

WILPF U.S. National Board Meeting

4/16/10-4/18/10; Boston, MA

Friday, April 16

Meeting Called to Order at 12:15 pm

In Attendance

Board members: Audley Green (US Representative to the IB)
 Ellen Schwartz (Treasurer)
 Laura Roskos (Co-President)
 Pat O'Brien (Chair of the Nominating Committee)
 Carol Urner (Program Co-Chair)
 Deborah Garretson (Secretary)*
 Nancy Munger (Co-President)
 Georgia Pinkel (Program Co-Chair)
 Sandra Junier (JAPA Board, Cape Cod Branch)
 Mary Zepernick (Personnel Chair)

Staff: Laurie Belton (Director of Operations)
 Linda Belle (Executive Director of JAPA)
 Sydney Gliserman (Administrative Intern)

Member guests: Joan Ecklein (Boston Branch)
 Robin Lloyd (Acting Development Co-chair, Burlington Branch)

*Note: Deborah Garretson calling into the meeting on speakerphone throughout the weekend.

Check-In Question: In your perfect WILPF world, what would your duties and responsibilities consist of?

1. WILPF International Report (Audley Green) 12:40 pm

Audley read from her written report, noting that it was not Anjie who left her position in December but Sam Cook. Madeline Rees will be taking the Secretary General position. She referred to a list of decisions that were made at the IB meeting in India. Robin noted that Audley did not go to India, and perhaps we should hear from those who did (Laura and Nancy). Laura and Nancy described their trip in the co-presidents' report, and in the forthcoming issue of *Peace and Freedom*, which is now on the website. At the IB meeting, they were asked spontaneously to discuss the Practicum program as a promising practice; Laura participated in meetings of the standing finance committee. She noted that prize money has suddenly become much more significant, often sponsored by cosmetics companies. Some prizes are appropriate for WILPF, some are not and volunteers agreed to look into applying for some prizes that are appropriate. WILPF U.S. agreed to circulate a fundraising letter, prepared by the International Presidents, around WILPF's birthday, April 28th. Nancy participated in a street protest regarding land reform, which is discussed in *Peace and Freedom*. A further protest action in February was peaceful but 1,500 people were detained by the Indian government.

WILPF will be running an international campaign from now through 2015, with the working title of Changing Every Nations Thinking About Security (CENTS). A PowerPoint on this campaign was shown at the IB meeting and again to WILPF members attending the Commission on the Status of Women meetings in New York. Carol asked if she could have a copy of the presentation. Audley is going to do a fundraiser at her home for international WILPF this summer. Carol wanted to refer everyone to the fourth paragraph of Audley's written report about NGO's being able, for the first time, to address the Conference on Disarmament. Women were allowed to speak in this forum, because Obama changed protocol. Laura was interested in Carol's story about U.S.'s change of behavior at the First Committee, and asked if it would be appropriate to write to Obama to note that we appreciate the change. Mary asked if the acknowledgement could go in WILPF e-news. Laura said that this would be good publicity.

Linda noted Ray Acheson created the book *Beyond Arms Control* and that she had brought copies with her; the cost is \$10 a copy if anyone wants to buy one. Joan reported that Boston WILPF is having a discussion about the book next week.

Laura asked if those present knew any members interested in issues of food sovereignty *and* fluent in Spanish, who might be willing to serve on the International Congress Planning Committee.

2. JAPA Report (Sandra) 12:59 pm

Sandra noted that Sandy Silver, Acting President of JAPA, had submitted a written report. She reported that the 1213 Race Street building has been sold. Linda said that the selling price was \$540,000.00—check received at closing was for \$500,007.00 after fees. Joan asked how the amount compared with what we were expecting. Linda recalled that we discussed selling the building for \$900,000.00, however this was before the financial collapse. Laura noted we may want to set restrictions on how we can spend our share of the proceeds. Ellen said she heard that the money to buy the Race Street building was given to buy a home for WILPF, and that there is the question as to if we can use the money for anything else. Are we obligated to preserve the grown proceeds or the original gift? Linda stated that there is no written documentation from the time of the gift regarding restrictions on its immediate or future uses. Robin said that if there is no documentation, there is no responsibility. Carol said we should consult a lawyer. Ellen said that we should remain true to the wishes of the donor, so future donors will have confidence in WILPF. Nancy said that the history is not well documented and mostly word of mouth.

Sandra noted that the planned giving project undertaken by the JAPA board is going very well. Women's personal stories of WILPF are being filmed. On May 1st, Ellen, Marjorie Boehm, and Joyce McLean are being interviewed. The DVD and supporting brochure should be finished by September. Sandra said that all branches should at least see it. Laura asked about the language that will be used regarding use of planned gifts made to JAPA, noting that WILPF only gets a percentage of undesignated gifts to JAPA. Forty

percent of undesignated gifts go to JAPA, not WILPF, and she doesn't think that this is clear in the language used on JAPA's website. Linda said that this formula was made because JAPA staff made the effort, and WILPF US board agreed to this. Laura thinks that the language should say that money will go to support JAPA and WILPF. Sandra noted that donors would be advised by lawyers to donate to JAPA because it is tax deductible. Laura thinks that the language regarding the final use and destination of bequests and other instruments given to JAPA should be clarified if we are going to put a lot of resources into promoting planned giving among WILPF members. Ellen said that the more you explain, the more complicated things often become. Ellen noted that this is not clear on the membership inserts as well. Sydney noted that this is an issue within a lot of WILPF literature, and we should clarify the language/distinction between JAPA and WILPF donations. Linda said that JAPA money is going to the planned giving project, not WILPF money, and that JAPA getting part of the money raised is fair. Pat said that the money to pay for the planned giving project, DVD and brochure came from WILPF members' donations. Linda said that JAPA is designed to support the work of WILPF. Pat asked if JAPA is open to a language change. Linda said that because they are the 501C3 for international and US WILPF, money gets divided.

Ellen noted that we should resolve this before tensions increase. Georgia said that planned giving language on the DVD and literature should be discussed and clarified by the Development Committees of both boards. Joan said that the literature has never been clear about how to give money to WILPF International. Laura said she would like to see some timelines regarding the clarification of planned giving language.

Outcome: Planned giving campaign language, including that appearing on the JAPA website, the new video, and all printed material, to be clarified by WILPF development committee and both boards. Development committee should prepare recommendations for presentation at the May 10 JAPA board meeting. (4/16/10.)

Sandra said that members of the WILPF board should come to the next Jane Addams Book Awards ceremony. Harriet Alonso, an expert on Jane Addams, has agreed to speak at that event in NYC on the third Friday in October, 2010. Sandra praised *The Shepherd's Granddaughter*, one of the 2009 award winners, and said that we should try to donate books to libraries and individuals. Linda noted that there is discussion of whether the book is anti-Semitic, and it has been pulled off reading lists in some areas. Laura said she would like to see an article about the controversy surrounding this book in the next issue of *Peace and Freedom*.

3. Co-President's Report (Nancy Munger and Laura Roskos) 1:28 pm

Laura said she'd like the discussion to focus on the WILPF organizational chart, board travel report form (board travel fund), and Committee Best Practices and why we have them. Robin said she was confused about the use of the word ageism in the co-presidents' report and asked if that could fit into other discussions. Ageism doesn't just mean discrimination against older people, but also discrimination against anyone because of their age. Linda asked if Laura and Nancy feel that they have been treated unfairly

because of their relatively young age. Mary said that she was 43 when she joined WILPF, and that she became aware at her first board meeting that she had different relationships with people within WILPF. Nancy said that the report notes ageism because of discussions she has had with members who are concerned that we are an aging organization. Nancy noted that several members have talked to her about ageism against younger people in WILPF. Ellen said that she was 26 when she joined WILPF and that she was treated with respect, but this is different among different branches. She also said that there is a difference between people who have been in WILPF for a long time and those who have not in terms of both their attitudes and their treatment. Laura brought up the tendency to give boring technical jobs to younger people, and said that we should be committed to bringing in younger people. She reminded us that at the fall board meeting, we will have to make some decisions around the future of the Y-WILPF board seats, and more generally how we will involve younger women in the transition to the next Board.

Pat brought up defensive and mistrustful attitudes of some members, noting that this has been going on for a long time. She thinks that a lot of this doesn't have to do with ageism per se, but rather resistance to the changes that the last two Boards have implemented. Pat said that WILPF has withstood a lot, but that this resistance to change may destroy the organization. Joan reported that she has heard people who are thrilled that WILPF is trying to bring in younger people. Laura said that this is clearly a hot topic, and should be discussed through the weekend.

We began to discuss the WILPF organizational chart. Nancy said that this version is not much different from the one presented last fall. Ellen asked about the membership clouds; she thinks they look like thought bubbles. Linda asked where the next new hire would potentially go on this chart. Nancy said that she should go next to the Director of Operations. Linda asked who would supervise the next hire. Nancy said the co-presidents. Pat asked about the Personnel Committee's support function. Laura said that new hire and the Director of Operations would be accountable to each other, and that supervising two, rather than one, wouldn't increase the workload for the president(s). In fact, because the new hire would supervise communications contract employees, it could mean less work for her personally. Ellen asked who used to supervise the ED in the past? Nancy said that lack of accountability was an on-going problem. Ellen noted that the arrow flowing from the Director of Operations to policy should be reversed (or say implemented by). Robin said that the International Board should be more present in the diagram. Nancy said that we should note that the chart is not to scale, and that this is an attempt to visually represent how WILPF U.S. works, which is why International and JAPA are not present.

Outcome: Organization chart should be revised as per our discussion a.s.a.p. so that it can be distributed to the Program Committee and other groups comprised of WILPF members. (4/16/10)

Laura said that money had been given by an anonymous donor for the previous presidents (Morin, James) to travel to different branches; later this gift was interpreted as supporting travel by any board member to meet with WILPF branches. Laura asked if this fund

could be re-created when resources permit. Georgia said that she liked this idea, and that this fund should be for use by the entire board. She also suggested that the location of board meetings should change regularly. This could also give membership a chance to see the board. Ellen said that technology can be very useful, and that substituting video conferencing for a board meeting once a year could free up resources for a travel fund. Georgia said that we should put a line for president's travel on the budget, perhaps \$2,000.00. Linda noted that we are already committed to another board meeting this year in Bloomington. Georgia said that she would like the board to meet in Portland, where there is a hostel that members could stay at. Linda said that it is cost effective to meet in Boston because so many members live near Boston, and said we could wait to see how the budget is in October before planning on a different location for spring 2011.

Outcome: Georgia will prepare a financial projection for holding the spring 2011 board meeting in Portland, OR, for the Finance Committee to review by August and identify potential dates for such a meeting. Decision on whether or not to meet in Portland will be taken at the fall 2010 meeting, upon recommendation from Finance Committee. (4/18/10)

Ellen said she would like to try committee meetings by video conference. Nancy agreed that we should begin by experimenting on smaller committees.

Nancy presented a document outlining best practices for WILPF committees; she would like board approval on this before it is shared with the membership. Linda said that she would like to add a clause that members not in attendance at a particular meeting cannot block decisions made without their approval. Nancy said that this document is more of an overview. Ellen said that this is not necessarily part of this document. Nancy said that committees must decide what constitutes a quorum for their particular committee, as well as rules about how meetings are set and invitations issued. Linda agreed that this needs to be clarified. Laura said that committees can deliberately undermine the process while following current rules. Nancy asked if Laura meant that we should reference the document on how to do consensus (currently in the Board Book) or create something new. Pat thinks that committees should reopen discussions if committee members who were not present request it. Nancy said that we should update the consensus document. Carol suggested that Mary take this on. Ellen agreed to scan and distribute the consensus document currently in use and this will be appended to the "best practices" document before distribution.

Joan left the Room at 2:29 pm

Policy Decision: "Committee Best Practices" document accepted as prepared by Nancy, and may be distributed to committees after the accompanying document on consensus process is ready. This document will be reviewed and evaluated at the spring 2011 board meeting, after a year of committee use. (Consensus, no stand asides, 4/16/10)

Break 2:30 – 3:00 pm

*Robin left the room at 2:30pm

4. Director of Operations Report (Laurie) 3:04 pm

Laurie discussed our office location. Our lease is up in 6 weeks. There are challenges and risks to continuing to operate in the CCB building. Electrical outlets do not work, the fire alarm goes off frequently and unnecessarily. Security is not very good; the church keeps the door open. Checks donated to WILPF have been stolen, changed, and cashed for larger sums. Laurie has filed a report to the Boston Police and post offices. Laurie has been assured that the church is planning to have locked mailboxes in the future; however, there are no deadlines for that or any other improvements/repairs. The church appears to be having some financial issues. Laurie is not advocating a move, but she wants the board to discuss the options. The building location is great, and Laurie is planning on starting building-wide activities, such as a re-cycling program, to build community among the tenant organizations. If we choose to stay in the building, we must take steps to manage the risks. Ellen asked how much we are paying in rent, Laurie answered \$900.00 a month for the two offices, and we pay telephone bills. Carol asked if we can put up our own mailbox in the interim. Laurie said we have lost about \$400.00 in stolen checks that we know about, but the real worry comes because we don't know about mail we don't receive. Nancy asked Laurie if she had asked Jason if we could just pay for our own mailbox, or buy mailboxes for all tenants as a loan to CCB. She also asked Laurie to prioritize the issues. Laurie said that the mailbox idea goes to the top of the priority list, and that buying all the mailboxes would be well received. Laurie said that the fire alarm system is the next highest priority, then electrical outlets. Deb said that we need to recognize that we are going to get \$200,000 from sale of Race Street and we could be considering alternative office space.

Mary asked how long we have to renew. Laurie said that she does not know if the lease is negotiable, and that she does not know the history of the Site Committee. Ellen said that she has served on the Site Committee, and Boston was supposed to be a temporary location. Perhaps, it was suggested, we could loan the church money for renovations in exchange for the use of the front part of the second floor. Linda asked what conditions Laurie needed to have met in order to continue to work for WILPF. Laurie said that this was irrelevant, because her concerns were for the security and continuity of WILPF's operations. To address those, she would like to see a written timeline from the church regarding renovations. Laura mentioned that Third Sector New England has a building that houses a lot of smaller non-profits closer to South Station. Laurie said that this would be a good option should we choose to leave. Georgia suggested that asking for a 3-month lease extension from the church would be a good idea. Ellen agreed to the 3-month extension idea, and said that we should push for a new fire alarm/sprinkler system, as well as new mailboxes. Nancy asked about the front door lock. Laurie explained that the lock broke a long time ago and they did not fulfill their promise to fix the lock. The church is committed to access. Pat noted that we are paying for an extra storage space in the church for documents that need to be scanned and asked, if we got the documents scanned, could we eliminate the need for this space? Nancy proposed that the Site Committee be reconvened to discuss these issues.

Georgia wanted to discuss the use of virtual offices. Linda said that Finance, Personnel, and Site Committees should all be involved in coming to any resolution. We are going to revisit these issues at the part of this board meeting on Sunday.

Outcome: Laurie will approach CCB about installing a secure mailbox, offering to lend the money to the church if necessary. Laurie will negotiate with CCB re: door lock, fire alarm repair, sprinklers, etc. and a three month extension to our current lease with a firm timeline for all repairs. Laurie will price alternative offices, in particular “incubator” arrangements with Third Sector New England and UUSC. Laurie will negotiate a Directors and Officers Insurance policy a.s.a.p. (4/16/10)

Laura said we need a communication plan for informing members and donors about the stolen and “washed” checks. Mary replied that she does not think that we should tell members, but if they ask, we can explain it. Ellen said that we should get secure mailboxes to show that we have solved the problem. Nancy said that she was concerned that she does not know how many checks this has happened to. Laura stated that the next quarterly e-letter to the membership would go out in June and the check situation could be explained at that time. Laurie said that she feels we should be pro-active in our communications. Ellen said that we could/should warn members, and perhaps look into ink that cannot be washed off checks.

Operational Decision: Information about the thefts will be shared with the WILPF membership in an e-letter from the board after the secure mailboxes have been installed. (Consensus reached, Mary Zepernick stood aside, 4/16/10)

5. WILPF's Corporate Structure (Laura) 3:55 pm

Laura reminded us that at the November board meeting, the practice of using JAPA as a “bank” to hold our bequest money for an extended time was questioned. Later, a board member raised the question of whether or not WILPF should become a 501c3 rather than 501c4 organization so that it could directly receive tax deductible donations. She said that this option had been explored by the “Resources: From Scarcity to Abundance” task group during strategic planning in 2007. In reviewing documents from strategic planning and checking back in with Ellen Murtha, convener of that task group, she found that this option was not actually rejected by the task group or the whole group, but rather set aside for later consideration in the face of other changes that seemed more pressing at that time. She explained that this is the context for revisiting the question now. In the discussion that followed, it was determined that WILPF does not expend more than 20% of its resources on direct lobbying, so it would not need to change its program in order to comply with the regulations allowable for 501c3 organizations. If there are no legal barriers, are there any clear advantages? Nancy said that it seemed like too much trouble in 2007. Laura brought Alliance for Justice pamphlets to the board meeting. The pamphlet discusses what a 501c3 status means. Carol thinks that we should go ahead and become a 501c3. Laura said that right now we are a c4, which means that donors giving directly to WILPF cannot enjoy tax advantages and that we need to pay sales tax. Ellen said that we should find out more about legalities. She pointed out that some donors

prefer to give to JAPA because they perceive that WILPF's elected board will spend their donation on current program needs and campaigns rather than thinking about long term survival. Sydney asked how the role of JAPA would change, should WILPF become a 501c3. Laurie said that money could go to both JAPA and WILPF. Linda asked why people would give to both, and said that JAPA would probably cease to be should WILPF become a 501c3. Linda also brought up the annuity program, and said that the decision of WILPF becoming a 501c3 is much bigger than the current operating budget of WILPF. Ellen said that we would have to manage all the kinds of accounts currently held by JAPA (annuities, restricted funds such as the Kay Camp and Jones funds, branch accounts), so administrative work would increase. Laura asked who has access to branch account information now. Linda said that she does, as well as the auditor.

Sydney asked why JAPA exists, and why could WILPF not be a 501c3 previously? Pat said that this is a big issue, involving political history and changes in the tax code, and that there will always be a reason for JAPA to exist (ex. book awards, etc.). Laura wanted to redirect the discussion to the advantages and disadvantages of WILPF becoming a 501c3. Laurie suggested that we should just weigh the benefits and negatives of changing, and that JAPA's future is a different discussion. Carol said that she probably does the most with legislative lobbying, and that we could do a tremendous amount more without transgressing the restrictions on 501c3 organizations. She said that we could have a person to do lobbying in Washington who could also coordinate lobbying in branch locations. Nancy said that she would like to investigate the options, and perhaps have the same board of directors oversee both WILPF and JAPA.

Pat said that if WILPF were a 501c3 the process of applying for foundation grants would be easier; we could apply directly. Laura noted that the DIA system only serves 501c3's, and that DIA took WILPF on as a special case. Sandra said she has been on the JAPA board for 5 years, and that it is very open to new directions. She asked where we are in this process. Ellen said that she is afraid that people would not give their money to WILPF as freely as they give it to JAPA. Ellen would like to ask JAPA to try and take the H option, which requires it to quantify the percentage of expenditures related to direct lobbying, if possible. Whose role is it to track donated funds? Laurie thinks that it is the accountant and the DO's responsibility. Ellen thinks that it is the treasurer's. Carol proposes that we begin investigation. Would volunteer time be tax-deductible?

Outcome: WILPF will ask JAPA to explore whether it can take the (h) option in preparing its federal tax return. (4/16/10)

Operational Decision: An ad hoc committee consisting of Nancy Munger, Laura Roskos, Ellen Schwartz, and Carol Urner is established to do an investigation of and prepare a cost/benefit analysis (including on-line fundraising through DIA) of WILPF's re-incorporating as a 501c3 for discussion at the fall 2010 board meeting. (Consensus reached 4/18/10. Robin Lloyd stood aside.)

Break 4:49 – 5:03 pm

6. *WILPF's Next Hire (Mary) 5:03 pm*

The Personnel Committee report recounts the search and hiring process undertaken to fill the position of D.O. Mary acknowledged how proud the committee is to have chosen a new DO. The Personnel Committee has worked well, but has a lot of work; they are interested in adding a member to the committee. Georgia asked about item E, under number 7 of the report, and said that she objects to background checks. Mary explained that any prior arrests could be civil disobedience. Laura said that this would be discussed in executive session.

Mary said that we should address the job description for a National Director, who will be hired when funds allow. There is a job description in the report from the Personnel Committee. Mary said that we should have 2 years salary on hand when we hire someone. Nancy asked if we agree that this is a common goal to work towards. If so, we should focus on where we can get the money.

Mary asked some specific questions focused on the National Director's job description: How do you see the national director interacting with members and committees on content? How can we develop program direction? Linda said that it takes different types of people to succeed with fundraising and program, and asked if it is realistic to think we could find this in one person? Mary said that the division of responsibilities between the D.O. and the N.D. was developed before this board, during strategic planning. Laura said that the National Director would translate between committees and development. Nancy said that this person should be able to write grants, and coordinate with branches and the UN. This kind of oversight and coordination is necessary. Nancy doesn't think that fundraising and program skills are so different, they are interwoven.

Mary said that suggestions for improving the N.D. job description should go to the Personnel Committee and revisions will be made. Laura said she sees the D.O. as internal communications person, while N.D. would be external communications person. Pat said that expertise and credibility in the areas of program content are extremely important for this job. Laurie said that this person needs external charisma. Linda asked if Laurie would be involved in interviews. Laurie was told she would be involved at her interview. Mary asked how the N.D. would collaborate with committees. Nancy noted that a lot of WILPF members are ambivalent about national leadership. Laura thinks that we should add "developing new WILPF leaders" to the job description; the ND would not work with brand new members, but those that show initiative, working to involve and help them develop further. Mary asked what the new hire's role would be in determining political action and goals. Laura confirmed that the next step would be for the Personnel Committee to take these notes and revise the description. Pat thinks that we should look around at other successful organizations; these are the people that we should be looking to recruit. Laura said that the person should have background/expertise in at least two of our issue areas. She also thinks we should figure out how this hire would interact with the WILPF structure as an international organization. Ellen would like to know how much money we have/would like to have to hire someone; how much of the current balance in our accounts is earmarked? Mary asked if Ellen is discussing discretionary money. Ellen

said yes, she would like to clarify what money is available and asked if we could start a reserve fund to save up for a new hire. Mary asked if this is something to discuss on the Finance Committee.

Linda is concerned about the use of the word “goal” in the statement from the Personnel Committee about the goal for hire in calendar year 2010.

Meeting session adjourned 6:05

4/17/10

7. *Executive Session Called to Order 9:00 am*

Board members in Attendance: Ellen Schwartz (Treasurer), Laura Roskos (Co-President), Pat O’Brien (Nominating Committee Chair, Acting Development Co-chair), Carol Urner (Program Co-chair), Nancy Munger (Co-President), Georgia Pinkel (Program Co-chair), Sandra Junier (JAPA representative), Mary Zepernick (Personnel Chair), Audley Green (IB Representative)

Operational Decision: The board will invite Robin Lloyd to fill the vacant seat of Chair of Development Committee. (Consensus, 4/17/10, no stand asides)

Outcome: Treasurer will share the monthly JAPA spreadsheet with donor information with Development chair. (4/17/10))

Outcome: WILPF Finance Committee will develop a policy about what sort and under what conditions WILPF (or JAPA on WILPF’s behalf) can accept earmarked donations and ensure that procedures for tracking earmarked gifts are in place. (4/17/10)

Outcome : Co-presidents will incorporate outstanding items from Development co-chairs memo into their report to the JAPA board and circulate a draft of this report to the WILPF board for review and comment by April 25. (4/17/10)

Regular Session Called to Order 10:55 am

In Attendance

Board members: Audley Green (US Representative to the IB)
 Ellen Schwartz (Treasurer)
 Laura Roskos (Co-President)
 Pat O’Brien (Chair of the Nominating Committee)
 Carol Urner (Program Co-Chair)
 Deborah Garretson (Secretary)
 Nancy Munger (Co-President)
 Georgia Pinkel (Program Co-Chair)
 Sandra Junier (JAPA Board, Cape Cod Branch)
 Mary Zepernick (Personnel Chair)

Staff: Laurie Belton (Director of Operations)
Linda Belle (Executive Director of JAPA)*
Sydney Gliserman (Administrative Intern)
Member guests: Robin Lloyd (Acting Development Co-chair, Burlington Branch)
* after 12:25 p.m.

8. *Internal Racism Workshop (Pat) 10:55 am*

Pat brought a letter submitted by the Missoula Branch for publication in *Peace and Freedom*. Like some of the materials created by our Corps v. Democracy committee, this letter asks other WILPF groups to join in a call for a “We the People Movement.” “Articles of Freedom” published on the website of the We the People Foundation, and referenced in the Spring 2010 issue of the Southern Poverty Law Center’s *Intelligence Report*, “Rage on the Right.” She noted that while the “Articles of Freedom” begin by criticizing corporate welfare, a familiar WILPF slogan, they end by calling for stricter border controls and by stating that President Obama is not a “natural born” U.S. citizen, a familiar racist claim made by members of the Tea Party and others. Pat thought it would be helpful to discuss potential racist readings or interpretations of our program and materials. The Articles of Freedom document that Pat brought is anti-war; would we like to extend an olive branch to the Tea Partiers because we agree with their anti-war sentiments? Ellen said that the first three points of the Articles of Freedom document she can agree with, but that the other points are disturbing. Mary asked about the purpose of this workshop, and if this was about our interaction with Tea Parties. Pat said that the purpose is to look at issues and language we have that are similar to that of the Tea Parties. We should extend the olive branch, but not ally ourselves with something that is racist. Nancy said we should discuss interaction, and brought up a letter to the editor of the *Boston Globe* that described members of the Tea Parties as “the real people”. She asked who the “unreal” people are, and has been thinking about the phrase “we the people” as a sign of exclusion rather than inclusion. Nancy asked how other races would relate to this statement, and if we should avoid this phrase. Carol thinks we should overcome hate with love, as opposed to fighting hate. She said this is at the core of all major religions, and people like Gandhi acted in this way. Carol said that this is also how Jane Addams worked.

Laura wanted to go deeper in our discussion of the use of “we the people.” She recalled that at the issue committee retreat, when they looked at the branch reports it came to light that there was a branch whose Building the Beloved Community/Anti-Racist work was reported as “adopting a poor family for the holidays,” Members of the BBC committee were shocked at this misunderstanding of WILPF’s program for addressing racial injustice. We need to address these differences in understanding among our membership. Robin said that at the issue committee retreat she was impressed with Mary Bricker Jenkins’s description of the Poor People’s Economic Human Rights Campaign’s walk from New Orleans to Detroit. She asked if this was a response to the Tea Party action. Deb said we should think practically about what steps we can actually take, and that the far right has really been successful in the last 20 years and we need to think about what we can learn from them, particularly with the skillful use of language. Ellen mentioned

that the Tea Party movement is primarily white. She added that in her view, the “fighting hate” campaign of the Southern Poverty Law Center is in line with Jane Addams’s thought and work. She read from their website. Carol said that she thinks that the “fighting hate” points are very good, but she believes that we should not separate ourselves and not be confrontational. We do not have to identify with the Tea Party, but we should interact with them. Carol said that she does not sense any hatred in Ron Paul, and that we should make a point to speak with him.

Laura thinks we should consider working with Poor People’s Economic Human Rights Campaign, which promotes a structural analysis of poverty. We can be more than intentional; we can be strategic. Pat said that the National Assembly conference from July 22-25 in Albany, NY is meant to bring together a lot of different groups; she is serving on the planning committee as a representative of WILPF. The National Assembly is an ongoing attempt to build unity among anti-war groups. Mary said that she would like to remind the group of Move to Amend’s Campaign to Legalize Democracy, of which WILPF is a founding member and she passed around their brochure which is very inclusive of people of color, both graphically and in its language. She said that it was very intentional to have diverse groups be part of this effort. Laura asked Mary what is at stake for this coalition in its embrace of the phrase “we the people.” Mary said that they haven’t had a discussion about it, but that a discussion of “we the people” is in order. She said that “we the people” referred to white, republican men, originally, and that we should discuss how we feel about this. Mary said that this is the first she has heard of any controversy about the phrase. Ellen said an explanation of “we the people” might be more in order; who are “the people”? Ellen said we should try to clarify the statement and reclaim it.

Carol brought up Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson. She said that there were people in the revolutionary era that WILPF can identify with today, if not completely, at least partially. Georgia said that she disagrees with Carol: there is nothing she wants to celebrate about the American Revolution, and that we have to be careful with what words we use. Robin said that she was happy with what she sees in the Move to Amend brochure and asked who were the lead organizations in the coalition. Mary answered that this is a coalition of several groups but that WILPF has been the primary membership organization in the coalition. Laura said that a few weeks ago there was some email discussion from BBC about racism in the Tea Party movement. Mary asked how much energy we want to give to the Tea Party movement. Robin asked Carol if there is energy to create a subcommittee to create a flier for the US Social Forum explaining how our taxes are going to the military rather than human needs. Carol said that the program committee is proposing a workshop on this theme at the USSF and that all the committees are contributing. She said that there will be a flier on this, but also something from BBC.

Pat asked how people want to continue on this internal investigation of language. Carol said that another thing we can spend a little time on this is when they do the program report. Pat said that we should come up with a statement to caution branch members to have discussions on language and similar issues. The language in the Missoula branch

document could be misconstrued. In the future we should urge branches to address issues of racism in their communities. Laura said that WILPF is not geographically well positioned to put pressure on or even understand the Tea Party Movement as we are strongest on the two coasts. Instead, we should find out how our mid-country branches are affected. Also we can support them by ensuring that they receive the Move to Amend brochure for tabling and other uses.

Mary asked who did the planning for the internal racism segment of our board meetings and suggested that we have a very crisp purpose for internal racism discussion at board meetings. Pat said that in the past we have carved out two hours of every board meeting for the internal racism issue; we have had very crisp intentions, but that doesn't affect much. She said we need to have more people on the Internal Racism Committee; she is the only remaining member. Georgia said that she would like to make a proposal that we ask the BBC what we should do with our internal racism segments. Pat said that we could do this, but that the Internal Racism committee is a board committee and a board charge. Nancy said that she apologizes because the report from the Racial Justice Committee established to oversee implementation of the White Privilege Workshop initiative was not sent to the board in a coherent fashion (due to technical difficulties), and she was not able to get it to this board meeting. Nancy also noted that the questions on racial justice work were never inserted into the branch survey, and she proposes revising the branch survey to make it an annual occurrence. Nancy said we should make a decision about whether or not we want to continue with the commitment to holding internal racism discussions at every board meeting and if so, then we need to reinvigorate the Internal Racism Committee.

Mary said that she was not aware that there was a board Internal Racism Committee. Carol thinks we should reassess what we are doing to bring about racial justice. Nancy said that the central question is what are we doing and how are we doing it and that in order to know this we should ask the branches. Laura said that BBC has a lot of resources but they have not come out with ways to share this with members. We should ask the BBC who we could partner with for resources; if we ask them and want a report back date, it could get them thinking. Georgia will be responsible for asking BBC.

Outcome: Georgia will ask the BBC to investigate the benefits of WILPF joining the Southern Poverty Law Center, the Poor People's Economic Human Rights Campaign, or the Women of Color Resource Center with the intention of promoting their materials among our branches and make a recommendation for action prior to the May Steering Committee call. (4/17/10)

Outcome: Nancy will circulate the Racial Justice Committee's report on outcomes from the White Privilege workshops for discussion at the May Steering Committee meeting. (4/17/10)

Outcome: Program Committee co-chairs will prepare a report on Issue Committee work for racial justice for discussion at the May Steering Committee meeting. (4/17/10)

*Linda Belle joined meeting.

9. Supporting WILPF Branches- Part 1 (Laura) 12:24pm

Laura said that in fall of 2008 we decided that individual board members would take responsibility for checking in with the branches and that Audley was responsible for assigning the branches to the board members. Some people made their branch calls and reported back to the rest of us on an ad hoc basis, but others didn't. Ultimately, there was no mechanism to evaluate the process. Mary said that she called a few branches, and that while branches were happy to hear from the board, it was a dispiriting experience. Carol said that in her view, part of the Program Committee's mandate is to reach out to the branches. She said that all of the Issue Committee chairs and co-chairs are overworked, but that we need to keep communicating as best as we can with all branches that wish to be involved in Issue Committees. Pat said that she did call her branches, and was able to reach several on her list and two on Carol's list. The branches were happy to hear from her and it was greatly appreciated. Pat said that the branches may not have regular meetings or a large membership base, but that they are doing the work. Nancy said that we need to decide if we want to recommit to reaching out to branches as individual board members, or not. If we choose to, we have to reassign branches and reinvigorate the system. Laura said that this discussion is to remind the board of the previous action, not to reinvigorate the system. Nancy asked, given our present structure, can we reach out to branches? Mary said that branch calls should be from committees. Deb said that we do not know a lot about our members, and we should put a page in *Peace and Freedom* surveying members skills and interests. She said research shows members will be more active if we ask them to do specific things for the organization. Laura noted that a survey was done electronically last fall and that we got more responses than from a survey published in *Peace and Freedom* a few years back.

Laurie said that it is clear to her that there is a mutual disconnect between branches and national. Laurie has put together an updated list of branch contact information which she distributed, noting there may be some inconsistencies/inaccuracies. She said that she would ultimately like board and staff contact information on this list as well. Laura asked that the contacts for the various issue committees be added to this "branch directory" and that it be distributed in hard copy to the branches. The branch contact information will be updated on the website as well. Robin asked about who is on the listserves [branches\(at\)wilpf.org](mailto:branches(at)wilpf.org) and [atlarge\(at\)wilpf.org](mailto:atlarge(at)wilpf.org) list serves, and Laurie said that that is a different issue, but one that is being worked on as well.

Laura said that we should add some language about responsibilities for updating membership information and fundraising to the National/branch protocol document. These issues have come up on Steering calls. Nancy suggested that the language in point six, about annual reporting, be changed to encourage the use of a common survey instrument. Pat said that the address should be changed. Carol said that we should think about what the consequences should be if a branch drops below 10 active members. Mary said that in the past 3 people or more was recognized as a WILPF group and 10 people or more as a branch, and that there was a financial obligation on the part of these units.

Ellen said that branches forward all of renewal money to national, and part of new membership. Sydney said that we should clarify what our dues forwarding policies are. Georgia said that she does not know what the protocol is, but that her branch operates on tradition. Mary said that we should standardize this protocol for all branches. Laura said that we should focus on making changes to this document which is published on our website and can be distributed to branches. Laura said that this could be inserted under number seven; it says that branches have to collect memberships by national policies, but the policies are not outlined. Nancy thinks we should assign someone to make simple changes to be approved at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Nancy would like someone to do an analysis of membership dues and investigate the feasibility of perhaps raising them; as changes in dues need to be approved by the membership we could put forward a proposal for this at the same time as we mail ballots for the next board. We should also find out how much it costs to have a member. Linda thinks that we should raise dues, and perhaps break it down for members to show costs. Nancy said that we should eliminate the procedure of branches keeping money for new members; it is very complicated and is not very much money. Ellen said that she does not think that branches would be very happy with that change. Originally this process was to give branches an incentive to get new members, and this money is important to branches. Sandra said that in this economy, many people are giving low income dues, but they do a lot of volunteer work. Laura suggested that these issues be referred to Steering and Finance Committees.

Outcome: Agreed upon revisions to the National/Branch protocol will be drafted and protocol will go back to Steering for approval before distribution to branches or posting on website. (4/17/10)

Outcome: Finance committee will analyze the cost of membership and prepare a recommendation for Steering by July or August. (4/17/10)

Break for lunch 1:16 pm

10. Supporting WILPF Branches (Part Two) Laurie and Sydney 2:17 pm

Branch Packet Discussion

Pat and Audley shared their work in progress on creating an updated packet for organizing existing or new branches. The correct address and dove logo are missing, and we need to include a welcome letter and a correct table of contents. Pat asked if we wanted to include steps for conflict management. All agreed. She also asked if we wanted to include fundraising documents. The board looked over the documents. Pat discussed several other documents and sample papers for the branches. Laura said that a lot of the program documents should be eliminated because they are out of date. Pat decided to take out the document that is replaced by our DIA membership database. Ellen wanted clarification on the branch document for submitting donations to national. Laura said that the new branch document is more efficient because it gives branch members an

opportunity to put members' updated contact information. Robin asked how many requests that one gets for new branches per year. Laura said that in 2009 there were three requests. Deb suggested the updated documents could be put online. Laura said that she would like this to be done, polished, printed, and given out to branches by the next membership drive. Audley noted that we have a congress coming up and this should be done by then. Laura said that money tied to this was approved and put into the budget. Nancy said that if this is a branch organizing packet, this is overwhelming; we should have a more concise, inspiring packet and then perhaps follow up with a branch "manual" that all branches should have. Nancy said that we need to have real direct support, rather than a 60 page manual. Laura said that there isn't anyone to do this work. Carol said the board should have a membership position to start this process; we have to nurture our membership, although this usually falls to the program committee. Maybe we could institute a membership position on the program committee. Nancy said that we should get a branch section on the website.

Ellen proposed that Pat develop a draft table of contents, and then ask the Steering Committee review it. The bulk of this material should go on the website, and the Steering Committee can decide who this is mailed to. Laura asked if our idea is that we want a big comprehensive resource package, or do we want a smaller package. Nancy wanted to make a branch packet for organizing branches, and reiterated that the packet we were looking at is complex and overwhelming. Laura said we should think about the process of organizing. Ellen suggested that we send out an Issue Committee brochure, a membership brochure, and a new branch form response. Nancy volunteered to work on the packets.

Robin reminded us that we have 2,000 JA1325 postcards and she was under the impression that 25 cards were going to be sent out to each branch.

Laurie and Sydney used the LCD projector and networked laptop to show board members the administrative view of a member record in DIA and to demonstrate how to pull a branch list using the DIA database, so that everyone would have a shared understanding of what we are expecting branch membership chairs to do.

11. Planning the Next National Congress (Nancy) 4:25 pm

We may need to reevaluate our goal of having the next National Congress in the fall of 2011; Nancy asked if we should keep this date in light of the fact that the International Congress will be later in the summer than we had thought. Mary made a proposal that we hold the 2011 National Congress in Costa Rica and that we tack it on to the International Congress by doing our section business and then participate in the workshops planned for the International Congress. This would be a good way to prepare for the 2015 WILPF Centennial. Linda said that Mary's proposal is an interesting idea, but U.S. Section would have to pay for members of both the old and new board to go to Costa Rica. Laura asked if people needed visas to go to Costa Rica. Nancy Ramsden answered no. Robin asked why we aren't having the National Congress in 2012, and then have the next one in 2015 on a three year cycle. International changed their cycle from 3 to 4 years, so it went from 2014 to 2015. International's cycle change led to the conference occurring in 2011, the

same year that the U.S. Section would normally have its National Congress. Audley asked if by going to Costa Rica, wouldn't we be excluding many people? Carol said that it is probably more expensive to go to many locations in the United States than it is to go to Costa Rica. Nancy R. asked how we would determine the topic for the National Congress. Nancy said that the board generally provides guidance and a theme for the planning committee. Nancy R. suggested the topics of immigration and food. Laura said that at the IB meeting they had already decided on a topic for the International Congress, and that perhaps this same theme could be a lens for examining U.S. policy. Linda asked if we had identified a branch willing to host a congress within the U.S. The answer was no. Linda pointed out that Mary's is the only proposal we have. Laura said that she likes this proposal if we could figure out the site barrier issue. Carol thinks that the next step is to e-mail someone in Costa Rica to explore this idea. Nancy suggested that if we had a U.S. congress in Texas, and then those who want to continue to international in Costa Rica could do so. Mary said that maybe we should just have a congress in 2011, without reference to the International Congress. Pat said that she doesn't want to have a National Congress in 2014, and that we should have a combination congress in 2015 to celebrate the 100 year anniversary of WILPF.

Linda pointed out that it is a lot of work for the branch that hosts a congress, and that we need to be flexible as to the branch's wishes. Laura thinks that we should decide on fall of 2011. The new board is mandated to meet in the fall, and they could hold their first meeting in conjunction with the Congress. Laura said we need to figure out how to do the transition from the old board to new board. Linda noted that if we decide to make the congress in the fall, we will not have access to cheap dormitory housing on campuses, and people may not be able to get time off. Ellen thinks that we should have the congress in 2012, and that we should switch to a four year cycle as long as international is doing the same. Nancy R. said that there is going to be a lot happening in 2015 around the Hague.

Laura said that the 2005-2008 board ran into a lot of problems planning the congress because the board constantly avoided making big decisions; she thinks that this board is doing the same thing. Nancy noted that we have several proposals: 1) We switch to 2012, 2) We have the congress in 2011 and in a location convenient for additional travel to Costa Rica, 3) We have the US congress at a branch location in 2011. For the past two congresses, we have hired someone to plan the congress for \$10,000.00. Nancy asked if it would be possible to hire a congress planner and hold a congress that was not hosted by any particular branch. Pat said that we should consider the West Palm Beach branch, because Miami is a major port of departure for flights to Costa Rica, but a lot of the members aren't there year round. Laura noted that this branch has had a lot of problems with leadership. Ellen said that hotel rates will probably be cheaper in July than in November. Nancy said we should figure out what steps to take to make these decisions in the next couple weeks.

Operational Decision: In planning for the next national congress, the co-presidents will proceed as follows. First, explore the possibility of holding the congress in a southern hub on dates adjunct to the International Congress. This will necessitate

pinning down the dates of the IC and talking to branches in FL. If dates of the IC cannot be gotten by April 26, then begin exploring host branches for a congress in the fall of 2011. If no host branch can be identified by June 1, then U.S. congress will default to 2012. (Consensus, Audley and Pat stood aside, 4/17/10)

Audley stood aside because she did not want to schedule close to hurricane season, and Pat stood aside because the international dates are not set and she would not be able to get time off in the fall. Laura would not want to have the congress in 2012 because then it would have to go to the next board. Audley, Pat, Mary, and Carol would prefer having the congress in 2012. Carol said that she doesn't care when the congress is. Mary said that she thinks we need to have quality control at the congress. Pat would like having 2012 because it gives people more time, but she doesn't want to hand this off to the next board. However, she thinks that our congress should coincide with the international in 2015.

12. Succession Planning (Pat) 5:39pm

The positions of U.N. Representative for WILPF U.S. and International Board Representative need job descriptions so that nominations for these positions can be solicited. Nancy said that she thinks that these appointments should occur at the fall board meeting because they are appointments made by the board rather than elected positions. The DPI passes for the U.N. reps are issued for a calendar year in January. Nancy noted that there has been an unstable history for U.N. representatives and that we now had the opportunity to make a more concrete job description. She also said that we should not rush the process and that we do not necessarily need to find U.N. representatives this year. Linda said that she believes that Jean and Anita are both ready to give up their positions. Robin offered to interview the two current holders and use that as the basis for a new job description. Linda said that anyone who is going to be a U.N. representative needs to live in New York City.

Sydney left the room at 6 p.m. and Laurie continued with the notetaking.

Audley asked if we can stagger the terms, so we don't lose both UN Reps at the same time? Ellen proposed that if Jean Verthein willing to serve longer, we only need to look for one U.N. Rep this year. Nancy pointed out that Jean and Anita complement each other in terms of interests and expertise; by replacing both at once, we have an opportunity to rethink both job descriptions at the same time. Carol hopes Jean remains, since she's so essential to Disarm. She also likes the idea of staggered terms. Laura likes staggered terms and would like to see more about these positions on our website, so that it is an incentive to membership and involvement. These positions should be advertised in the June e-letter to members in order to meet our desired timeline.

Outcome: Laura and Robin will write a job description for the U.N. rep position(s) by June 1. Our preference is that these be two year staggered terms, but we don't want to push either Jean or Anita out of office, because they are performing well. The openings

will be advertised in the June e-letter with nominations/applications due by Oct. 1. Appointment(s) will be made at fall 2010 board meeting. (4/17/10)

Laura asked if there a job description for the IB Rep? No one seems to know. Mary thinks the job is to represent International to the Section. Pat thinks Darien may have a job description. Nancy thinks International may have a job description.

Outcome: Nominating committee will research and draft job description for IB representative. This is a three year term running from International Congress to International Congress. The position will be announced in the fall 2010 issue of *Peace and Freedom* and appointment will be made at the spring 2011 board meeting. (4/17/10)

The next national board will serve from 2011 to 2014. Call for nominations will go out in the June e-letter to members and in the fall issue of *Peace and Freedom*. Applications should be due by January 2011. Candidate information will go out with ballots in a first class mailing to all members. This needs to be in the 2011 budget. We need to also seek applications and nominations for the position of president(s). Although the president(s) are elected by the current board, any qualified WILPF member may run for the office. The current board will elect the president(s) of the 2011-14 term at its spring 2011 meeting.

Anyone who has been a WILPF member for 24 months may run for president; she does not need to have prior experience on the national board. All current board members, except Pat, are eligible to run for an additional term.

Outcome: Call for board nominations for the 2011-14 term will go out in the June e-letter and again in Fall 2010 *Peace and Freedom*. Applications for nominees will be due by January 15, 2011. (4/17/10)

We should clarify what the term limits are for those board members who came on in the middle of a term. It is suggested that a by-law change making this clarification be prepared by the Nominating Committee for discussion at the fall board meeting.

Robin asked if we can ask for money when we send out the ballots? Board formally invites Robin to fill position as Chair of Development committee. She would only be able to run for one more term. Robin accepts! ☺

*Deb got off phone.

Laura explained that tomorrow's meeting will begin by revisiting unresolved issues from previous sessions of this Board Meeting. Please read all the easel pads and think about what still has to be talked about. Think about solutions to make tomorrow more efficient.

Sunday, April 18, 2010
8:44 AM Start

In Attendance

Board members: Audley Green (US Representative to the IB)
Ellen Schwartz (Treasurer)
Laura Roskos (Co-President)
Pat O'Brien (Chair of the Nominating Committee)
Carol Urner (Program Co-Chair)
Deborah Garretson (Secretary)
Nancy Munger (Co-President)
Georgia Pinkel (Program Co-Chair)
Sandra Junier (JAPA Board, Cape Cod Branch)
Mary Zepernick (Personnel Chair)
Robin Lloyd (Development Chair)

Staff: Laurie Belton (Director of Operations)
Linda Belle (Executive Director of JAPA)
Sydney Gliserman (Administrative Intern)

Member guests: Joan Ecklein (Boston Branch)

13. Unfinished Business (Nancy) 8:44

[Some decisions listed under this section also appear under the discussion of the agenda item to which they relate for ease of reference.]

1. Anonymous Donations.

The intention of the Development Committee has been to publish names of donors of \$100+ in *Peace and Freedom*, and we need to find out if donors are OK with that. To ensure this, we've added places on our on-line giving interface and paper solicitations where people can opt out of making their name public. Is this true for JAPA as well? Development should look into this. People who donate more than \$250 through JAPA know they can opt of out their name being made public because this is stated on the gift acknowledgement they receive from JAPA. However, there is disagreement about what degree of anonymity of donors can be honored between the two organizations, both of which are raising money for essentially the same purpose from the same donor pool. What does it mean for our fundraising work if either JAPA or WILPF don't reveal donation information to each other? What does it mean to WILPF Development team if JAPA doesn't tell us who major donors are? What does anonymity mean when a single database is used by multiple people? Linda feels it is her obligation to maintain anonymity if her donors ask for it. Ellen says that Linda does tell us the names of all donors to WILPF U.S. in her monthly spreadsheet. Nancy M doesn't want to have the discussion now, but would like the Development Committee to take on this issue.

Outcome: The Development Committee will research "industry" best practices regarding internal confidentiality and sharing of identities of anonymous donors and made a recommendation to the board as to what our (WILPF and JAPA) practices should be.

(4/18/10)

2. What kind of database queries can the D.O. run for whom and by whose authority?

WILPF is concerned about protecting the privacy of its membership records, in particular the giving history of individuals. Laura suggests that Laurie write memo to Steering committee outlining each kind of ask and its potential ramifications. Robin asks about what privileges the Development Chair has on DIA? Laura answered that Development Chair can read only, not change. Robin is also a Branch membership chair so she will have two different logins, each with different privileges. Although Pat has Development Chair privileges it's not clear what sort of privileges she should have as Nominating Chair.

Outcome: Laurie will draft a memo to the Steering Committee recommending policies regarding the running of queries from the DIA database, addressing issues of for whom such queries should be run and under what approval process and authority. (4/18/10)

Sydney joined the meeting at 8:59; takes over note taking responsibilities.

New issue arises: discussion of branch membership chairs' DIA access to information about unassigned members residing in geographical area.

14. Growing Our Political Work (Carol & Georgia) 9:03 am

Carol began by framing the question of how we allocate our resources to support WILPF's membership in coalitions. The 2010 operating budget allocates \$700 for coalition memberships, but sometimes dues are paid from Issue Committee allocations. Now that we don't have a lot of staff, we should use our Issue Committees as a resource. Carol would like issue committees to become stronger and share work. She would also like to see members being the driving force, not the staff or board members. We need a structure that supports this. WILPF is currently part of any number of coalitions, some of which require dues. One is Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (ANA) where we currently pay at the lowest level, \$75.00. This coalition payment is based on budget. End the Occupation is \$100.00 per year. UFPJ is \$300.00-\$400.00 per year. Carol said that she recommends continuing on with UFPJ. One part of UFPJ is Disarm, and one part is Afghanistan; these topics go well with WILPF's program. Georgia said that Global Network is \$100.00 per year. Pat said that she represents WILPF on the planning committee for the July 22nd National Assembly conference, and they are asking for donations. She wants to know who decides if and how much WILPF can donate? She would like to give \$100.00. Carol said that if the board agrees, we should add this and perhaps lower money given to the ANA or UFPJ. Audley asked if any other groups would like to donate money with WILPF; she also thinks that we should not have to pay the top amount. Laura said that she is not sure if this accounting line is intended to support single events; she also said that we have traditionally been part of the National Council of Women's Organizations and the United Nations Association. The National Council of Women's Organizations coalition asks \$50.00 and gives us access to an email

list. Nancy asked Pat if our membership in UFPJ has anything to do with the National Assembly. Pat said that UFPJ is not a member of the National Assembly planning committee yet, however they are considering it. Carol said that the main people to report to are the co-presidents. We have the basic money decided. Linda asked if Laurie had all of the information she needed to allocate the money.

Outcome: WILPF would like to use the \$700 membership allocation to join Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, End the Occupation, UFPJ, Global Network, National Assembly, National Council of Women's Organizations, and UNA-USA. The Program Co-chairs will make the decision about how much money goes to each organization and inform Laurie in a timely manner so that she can implement. (4/18/10)

Carol said that each coalition membership should be connected to an issue committee.

Policy Decision: There will be a point person within WILPF for each organization or coalition that we affiliate with at the national level and program co-chairs will compile a document describing these relationships and listing the point person and share that with the communications staff and co-presidents. (Consensus 4/18/10, no stand asides)

Carol discussed the U.S. Social Forum next. Carol said that WILPF has joined the national planning committee with Terry Futvoye-Micus and Odile Hugonot Haber providing leadership. The committee is excited about it though it is a lot of work, just as Laura had warned. At this point we have 12-15 people who said that they are going to the forum; last time we had 47 attendees. There is currently \$2,000.00 in the budget for expenses related to participation at the U.S.S.F., but that members will have to take care of their own transportation and hotel costs. Carol is proposing a workshop focused on the military industrial complex, especially the connection between disarmament and corporate accountability. Carol would like the board's general okay to proceed and it was given. Laura was excited to hear Carol's excitement and she sees the way that this will build up the issue committees. She also said that this is a point of entry into WILPF for new people. Nancy asked Carol what kind of support she would like for the project, and said that it is critical to get commitments from people and find an intern. Laurie said that she has a lot of resumes from people who would like to be interns.

Carol thinks that the Program and Development Committees should be working closely together; however, she wants to note that everyone here is a volunteer. Robin thinks that each issue committee should create ideas for fundable projects, perhaps by scaling up small successful efforts. She noted that Nancy Price is good at this.

Policy Decision: Issue committees or branches seeking external funding for programs or projects should be asked to coordinate their plans through the board chair of the Development Committee. (Consensus 4/18/10, no blocks, no stand asides)

Nancy said that if a branch is going for a grant, they need to discuss this with the board. Ellen said that there should be a quick turnaround. Nancy noted that this proposal is

disagreeable to some. Laura said that we need to decentralize fundraising and raise money in areas local for events. Nancy said that the internal grant program was step one in fostering this sort of thinking and that there needs to be more direction given, although this proposal is the first step. Carol wanted to note that seven of the Issue Committees are now in good standing. There are three “dormant” committees. Carol didn’t know if we needed formal approval for this but she would like these committees to stay on the website. Laura said that these three committees are Advancing Human Rights, Haiti, and Pan-African Diaspora Women’s Issues. Laura said that any of these committees could move in a different direction if new leadership emerged that wanted to shift course. Carol noted that there are branches working on the issues promoted by the dormant committees. Georgia and Nancy suggested that we could use WILPF’s history with these issues to sign on to other events and statements. Mary said she believed the co-presidents had the authority to sign WILPF on to other events. Carol also brought up issue committees’ self-assessment of their work on racial justice; almost nobody answered the racial justice questions.

15. Committing our Resources (Ellen) 10:30am

There is an internal contradiction in the bequest policy. Nancy would like to have more specific language. Ellen said that the language should be changed to “equal to” and specifically note percentages for exact amounts. (Ex. between \$10,000.00 and \$20,000.00 as opposed to having a clause for more than \$10,000.00 and less than \$20,000.00 and a separate clause for exactly \$10,000.00) The board agreed. Laura said that clause four seems to assume an accumulating balance in the account as opposed to a one-time bequest. Ellen would like to make a proposal that we clarify the policy to be not what original intent was, but to put 1/3 of what is in the long term savings at the beginning of each year into the operating budget for the next year and let the long term savings attempt to grow. We should revisit this policy in spring 2011. Nancy said that she would like to see some concrete figures, and that Ellen’s policy seems like a requirement. Laura would like to go along with the proposal as an experiment, but would like to make adjustments to the language in clause six. Laura would like to change the bequest language from “Director of Operations would initiate the request” to “Director of Operations or the President(s) may initiate the request”.

Policy Decision: To amend the Bequest Savings Policy as follows:

- 1) Clause 3 changing the brackets so that if it falls on the \$10,000, \$20,000, or \$50,000 mark, we include it in the higher percentage bracket**
- 2) Changing the language in number four from “will be” to “may be” budgeted**
- 3) Number 6 request can be initiated by the DO or the President(s), if the special account is tapped for a request it could be considered to an internal loan**
- 4) Number 8 this policy will be evaluated at the Spring 2011 board meeting.**
- 5) At year end, 1/3 of what is in the long term savings may be budgeted into the next year to be spent for operations.**

(Consensus, 4/18/10, no blocks, no stand asides) Laura will provide a final copy of the revised document to Laurie and Ellen for their files; final document has been appended to these minutes.

Joan said that members are concerned about the preservation of our long-term funds and asked what kind of effect these proposals would have on the long-term funds. Ellen thinks that this will better preserve our long-term funds. The policy originally said that all bequests should be used in three years, except for interest. Following the 1/3 policy, we will never get to zero. Linda was concerned about the language giving co-presidents' greater access to money. Laura and Nancy both said that the procedure requiring board approval must still be observed; the new language simply allows us to act in the event that the D.O. position is vacant as it was for a few weeks this past winter.

Ellen said that at the end of December, 2009, there was \$2,100.00 in the long-term savings account. Ellen would like to propose that we do not take out a third of this now. Laura said that she does not think that this decision has to be made here. The budget for 2010 was approved at the last board meeting. Ellen then withdrew her proposal. Laura asked what decisions finance has made for the proceeds from the sale of Race Street. Ellen responded that the decision is to put the money into a 90-day CD initially. JAPA has not yet sent us the check.

13. Unfinished Business (cont'd: Nancy) 11:12 am

3. Corporate Structure.

Nancy asked if there was anyone who would like to serve on an ad hoc committee doing the cost/benefit analysis of becoming a 501c3; Carol said that she does not have time but she would like to serve. Ellen, Nancy, and Laura also expressed interest. Laura said that this committee should generate a report by the fall, 2010, Board Meeting. Robin asked if this report would look at the potential effects on JAPA of making this change. Laura said that she thinks the committee should focus, at least initially, primarily on the needs of WILPF. The board confirmed that it is just looking for an analysis, not a recommendation at this time.

Operational Decision: WILPF will begin a process of investigating the potential of reincorporating as a 501c3 by establishing an ad hoc committee to create a cost/benefit analysis for review at the fall 2010 board meeting. (Consensus, 4/18/10, no blocks, Robin stood aside)

4. Internal Racism Committee

Nancy asked if the board should reinvigorate the Internal Racism Committee that is now composed of one member. Laura would like more specifics on the proposal. The resolution for this is to revisit the mission of this committee after discussing the other reports at the May Steering meeting. Audley volunteered to join that committee.

5. Proposal to hold spring 2011 Board Meeting in Portland

There was a recommendation to hold the spring 2011 board meeting in Portland, Oregon. Georgia said that more financial information is needed to make a decision. Mary asked if this has been accepted by the Portland branch; Georgia said it has not. Audley asked if there are accommodations there. Georgia is going to get more information. Funding for this meeting would be in the 2011 operating budget. If we accept this, we are essentially instructing the treasurer to add this to the budget. Laura said that she would like to make this decision no later than August pending concrete financial information. Ellen would like to know more concrete financials; Laurie said that the 2009 audit would be done by the end of June. Laura said that big expenses for the Advancing Women as Peacemakers project will not be over until October. Ellen said that she would like until October to make a decision. Georgia will prepare a financial projection for finance by August, and in October the board will make a decision. Laura suggested we pick the dates for a board meeting early.

Outcome: Georgia will prepare a financial projection for holding the spring 2011 Spring Board Meeting in Portland, OR, for the Finance committee to review by August and identify potential dates for such a meeting. Decision on whether or not to meet in Portland will be taken at the fall 2010 meeting, upon recommendation from finance committee. (4/18/10)

6. President's Travel Fund

There was a proposal made to amend the budget to include \$2,000.00 for the presidents' travel to visit branches and/or donors. Linda asked about a \$1,200.00 check that came into JAPA earmarked for presidents' travel. This was a check from Nancy to reimburse WILPF for expenses related to her travel to the IB meeting.

Policy Decision: **Two thousand dollars will be added to the budget for presidents' travel to visit branches and/or donors.** (Consensus, 4/18/10, no blocks, no stand asides)

Decision forwarded to the Finance Committee for implementation if possible.

Outcome: Board members using WILPF funds to travel on WILPF business are required to submit a report of their expenditures, intent, and accomplishments, to the full board at its next meeting. Reports are recommended for self-funded travel on behalf of WILPF. (4/18/10).

7. Nominating Committee

Nancy asked if the nominating committee needs support for the heavy workload it is facing over the next year. Pat said that if she did, she would ask. She would like members to look for volunteers.

8. Branch access to At-Large member records

Nancy asked what kind of access branches should have to members at large. Laurie asked if it was a topic that she could add into her report on DIA.

Outcome: Laurie will make a recommendation to the board regarding how and under what circumstances branch membership chairs can have access to the membership records of “unassigned” WILPF members in their geographic areas. (4/18/10)

Robin wanted to know what our policy is on sponsors. The board does not have time to discuss this, but Pat may have some more information, as this is a perennial topic of discussion for the Development Committee, which is in charge of the sponsor program.

Check Out/Evaluation 11:47 am

Laura noted that some themes emerged in the responses to the opening board meeting question of “what would your role in WILPF ideally look like”. Several common attributes emerged as themes. These include: being attentive to process; responsibilities scaled to capabilities of “one person”; work coordinated across organization, strategic priorities; focus on projects over maintenance; being able to follow through and finish tasks; writing up complete and accurate reports; sharing and saving reports; being appreciated and thanked; and nurturing new leaders.

Meeting Adjourned 12:02 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Sydney Gliserman and Laurie Belton. Compiled by Deborah Garretson and Laura Roskos.

Appendix I: Bequest Savings Policy

WILPF US Bequest Policy, adopted January 2007
(Rev. November 2009; Rev. April 2010)

- It is the intention of the Finance Committee to honor all bequests and that US WILPF will operate within a reasonable budget without having to rely on bequests to save operations.
- A percentage of each bequest will be set aside into a separate saving account, insured, with the highest interest available. The remainder of what is not set-aside will be available for general operations in the current year.
- The percentage set aside will be based on a sliding scale that puts a larger percentage away the larger the bequest amount: 5% of bequests under \$10,000,

10% of bequests of at least \$10,000 and under \$20,000, 30% of bequests of at least \$20,000 and under \$50,000, 50% of bequests of \$50,000 or more.

- At year-end, one third of what is in the long term savings account will may be budgeted into the next year to be spent for operations.
- When the account reaches a total of at least \$100,000, the Board will be asked to discuss longer term accounts, especially the possibility of setting up an endowment.
- The Board would have to approve any movement of funds, outside the regular budget cycle, from the account into regular saving or checking. The Director of Operations or President(s) may initiate the request to the Finance Committee for funds to be transferred. Finance would prepare the topic for the Steering Committee. Steering would then be responsible for notifying the full board with any decision to transfer funds. The criteria for approval would include an immediate liability or need, including payroll that can not be met by existing checking, savings, Pax reserve or expected revenue. If this special account is tapped for an emergency, it should be considered an internal loan that must be repaid. It would then be the responsibility of the Finance Committee to review how this loan would be repaid.
- This new bequest policy will start no later than January 2007. This means that the account will build in '07 and 1/3 of the funds saved in 2007 will be budgeted into 2008 operating budget.
- This policy will be evaluated at the Spring 2011 Board meeting. The evaluation will be written into the Finance committee's workplan and passed on to the 2011-14 board.