I was pointed to this is the best practice for this, and this is the way we have always done this, and so, I've done it that way, and then um, and then to be honest gotten quite a bunch, quite a lot of feedback that maybe I shouldn't do it that way, and then there is a big point

of confusion, and so now kind of re-reflecting on what my job actually is or was defined to me, and pull, this is why I'm allocating some of this time next year to kind of institutionalize this.

...

Eva -- . . . I feel like our Board needs to set priorities, but not necessarily identify specific programs, that's a different job, and so when an Issue Committee comes through in the Program, people approve something, then I think that that Tanya needs to be given the leeway to go ahead with it, so that's, I'm just coming in with that, that I think we hired these talented women and we should utilize their talents. We don't have two administrative assistants here.

...

Darien: First, I do want to really acknowledge the skill and expertise of both Laurie and Tanya. I don't see that as a question. For me, more the question is, the knowledge that we as a Board have of WILPFers and WILPF attitudes, and a long history of positions and so forth, and so forth, and I don't mean to bring it up at this point as a discussion item, but just to briefly cite the whole UNITAR thing as a prime example where hey, your job is to write grant proposals and bring in money. You can't know all the intricacies right off the top of how people might feel about UNITAR, but that is an important example of where the Board I think did need to be more specifically addressed and consulted and asked for direction. We talked yesterday very briefly about scaling things up, and just because the campaign is National, doesn't mean it necessarily has to have Board okay, but maybe there's some definition we need as to what is big enough that the Board really needs to address that.

...

Tanya described the process of seeking board approval for the UNITAR proposal, and others explained why they did not feel sufficiently in the loop. They had expressed concerns but had not stated clear opposition to the proposal.

## **POLICY** Laurie chairing

[Laurie referred to the WILPF/Geneva staff working practices, prepared prior to the Bolivia Congress. Linda not sure what use if any has been made of it. . . It says individual sections may adapt parts of it for their own use.]

So I think the purpose of this document, and the purpose of us discussing it here is to sort of establish some basic ground rules about how we engage each other, and how we respect each other.

Two questions: What is our goal in terms of leadership of the organization, what level of autonomy do we have, and how can we respectfully disagree with each other without making Tanya and I feel like we are less than you? That our voices are less than you, that our importance to the organization is less than yours? Often, that's how we feel,

LR: . . . what I'm seeing in our organization in WILPF is that the document treats, it gives volunteers the prestige, equal prestige as staff cause I think what's happened is that we've given each other permission to disrespect and trash each other, and there's slippage. People don't remember. They are so used to trashing another volunteer, that the trashing slips over the edge to the staff at times, and the lack of respecting the institution that exists, and ourselves as elected leaders. . .

Ellen:[ final National Action Plan from the US government didn't reflect the consultations but we had lent our name to the process.]

Tanya 1325 Committee members are knowledgeable, capable women, and their ability to send a message that reflects wilpf values should be trusted.

## **AFTERNOON – GOAL SETTING REPORTBACK**

**Group A:** Eva, Barbara, and Darien. Topic: **Resolving the Relationship With JAPA**

Barbara: The task we were assigned was to find a possible way to do this. There had been a suggestion by Laura and Eva that funds had been made available to support a meeting between JAPA and WILPF facilitated by Heather Harker. There was a deadline for the suggested meeting of the end of July 2012.

However, the outcome we came to by openly discussing the question with JAPA members was that the issues of finances and logistics led to an alternative solution, at least as a first step. The procedure we decided upon is that of direct contact between members of the WILPF and JAPA boards. Eva will be meeting with the treasurer of JAPA. We all believe this is a good first step.

**Group B:** Tanya, Marie Louise, Robin. Topic: **Developing a multiyear fund raising plan for the board**

**Board Relay Race** with the goal of it being a strategic multilevel Board fundraising plan, but to include Board members at different segments. So the first step would be from April to June, and with the Development Chair, the National Director and the Finance Chair we would like 2-3 Board members to agree to work on a small committee for three months to gather information on all the revenue streams coming into WILPF so that we can have a big picture analysis of how money comes into WILPF, so we can really see clearly all the different ways, and then they are running, they're running, they're running and in June they pass off the baton, pass off the information to 2-3 new Board members who continue to work with the Development Chair, the ND, and the Finance Chair to analyze this information that comes in, and to set some goals, to say wow, we thought we were getting more money in from our lifetime donors, lifetime members. Surprise, surprise, wow, this is an area we can really increase, how are we going to do this, so they start to set goals from that. So they analyze and set the goals, and they run, run, run with their goals and analyzed information, and then in October they pass off the baton, the goals and analysis to 2-3 new Board member with the Development Chair, and the National Director, and we would probably take it at this point, and this group would then actually take the analysis and the goals and put it into this procedural plan, how are we going to get there with the goal that by the end of December we would have a document, a strategic plan that could then be launched in January, 2013, and released for all of us to begin taking action on. So that means that overall, it looks like a lot of coordination, which is why Robin and I will be the key people through the whole process, but at the same time it means that every Board member is really going to have a big understanding of our big financial picture and have buy in to whatever comes out of that final document and that final strategic plan. So that was our little thing.

**Group C:** Laura, Ellen, and Joan

Laura: I changed ours a little bit too, in the sense that I assigned people to do different parts, or bodies that will take the next 9 to 12 months to develop, oh, I'm sorry, the Program Committee and Issue Committees develop alliances with other organizations who can take the lead on sort of peripheral issue areas, and so will the National Director, and so you will see how this becomes

important in areas where we aren't in the lead, political areas that we've had historical involvement in or they are on the edges. The Program Committee takes the next 9 to 12 months to create a lens through which we look at opportunities and do different parts, so that's something we might have to discuss. So our big goal is to have the ability to respond to time sensitive issues be they crises or opportunities. We decided these are the things that we would try to do to move that along. Establish a contingency fund in next year's budget so that there is some wiggle room. The National Director would keep an updated list, an experts list of our members who are experts on different things that we deal with in different political issues. The lens is a one page articulation of how we understand the connections among our issues. The lens can be used to help inform when we want to contribute, when we want to issue a statement, it will have some boiler plate language of our big picture political analysis that can be moved into different contexts and facilitate the work of the National Director. The National Director and possibly the National Board together will create a screen, like a socially responsible investing screen that will help us decide on issues whether it's an issue where WILPF needs to be the leader, where other organizations are also acting, but WILPF has something distinctive, a distinctive voice to bring, or whether it's an issue in which WILPF can just join a growing coalition that has a common stance, or whether it's an issue that we just sit out. So we think between the screen and the lens that we should be able to make decisions a lot more effectively.

### **DECISION GRID DISCUSSION**

Extensive discussion of UNITAR proposal as an example. The issue came back to the unresolved tension between the role of the national director and board members, particularly the Program co-chairs.

BR: Ok, the topic of discussion is what does the role of staff look like in populating the decision grid, and we discussed this. We began discussing this in our last segment, right, Laurie and Tanya, so the answer to the question, is there a role for staff in the decision grid is a resounding, "yes", and the question of what is that role is something we touched on quite a few times during the presentation. If we can get back to the examples we had yesterday which we've written and saved, right?

BR: So, thank you and we added #5 for evaluation. So if we take a couple of examples, and one of them we promised to discuss was the UNITAR proposal.

NM: I see most of these coming from one or two directions. One is usually from an Issue Committee let's say, it could be from a branch, but let's just say it's coming from an Issue Committee, or sometimes it might be coming from outside, somebody is proposing something. ..

BR: This one came from outside to Tanya. Is that correct?

Tanya: This came from outside as a consequence of something internal of an Issue Committee. Because if this was an issue, if this was a topic area, say it's human trafficking, right? We haven't really been doing much with human trafficking outside of the "Whistleblower", we don't have a human trafficking committee, an issue committee, any of that. I see that as a whole new programmatic policy area that would take an organizational decision to decide, or to come up from within.

BR: Ok, so this one came?

Tanya: This one, we were contacted externally in regards to getting a grant as a result of a program internally.

BR: Right, because we asked for money first.

Tanya: Connect US, right. I'm sorry you guys, I'm tired, so I didn't realize that I had to lead this conversation.

BR: No, I just want to get a feel for putting it on the grid from what you said this morning. So we're really just transposing it to numbers from what you have already reviewed for us. So, you recommended, you were the recommender and recommended that we would consider this.

... BR: National Director, there we go. (marks it on the grid)

..

Tanya: I would be recommending a 2. Ok and I was, so technically, if we are talking about the actual example, I was looking, I was consulting the Board.

BR: Right, yes Nancy.

NM: Well I admit I am having trouble with this grid because it is so specific, and I think much more generally. I like to have policy so that, so because actually after we had this morning's discussion, I wrote down, it's just my belief that the National Director should seek Board approval only when the scaled up project or grant proposal: a) will add to the ND's time beyond that allocated in her work plan. Meaning she could have 3 or 4 scaled up projects coming from Issue committees, external funding, etc. but she can have interns, she can get it done, I mean basically in the time she has already allocated to program, so why would she need to go to the Board for approval and so that's a), or b) if it's unprecedented or like something from the outside, . . .

BR: Ok, let's address that one issue that you raised first which is, is there really any need for her to go to the Board, or can she just make the decision?

NM: Well, I was saying she doesn't need to go to the Board if it's not putting excess, a certain percentage extra of her time or whatever. She's got time allocated in her work plan to development work and program work, if it's not impacting her time and it's coming from an Issue Committee then great, it's only when it hits some trigger point where she would be overloaded.

BR: Ok, can we get somebody to –

Linda Belle: Can I ask a question about that? At your last Board meeting, I think it was your last one you came up with a list of people to be consulted about grant writing. This was grant, does that fit into this?

Tanya: Well it does because the Connect US funding is a grant. It's a funder that we have been trying to get funding from for a while. We applied to them for the 1025, for the AWP. They're an organization, so they've been

Linda: Vetted?

Tanya: They've been vetted, I mean the ethical fundraising guidelines say any new funder we're looking for funding from we have to go through these steps.

Linda: And they're not new.

Tanya: They're not new.

Linda: So you don't need to go to that committee? Just a question.

Tanya: Yes, no, I hear you.

BR: Ok Darien?

Darien: I continue to feel that there should be some kind of dollar limit that probably would change with the cost of living or something, but basically that over some amount, even if it comes from an Issue Committee, even if it's an approved grant, even, even, even. It should still go to the Board, because this would be a major commitment. If funds are coming in, it's something the Board should be aware of, should be aware that it's being considered, and there might be aspects to it that would be something the Board members would be aware of or concerned about that aren't known to that Issue Committee that don't have to do with a particular funder, and that you can't be expected to know everything.



Tanya: Just in response to your question, I think that that would make sense anyways because we're talking about a \$100,000 grant. It's probably going to take a good chunk of my time, which would mean I would have to consult personnel, and anybody else, so I think that that is right.

Darien: Yes, and I'm not thinking as high as that, but whatever.

Tanya: Yes

BR: Laura, did you have your hand up?

LR: Yes, I was trying to think of why money is a superior trigger point to time allocation or to political commitment, because you're saying and because Nancy's identifying two continuums that at some point there's a trigger on, and you're saying that of those two continuums, you think money is superior. I'm just going on, I mean what is the better measure here, affinity, time, or finances? . . . .

Joan: Well, I see here there are two lines under the grant proposal. One is program, and the other is budget. So I think on different committees there'd be different people consulted on each. It could be the same project, but does this mean there are two different aspects of the same project? . . .

Darien . . . but it should go to the Board saying here's the preparation work of what the Issue Committee has done, here's the recommendation from the National Director. We see no issues with this, but we want consensus from the Board, because something that would be large by any of those three criteria would be large enough of the nature of US WILPF, and the Board I feel should be a place where the nature of US WILPF is taken into consideration as a whole.

Extensive discussion of **decision rule:**

## **Decisions from Newsprint**

### **Decision Rule**

Beginning April 14, 2012 and until April 30, 2013, the WILPF board will adopt on a trial basis the following decision rule:

6. A proposal is made to the board.
7. Try for consensus in good faith with every voice heard.
8. If unsuccessful, representatives of differing sides meet to try to agree on a new proposal.
9. Issue is brought back to the board within the agreed upon timeframe.
10. If unanimity still cannot be reached a decision can be made by approval of at least 75% of board members present.

### **Unanimous consensus reached**

BREAK

Robin: Can I take this opportunity to hand out the report to the Board on the local2global WILPF seminar at the Commission on the Status of Women, 2012. . .

NM: So on the parking lot,

- We need to approve two executive staff work plans.
- It was requested that we have some next steps generated in utilizing membership data
- Does the executive staff need Board consensus to act?
- The six month extension for the Practicing Peace committee that they requested. It was set up as a one year ad hoc committee, to evaluate the survey Tanya had sent out.
- Do we need a new conflict resolution process we respect?
- The listserv crash report,
- How to move forward with priorities chart work that we did yesterday

- Who calls Board meetings and Steering Committee meetings?
- The Pakistan funding decision
- Then tomorrow we have all our money stuff
- Proposal about the International assessment, ok.

. . . **Bylaws Discussion** (Darien facilitator, Laurie chart padder, Joan timekeeping, Barbara vibes watching, and Tanya notes.)

Darien noted that the rationale for the staggered terms bylaws proposal had been emailed to the board, plus the full text of the bylaws proposal for staggered elections.

. . . Proposal: The members of the Board should review, and, if consensus can be reached, take a position on proposed bylaws changes that are to come to a member vote. At this time, those bylaws are as far as we know:

- Direct election of President
- Membership Development Committee Chair

[ the proposal was amended to add an extra member to the Board rather than to be designating an existing Board position],

- and of course, staggered terms, should that be passed.
- Additionally there is a need for some kind of an online forum or blog in order to better obtain a sense of significant points of view pro or con on proposed bylaw amendments, that go before the membership. The WILPF Bylaws page could serve this purpose if properly implemented. It would be most helpful if such a discussion were announced as moderated, and limited to WILPF members, so that inappropriate comments by WILPF members could be removed, and nonmembers would be . . . ,.
- Pros and cons should be published in “Peace and Freedom”, and an ad hoc committee appointed by the Board could write the pros and cons language in consultation with the Bylaws Committee, if one is currently functioning at that point. The Board should agree that the content of the language chosen by the Pros and Cons subcommittee, with the exception of minor grammatical spelling changes, may not be altered by anyone without the consent of the committee.

Question: So this is saying that whoever believes that Pennsylvania law says that whenever we change the size of the Board it must be voted on by the members?

Darien: That and more particularly that whenever the method of selection in a Board member is changed, it must be voted on by the members

Meeting Adjourned at 6:30pm

Minutes by Barbara Reed, summary by Joan Bazar

WILPF US National Board Meeting  
Thomas Merton Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
Sunday, April 15, 2012

**The full meeting was preceded by an executive session in the morning**, facilitated by Joan Bazar – concerning 1) staff matters and the Program Chair openings. Also in this session Board members were asked to provide job descriptions for their current positions, rather than have the Nominating Committee draft updated ones.

**Decisions:** We approved Tanya’s annual review. While we cannot afford to offer Tanya a raise, we will offer the cost of living increase as well as paying for one week of her special leave this summer, during which she will be providing training in Lebanon.

The Board considered Ellen’s offer to officially fill one of the empty Program Co-chair positions. The Board decided to invite Ellen to continue as interim Program Co-chair up to the next Board meeting, and invite her to formally apply for the position. We will continue to advertise the two Program Chair positions. Also decided that, in this interim period, Ellen can be on the Board list.

---- **End of Executive Session Decisions** ----

**Present:**

Laura Roskos, President  
Laurie Belton, Director of Operations  
Barbara Reed, Secretary  
Nancy Munger, Past Co-President  
Robin Lloyd, Development Committee Chair  
Joan Bazar, Personnel Committee Chair  
Tanya Henderson, National Director  
Darien De Lu, Nominating Committee Chair  
Eva Havlicsek, Treasurer  
Mary-Louise Jackson-Miller, At-large Board Member  
Sandy Silver, Co-President of JAPA  
Judith Joseph, Co-President of JAPA  
Linda Belle, Executive Director of JAPA  
Catia Confortini, IB Representative, as noted, via Skype connection

**Absent:**

Rita Jankowska-Bradley, At-large Board Member

**Also Present:**

Ellen Schwartz, Temporary Program Committee Co-Chair  
Edith Bell, WILPF member, Pittsburgh Branch

**Board and Board Member Fundraising (as an expectation of bd. members)**

Laura noted that we do that in aggregate, so if 11 people, our board goal would be \$5,500.00 (11 x \$500), Write down anonymously how much money you gave or personally raised through Asks to other

individuals.

### **Program Chair appointment.**

In response to the invitation to continue as Interim Program Chair appointment, Ellen agreed.

Linda asked about the process for filling the two Program Chair positions. Darien explained that, given the Board request for a more formalized process of advertising the opening, she asks that the Board evaluate that process once it's completed. It would be useful to have written guidelines on how positions should be advertised to satisfy board expectations.

Eva emphasized that the Nominating Committee advertising gives everyone an opportunity to apply for the positions, not just somebody who's been active.

### **Review of chart padded decisions/Dangling Decision Items**

- when is the fall board meeting going to take place,
- who will take responsibility for preparing the racial justice segment of that fall Board meeting
- the proposal from the Finance Committee about how to invest the proceeds from the sale of 1213 Race Street (That money was, then, in a savings account at Bank of America.)
- a proposal for establishing a contingency fund or reserve fund
- from our Development Chair: Reauthorization of our Local to Global program
- approval of additional members to the ad hoc Bylaws Committee
- additional members to the Nominating Committee
- and of US rep to the UN (not be of the most urgency, given very limited time)
- carryover decision items:
  - a proposal for agreement on how steering meetings are called
  - a proposal for the membership number on which we base our international assessment payment
  - a proposal to extend the mandate of the practicing peace committee for six months
  - needing a conflict resolution process we respect and agree to follow
  - affirm our priorities as a Board for the next 9-12 months, as rendered on newsprint (from the Friday and Saturday sessions)
- a policy proposal about notification of WILPF members about Board meetings
- a Bylaws proposal about member input into the Bylaws changes, and how members would actually vote on those Bylaws changes. (Including "pros and cons" proposal).

Darien added:

- decision on the Staggered elections Bylaws proposal that was revised overnight (from the Saturday board discussions)-
- the Bylaws proposal of restriction of ex officio blocking by the President on committees in which she serves as ex officio.

Laura added –

- approving our staffs' work plans, which didn't happen on Sat.
- 

### **Practicing Peace Committee**

Darien proposed that we extend the Practicing Peace Committee for another six months.

Discussion noted that one person on it, intermittently, is Lashonda from Milwaukee. There's also a young college student. The four people consistent in meeting monthly are Patricia Schroeder, Santa Cruz; Paige Willard from Boston, Nancy Ramsden, and Tanya Henderson.

The Committee drafted the branch survey about conflict resolution methods. Tanya provided this overview of the committee's report on the branch survey:

- 14 branches participated in three weeks, more coming in.
- Some reported that their branch is a group of four or five who have known each other for 25 years, so they've figured out all their conflicts.
- lots of great recommendations, from nonviolent communication to mediation to bringing an outside mediators
- The comm. wants to do follow-up with those branches that really have done a lot of work around this.

**No decision was made on the proposal for extension of the committee.**

### **List serve crash report.**

Laurie provided the info:

- Somehow all the settings on all of our list serves, which had been set to private, were changed to public. So the list serve archives were visible online to anyone, including confidential Board conversations. Theresa changed everything back to private, but within a couple of days several of them had been changed to public again.
- HostGator, our web hosting service, and others consulted, said that those changes would have to be done deliberately by somebody. So Theresa and Laurie changed all of the passwords, and made a much more complicated rubric that will be much harder to break. Those passwords are not written down anywhere, only known to Laurie and Theresa.
- Our list serve system is fragile. It doesn't really accommodate our needs. One cannot address a message to more than one list at the same time or the system tags the email as spam, so WILPF members' e-mails get bounced as a result. Following the debut of the new website in May, WILPF will be moving all of our list serves to the Google office platform. The security and capacity are much better.
- WILPF US has suspended giving Issue Committees the passwords to manage their own list serves. It's at least the third time in about two years that someone has hacked into our list serves. That puts the organization at risk, not only because of information that could become public, including personnel discussions, but because of the time it takes for staff when this happens.

A brief incidental conversation took place about rebuilding relationships with the New York Metro branch, including in order to obtain their report for JAPA on the use of 501(c)3 money.

### **Fall Board meeting**

It was observed that we don't have the money for conducting an in-person one, but we will try to find it. Virtual or in person, we chose November 9-11.

While members completed papers about their preferred board dates, Darien asked about a question she had from the day before – what is meant by the “Bylaws Committee mandate”?

Laura explained, it was the instructions given to the Bylaws Committee when it was created by the Board; what the Board thinks the committee should be doing. (Darien is unaware of any such mandate.)

Laura reminded the board that on Friday the board did some work on what it would mean to take care of those suggested board priorities, to get them off of our list. On Sat., board members talked about what was on their newsprint. Three of them are —

- create a three year multi-strategy, multi-level Board fund raising plan,
- resolve relationship with JAPA, and
- develop the ability to respond to time sensitive issues.

Laura called for questions about the newsprint renderings of these three in order to affirm them before lunch.

## Board Fundraising Plan:

Robin emphasized that all Board members, even besides those who are currently involved in fundraising, are part of the fundraising effort — the "relay race". The proposed plan calls for the first three months for gathering information, second three months, analyzing information and setting goals for, and the last three months would be creating a strategic plan document from the goal setting that group 2 did.

Laurie requested that board members sign up on the sheet to give pep talks to failing branches.

Laura asked whether, if we're going to spend this year developing a fundraising plan, does that mean that all of our fundraising is put on hold for this year? No—we will do the annual letter; we will strategize about major donors and so on; the Development Comm. will be doing its usual work. The proposed strategy plan is for how the Board is going to become more involved in fundraising, as a Board, including how to use the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary as part of our fundraising outreach.

Darien asked about the criteria envisioned for use of the contingency fund [shown as an option under the "rapid response" issue, on the newsprint]. Laura responded that the point is to get one, so that if we ever want to respond to something that costs money, we can do it. But right now it's not in our budget, there's no contingency. The Finance Committee creates the contingency fund and will work with the new DO to do so, and the Board would have to approve the criteria.

## Relationship with JAPA

Laura sought to clarify the proposal from the group that addressed resolving the relationship with JAPA, since, when it was presented verbally, it was very different from the newsprint version. There appeared to be a suggestion for a joint WILPF-JAPA board meeting, or a third-party-facilitated joint meeting of parts of those boards

However, Eva explained that the meeting is not taking place, since the JAPA representatives said they do not think that that such a meeting is necessary. So the second strategy idea is direct contact. For instance, Eva would have direct contact with Tura [Treasurer of JAPA] to discuss a number of issues. Also, Linda [JAPA E.D.] and Tanya are going to have monthly meetings. A couple of other issues remain: One is the fear on one side that WILPF is going to decide to become its own 501(c)3, and the other was the issue of the Race Street funds [proceeds from the sale of the former WILPF US offices building on Race St., owned by JAPA].

Eva expressed that there are some questions about the committee that decided on that Race St. money, not having the full records. That is one thing that a facilitated joint meeting could have worked on, but the other thing to really work together on is the positive points of agreement — all the years we've had together, the relationships.

Eva added that it was very important to notice that the particular issue that got even more votes than anything else during the Priority session was that everyone wants an IT person. [The board did not address that option.]

Judith clarified that JAPA *doesn't* think there are *no* issues to resolve. But they feel there are ways to resolve them that would not take a weekend and \$5,000. Also, a committee, working in confidence, is already constituted with six members representing all three of our sister organizations [WILPF US, WILPF International, and JAPA]. JAPA hopes that, in addition to resolving the issue that is assigned to the committee, they would also set up a model of how representatives from the organizations could work together. If it works, great, if it's not working, it might not work any better to spend a lot of money for a meeting

Eva noted that having someone to facilitate that is an independent party would be the biggest difference. However, Judith said that it's like a marriage that can't go into a facilitated, mediated 3<sup>rd</sup> party counseling session without will to want to do it on both sides. Had JAPA been permitted to be part of the small group and participate in that conversation to come to a collective understanding... but the JAPA

representatives didn't know when they left the meeting, and neither did Laura when she set up the model, that the JAPA relationship would be one of the choices the board was working on.

Eva explained that the small group spent all its time on the joint meeting idea, which was not acceptable to JAPA.

Continuing discussion clarified that there was no small-group discussion of memorandums of agreement or a time frame for completing them.

Nancy clarified that she was not advocating for an expensive weekend meeting between the Boards — which might have been productive three or four years ago. But she would like to see some concrete goals. Laura suggested some specific steps be identified.

However, Darien raised a process point, that the board went to some effort to create a list of discussion items, but it includes no time limit guidelines. This session, that she thought was just going to be a report out, was merging into something much lengthier. She suggested that this new discussion item needs to be on the list with the other items so that the board members can express what they feel are the most pressing.

Laura suggested that the board might be ready to affirm the goal of creating a 3 year multi-strategy for fundraising and to affirm a goal to develop the ability to respond to time sensitive issues. We could wait on the other one [the JAPA relationship].

JAPA would not be expected to participate in the fundraising effort. However, Sandy noted that planned giving *is* a development [fund raising] strategy, and that was one of the things on the work plan that she and Judith were wondering what was happening with it.

**Decision to create a 3 year multi-strategy for fundraising as one of the board goals for the next 9 to 12 months, which means that those involved will support it through their actions and words.**

- **Darien, Robin, Marie-Louise, Joan, Barbara, Eva ,Laura, Catia — Yes**
- **Nancy, Judith — Stand aside**

Barbara asked if Ellen [who was involved and active in the small group discussions on the three designated priorities, but was not on the Board at this point] would be included in this consensus. Laura explained that this consensus is the Board affirming its goals.

As discussion continued, Ellen volunteered a resolution: She was standing aside on everything.

**Consensus reached with two (or three) standing aside.**

Board goal, for the next 9 to 12 months, to be able to respond to time sensitive issues, Laura asked for affirmation of that goal.

Eva wanted to get some ideas from people for establishing the contingency fund. All the people who agree to this proposal should be agreeing to help with ideas for the contingency fund to address rapid response to mobilize against a war. (This is independent from the reserve fund — which had also been discussed during this weekend.)

Eva stated that she would like to establish the contingency fund with Board cooperation and support.

Robin noted that there was previously an emergency response committee or something similar, and, tho' it no longer exists, we can refer back to the structure. Laura suggested that the prior experience is why this approach is different, to learn from that experience.

In the call for consensus [the language of the proposal was, apparently, written, and it is unclear what the actual proposal may have been; apparently the proposal was to approve a contingency fund with Board co-operation and approval].

**Robin, Marie-Louise, Joan, Barbara, Catia, Eva, Laura, and Ellen agreed. Darien and Sandy/Judith (for JAPA) stood aside. Consensus reached with two standing aside.**

**Laura proceeded to suggest that the board put dots up (to show prioritization) and, also, collect money for lunch.**

[Break for lunch]

**Discussion of the Race Street sale proceeds** (including whether they have to be used for housing WILPF).

Eva clarified that the proposal was to put some of those proceeds in CDs, use some of it, \$21,000 to complete our reserve account [for final payments of staff wages, in the event of WILPF US closing down], and put the rest into bequest savings.

Darien objected that this proposal was not about investing [which was the language in the agenda].

Eva noted that, with bequest savings, we can take a third of the funds out every year. However, the reserve account can be tapped and spent only when WILPF US is closing down, with no money left. The reserve account is enough to close the office and to pay the staff — not touched for anything else.

The question was raised as to whether the Finance Committee, rather than the full Board, should make this decision.

Laurie said that the funds are currently sitting in a Bank of America account (a savings acct called “the 1213 Proceeds account”) at the lowest interest rate possible. Since we’re about to take our money out of Bank of America and put somewhere more world friendly; this is a good opportunity to decide how we’re going to make the money work for us instead of just sitting there.

Joan volunteered to do vibes watching.

Eva explained that WILPF US is in the process of contacting LEF for the \$20,000 so that WILPF US can return that money [borrowed from the Race St. account for operating expenses] to the 1213 Race St. account. With that the fund is about \$174,000. The proposal is to put \$100,000 into a CD for between 2 and 5 years. Also, it is proposed to put \$27,000 into the last breath reserve fund, the operational reserve: \$27,000 because it’s about \$9,000 a month for 3 months. Laurie explained that right now the money in the operational reserve is just enough to cover Tanya’s and her salary.

Eva confirmed: it’s no longer the Race Street fund, because it has been determined that no Board has made a designation. Eva had heard that it was for housing WILPF, but no Board actually passed that.

Ellen reminded the group about the Site Committee: an ad hoc committee, appointed by the Board, chaired by Pat O’Brien, consisting of Ellen, Barbara Nielsen, Madeline Duckles, Laura, Darien, Robin Lloyd, Stacy Ferguson, Ellie Bluestein, and briefly, Barbara West, and later Libby Frank. They met in September 2008 until November 2009, working all that time thinking that the money, the proceeds of the sale of 1213 Race Street were to be used for a home for WILPF.

Eva reiterated that this was never passed by a Board, and that’s why someone looked at all the old Board meeting minutes.

Judith noted what might not be obvious: the Race Street proceeds money came through JAPA. Any money that comes through the JAPA is restricted to the 501(c)3 eligible uses. So housing isn’t 501(c)3, though, housing an organization doing educational work is.

Darien suggested that, because of that constraint on the funds, it’s great to invest it long term, but it should be invested in a separate account rather than comingled with unrestricted funds. Laurie responded that, although WILPF US has only one operational checking account, we keep accurate records in the office of which funds are restricted and spend them appropriately.

Judith reiterated that funds that come through JAPA need to be accounted for the eligible purpose.



Ellen explained that she also looked at the Board minutes, and all she could find was one in late in 2009 thanking the Site Committee for its report, but not approving it, and she hasn't found the report.

But she read the following aloud from the Site Committee minutes of 2008, September 9<sup>th</sup>: "Ellie Bluestein asked, what will happen to the money from the sale of the building? Laura Roskos: the building belongs to JAPA. We can request that they use the money to buy us a new building or whenever we, the Location Committee decides what's best for us. The money will be here for us. The original funding for the building was to JAPA to provide a home for us, for WILPF." That's all Ellen found.

Laura clarified that she needed to correct that misunderstanding, because she has since learned that was not the case.

**Laura reiterated the proposal on the table:**

**Proposal for Distribution of Proceeds from Sale of 1213 Race St.**

- Close the account of Bank of America that has held that money as a single sum,
- \$100,000 of it goes into a 2 year CD, or 18 months to 2 years, whatever interest is good,
- \$27, 000 into the reserve fund, that will make the reserve whole in terms of not just a salary reserve, but also an operating reserve, and
- the remainder, approximately \$47,000, (once the LEF money comes back) into the bequest savings fund where it will be restricted by the already existing bequest policy.

**Darien, Nancy, Joan, Barbara, Eva, Robin, Marie-Louise, Laura — affirm  
Judith/Sandy — stand aside**

**[Catia was not available for this decision point.] Consensus reached with one stand aside.**

**Authority to call Steering and Board Committee meetings,**

**Proposal:** "Steering meetings shall be convened by the President and our 4 steering members, and others by invitation. The person requesting the meeting would be the person requesting others to attend. Requests for a steering meeting should be e-mailed to the President. If no response, phone and follow-up with a second e-mail. If no response still, contact other members of the steering committee."

In discussion, the following wording was framed to be added to the proposal:

"The person requesting the meeting would be the person requesting others, pending approval of the Steering Committee."

Regarding a time frame, if still no response from the President, it was noted some items are more pressing than others.

Several people had questions about the fact that the full Board is not automatically invited to Steering Comm. meetings, even just to listen in. Because the other board members don't get minutes quickly, the entire Board is not always informed of things that might be helpful for them to know. It was noted that the Board did have agreements along those lines, which they haven't been able to honor. So a plan B could be a short informational e-mail sent, of the decisions, from, perhaps, the Treasurer or the President.

Laura noted that the proposed wording is the same wording that was adopted in the fall: other people will be invited on the Steering Committee call on a case by case basis, dependent on the agenda and the consent of the Steering Committee.

**In response to a question from Edith, it was reaffirmed that the Steering Committee minutes will always be made available to the full Board.**

Darien suggested to the Steering members that the content of the Steering Committee meetings is not so controversial as to prevent the release to the Board of "provisional minutes", with the understanding that

they have not been approved, and they should be treated highly confidentially. **This suggestion was rejected.**

Laura tested for consensus on the proposal:

Yes — Laura, Eva, and [unclear] another board member

Standing aside — Darien with this reservations: unhappy with excluding the full Board from the Steering meetings. A second person [unclear who, in the transcript] stood aside with the same reservation, and so did Catia, Barbara, and [unclear] perhaps another board member.

**No consensus reached.**

In response to the mixed response, Laura suggested a discussion about whether the Steering Committee should even exist, based on questioning the validity of the concept of the Steering Committee, which is in our Bylaws.

Laura restated that the Board agreed last fall that Steering Committee would invite other people on the Board on a meeting by meeting basis. After brief discussion, a **shortened proposal** was framed:

**“The Steering meetings shall be convened by the President. Requests for Steering meetings should be e-mailed to the President, if no response, phone and follow-up with a second e-mail. If no response still, contact other members of the Steering Committee. If urgent, please call the President.”**

**Call for consensus —**

**Eva, Barbara, Darien, Nancy, Judith/Sandy, Joan, Robin, Marie-Louise, Catia, Laura — yes.**

**Consensus reached.**

There was a second proposal about general or informational meetings, and it would be the same process. The general informational meetings are not Board meetings. They are meetings of Board members for general and informational purposes.

Darien noted that this proposal gets us into a slippery area, because if there’s going to be substantive discussion — even though there can’t be decisions unless the Board meets — such meetings probably should be open to the general members. The board hasn’t talked about how that might be handled.

However, it was pointed out that the board was, here, trying to establish who calls such meetings.

Darien noted examples of such meetings-- of the Board, but not Board meetings. The board doesn’t have to figure it out right now, but it hasn’t addressed who might attend those meetings other than Board members. Darien suggested a proposal, for such meetings, very much like the one just passed.

This idea was rejected. Lots of discussion followed, touching upon the circumstances under which the President might reject such a request. Nancy noted how, in December, there were three meetings once a month for all the Board, or all membership — a huge number of meetings requested. She supported a more collective process, so that the board would not be too busy — that the President could confer with the rest of the Board and make it a consensus decision. The Board should grant authority to the President to be able to make judgments about what’s a reasonable burden on the Board and what priorities of the Board to be addressed. Or it can be more of a collective process where you have a vote, and the Board members would say, yes we want this meeting, or no we don’t.

After further discussion back and forth, Darien proposed a second version of the proposal, like the one on Steering meetings, but addressing "general informational meetings of the Board that are not Board meetings" and that they shall be convened by the President. Requests for general informational meetings of the Board that are not Board meetings should be e-mailed to the President... [etc., paralleling the prior proposal].

**No consensus reached.**

However, the time for this item was exhausted. Laura noted that the question came up, what if all these meeting requests cannot be accommodated within time frames that satisfy the requesters? She suggested we move on without addressing this proposal further, since the board had not suggested an answer for that question, and we had only 45 minutes left before checkout and other work outstanding.

It was suggested that the board can address these items at a Steering meeting and then bring a proposal forward via e-mail to the Board members.

### **Staggered Board terms Bylaws proposal.**

Darien pointed out that the Bylaws Comm. circulated the rationale for Staggered Terms proposal 60 days ago and it is essentially unchanged from earlier versions except to change "spring and fall" [board meetings] to "next regular meeting".

Darien reviewed the proposal made Saturday, to change the proposed yearly election cycle to 1 ½ year periods, instead. The Bylaws Committee considered that proposal, and decided that this would be even more confusing than having yearly elections, So Darien proposed that the board return to consideration of the yearly election proposal. Also, addressing the concern about the board elections being in every copy of *Peace and Freedom* — the election contents are going to require about the same number of pages in *Peace and Freedom*, whether they are every year and a half or every year. To make this a more predictable process for our members, to have the same process going on in the same months each year so that the members know what to expect, a yearly cycle is probably easier for people to cope with.

Questions arose:

- Are we going to have to find board candidates every year? Yes — as readily as we're going to find them every three years.
- Are the terms for three years? Yes — except during the time of transition.

Laura requested that the sentence about putting the ballots in *Peace and Freedom* be stricken from the Bylaw proposal. Several people were concerned about putting into the Bylaws something that institutionalizes the magazine, *Peace and Freedom*.

**The revised language for the proposal was to strike the wording under A3, the sentence, "Ballots are to be distributed in the fall *Peace and Freedom* and results are to be announced in the spring issue". Call for consensus —**

**Catia, Darien, Robin, Marie-Louise, Joan Barbara, Eva, and Laura — yes  
Sandy/Judith — standing aside, only because they represent JAPA concerns. However, they like the proposal. Nancy also stood aside.**

**Consensus reached with two standing aside.**

**Operational proposal: pros and cons** [concerning how the pros and cons of Bylaws proposals should be selected and presented to the membership].

Darien read the proposal: Members of the Board should review and if consensus can be reached take the position on proposed bylaws changes that are to come to an all member vote. Also a need for an online forum to obtain points of view pro and con on the members-only part of the website announced in eNews and on the website. Pros and cons should be published in *Peace and Freedom* with word limit and deadline determined by the "Peace and Freedom" editor, and written by an Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Board, or appointed by the Bylaw Committee. **[In discussion it was decided that the Ad Hoc Pro and Con committee would be appointed by the Bylaw committee.]** The Board agrees that the content of the language chosen by the Pros and Cons Committee shall not be changed beyond minor grammatical and spelling changes, by anyone without consent of the Pros and Cons Committee.

Laura said she would prefer to wait on the decision until when the Board has determined who is going to appoint the ad hoc pros and cons committee, because she thought it should be a subcommittee of the Bylaws Committee and didn't like the ambiguity. After discussion, at Laura's request, Darien crossed out "by the Board", since no one wanted the Board to make that appointment.

Eva agreed that the Board wants a way for members to see these pros and cons, and she doesn't object to it, but she'd like to stand aside.

It was noted that one Board member, Rita, was present; but she hadn't heard all of this

discussion. Laura announced that she will put the proposal on the Board list so that Rita can ask questions, and Laura will also explain what kind of decision this is.

**No consensus reached.**

### **National Director work plan:**

Darien reiterated her request that each Board member should update their job description, instead of Darien doing it with Tanya [as stated in the work plan]. Then Tanya and Darien can get together to see if they're all consistent and make sense as a whole, rather than Darien trying to describe what other Board members do.

Someone noted that this procedure also was attempted in the last Board term — that each Board member would write their own job description. But the Secretary, not the board members, did it. If it's in a Staff work plan to follow up with the members to obtain the job descriptions, it might actually get done.

Tanya said she liked Darien's response, but she thought that the Nominating Committee needs the information, and so Darien has a vested interest in obtaining the board position job descriptions.

Darien responded that she would have liked to have been approached in advance. Everybody who is a current officer got a job description, or will have a job description waiting for them at home, but everyone should update it.

Laura asked for any questions that might pose barriers to approving Tanya's work plan.

Darien offered a cautionary note about the risks of expanding coalition work: e.g., getting lost in coalitions or of getting time sucked out. Tanya agreed that this has been a bit of an issue. She has been struggling to pull all these pieces of information together.

Judith offered that JAPA is concerned about the work plan only to the extent that it impacts or involves the JAPA work.

Darien brought up that this work plan and the DO work plan have "practicum all over the place". The Board has not come to any agreement about the practicum and is awaiting reports, so she doesn't want this agreement to the work plan to be interpreted as an approval of the practicum.

**Laura accepted that as an addendum to the proposal. Laura called for approval and affirmation of the National Director's work plan, as submitted for the April Board meeting:**

**Catia, Darien, Robin, Marie Louise, Nancy, Joan, Sandy-Judith, Barbara, and Laura — yes. [Eva was out of the room.]**

**Consensus reached.**

### **Director of Operations (DO) work plan approval**

Darien asked about line 38, "Renew regular International operations conference calls." Laurie explained that, when she first started at WILPF US, there were regular monthly calls between the WILPF International Geneva staff, the WILPF International UNO office, Laurie's equivalent in Sweden, and US WILPF DO. When Angie Roska [UNO Director], who had been the convener of those calls, resigned — just a few months after Laurie started — those calls ceased. Laurie found them useful; they gave her a lot of background. They had started discussing making the SALSA database [which WILPF US uses] International, so that all sections were using the same standards to record membership.

It had been in Laurie's work plan last year to get them started again. It didn't happen, so Laurie put it in again this year, because she thought the new DO would find it very useful. Also she thinks there's huge opportunity there for synergy among sections.

Darien asked another question about who attends JAPA Board meetings. Laurie explained that job description has not been modified to reflect the addition of the National Director. When she was the only staff member, she went to the JAPA Board meetings, and for the sake of continuity she has continued going to them.

Darien noted that the DO job description may have been rewritten to account for the ND, in order

to do a job search. Darien noted that it's in Laurie's work plan, and may be it may not be in the future. Laurie suggested that she could revise it to "attends JAPA Board meetings as appropriate".

Darien also asked about Line 45, "purchase web cams and headphones for office computers to facilitate web access, Skype and conference calls". Did that also extend to other kinds of virtual meeting calls? Darien added that she had understood that Laurie was going to be researching virtual meetings, and she didn't see that reflected anywhere in this plan.

Laurie responded that she could add that line. She added that she, Tanya, and Laura did do some testing in January or February. They tested Go To Meeting, which was pretty much a failure: Laura was in Wisconsin, Tanya and Laurie in Boston, and they kept losing Laura. They thought it would be a disaster for trying to keep 16 people on the call, plus however many members, when they couldn't even keep three on the call. Skype also has a limited number of participants. She is happy to add a line that says, continue researching the possibility of virtual meetings, and change the language in 45 to say virtual meetings, instead of "and Skype".

Darien asked Laurie to confer with Ellen Schwartz, because she does have experience with virtual meetings.

She asked about Line 59, support planning and implementation of Board meetings, that Laurie had only the October and April checked, and Darien thinks it's more realistic to check a couple months prior because it's a long term process. It would help the DO to come to be aware that this is not something quick and easy.

Laurie agreed that she will change that, and she will add that to the Operations Manual she is writing. That is very fair: You need to start a couple months ahead of time.

Darien suggested that this may also apply to "arrange food and hospitality". Laurie noted that it depends on if the meeting is in Boston or elsewhere. If it's elsewhere, then hopefully, as in this case, the branch will take care of that, and it's not the DO's responsibility. If it's in Boston, it has been a DO responsibility.

Darien added that she think the branches may need more help if they are ever going to consider hosting meetings again. **Nancy volunteered that she had written a document for Deb Garrison, but forgot to include it in the Board book or to send it to Pittsburgh. It's a beginning guide to the hosting branch.**

It could help the future host branch if the DO could send them such a checklist.

Laurie noted that when the Board meeting is in Boston, it's pretty much 100%, the DO doing everything, and it's overwhelming. She doesn't think it's fair to call on the Boston branch time after time after time. That's something to think about for the future — about how that workload, which is pretty grinding can be more equitably shared. If you're having one meeting per year in Boston, it's not fair to repeatedly ask the branch.

Darien concluded by noting that for the line about Support Design Issue Committee brochure, there's no month checked for when to do it. Laurie responded that, when WILPF gets the money for it, she'll put the month in.

**Laurie added all the things that were agreed to add, and Laura asked that the DO's work plan, as submitted and revised during this session's Board meeting, be affirmed and approved. All board members approved. Consensus reached.**

[A 5 minute break, preceded development discussion and checkout. Sandy and Joan departed.]

Tanya and others appreciated the level of thought and attention that went into the work of the Bylaws Committee.

Darien suggested that there should be evaluation of this board meeting.

Laura suggested that the board should do development on the first day of the meeting; several agreed.

The board thanked Edith and the Pittsburgh branch warmly for their support of the board meeting. Laura acknowledged Edith not only as a political inspiration, but also as a model caretaker.

Laura asked for consent for the Steering Committee to have an open Steering Committee meeting within two weeks, to really digest and examine the report from the Local to Global program, recently sent out, sans the financial info.

She added that the Local to Global financials have been done, and they were able to retain a 20% operating margin, to go back into our operating budget. The income for that program was \$15,000, the budget at \$14,590, and expenditures a little more than that \$14,691. So WILPF US keeps both the 20% overhead and about \$309 leftover beyond that.

She added that there are some important questions about how Local to Global (L2G) fits into WILPF's mission, and ongoing operations, meriting time for further conversation.

Laura agreed to schedule for the weekend after for the JAPA Board meeting. It will be a Steering Committee call that is open to all Board members and staff.

Laura asked the board to affirm not only its responsibility to raise money for WILPF, but also its ability to do so. Robin reported that the board member average was nearly \$6,500, counting, for example, Robin getting a grant of \$15,000. The total raised is \$72,900. Laura reminded the board that, collectively, they were expected to raise \$55,000, and they succeeded in raising more, when it is not even a whole year.

Subsequent discussion noted that this total did not include grants or the funding that staff pursued, nor is it funding that came to us because people heard about WILPF vaguely. It is funds the board directly made the connection for: 20% of our operating budget for last year.

Laura presented a worksheet to help board members think about what they are going to do in the coming 12 months to contribute to WILPF's wellbeing, including each one's personal commitment, which is really dependent on where individuals are in their lives, what they can do.

The second thing is what can each board member do to develop new donors. Members can provide a list of prospects to the National Director (ND) and the Development Committee Chair, Robin, who can work with them on how to invite these prospects to support our work. Robin and the ND can coach board members in how to do an ASK that will be effective, and think about what's the appropriate amount to ask for.

Board members should think about setting a financial goal for what they can do by providing prospects to WILPF. They also can participate in major donor fundraising by serving as a contact or making an ASK, including to do this with prospects that are identified by Robin or by Tanya, as people who can give major gifts. Members can be the one to go with Robin and Tanya to do the pitch, or they can be the person to cultivate that relationship.

Members should let Tanya and Robin know how much is it that they want to be responsible for bringing in, setting a reasonable but challenging goal: Make a presentation at your place of employment, or an association that you belong to, to raise money. Host a house party, or invite a friend to host a house party to raise money. Solicit a sponsor for an event. Arrange a donor meeting with an individual, a responsible corporation, a foundation, or an agency that you have a connection with. Say, "I think these people might be able to give to WILPF, but Tanya or Robin, I really need you to come with me, and for you to make the ASK, because I'm the connector."

Board members can ask for help in upgrading your skills, but it's pretty easy, and really fun once one has the courage to do it. Members can agree to make thank you calls to get you used to relating to donors and supporters. And there are probably some other ways to raise money, so put them on the table now, because they might be useful to someone.

### **Board Member Responsibility for Fundraising and Approaches to That Role**

Robin took this opportunity to explain about the L2G donor and who it was that talked to Robin about her. Rose, a Milwaukee WILPF member, has been in touch with this woman for grants and help for Milwaukee WILPF and their projects. She realized that she was maybe introducing WILPF US to this woman, and, therefore there would be a cutback in the amount of money given to Milwaukee. That might be true of a lot of people whom WILPFers might have approached to give locally to WILPF, but who also have the potential to give to WILPF US. Robin said she thinks donors like to be upgraded in a way and asked to do more for bigger projects.

We were reminded to be aware as Board members of our responsibility to communicate the connections with our national programs and cultivate new donors. Think about each person as a possible donor, find out about what issues they are working on, whether they have friends that want to be members, and whether this is somebody that can really contribute to WILPF — contribute financially, contribute resources, have friends of circles where we can engage more funding.

Laura pointed out that the Advancing Women as Peacemakers project in 2009 was the opportunity to learn with Robin how to do a major donor ASK — how to prepare for it, and how to get comfortable with it.

Further discussion addressed the way many of the board members may *think* they don't know potential major donors. But they should think more carefully about the people they know at church, in the neighborhood.

Nancy encouraged people to read Kim Klein, her fundraising stuff; it's fun to read. There could be donations of different kinds, such as of time. Often we make mistaken assumptions about possible donors. Beware of contributing to a negative atmosphere, how we speak to each other, in front of a new member; that potential donor may have just disappeared.

Marie-Louise mentioned her interest in visiting a particular donor, to learn why she gives, and get some training. Also, WILPF US has a wonderful thing to give to people, the 1325 report. This is what we've accomplished — not making the actual ASK right then, but opening them up for being more generous next time.

Laura agreed that such connections with major donors are all about relationship building and maintaining those relationships.

Board members will receive an email reminder to complete their commitment statement.

#### Check Out

Minutes by Barbara Reed, Summary by Darien De Lu

THE END

Final summary by Ellen Schwartz and Catia Celia Confortini