

WILPF U.S. National Board Meeting
October 23-25, 2010, Bloomington, IN.
Theme: "Ensuring Continuity"

Saturday, October 23

In Attendance

Board Members: Georgia Pinkel (Program Co-Chair)
Ellen Schwartz (Treasurer)
Laura Roskos (Co-President)
Pat O'Brien (Chair of Nominating Committee)
Carol Urner (Program Co-Chair)
Deborah Garretson (Secretary)
Nancy Munger (Co-President)
Audley Green (US Representative to the IB)
Sandy Silver (Co-President of JAPA Board)
Robin Lloyd (Chair of Development Committee)

[Excused absence: Mary Zepernick (Chair of Personnel Committee)]

Staff: Laurie Belton (Director of Operations)
Linda Belle (Executive Director of JAPA)

Guests: Linda Green (Bloomington Branch member)
Also during morning Mary Ann Craig and Kathy McGuire

1. Meeting called to order at 9:10 a.m.

Start of Meeting Procedures:

Check-In Question: What would you like to see accomplished by this board during the remainder of its term? The following ideas were brought forth:

- * Bring issues of disarmament and de-militarization more into the mainstream of WILPF
- * Continue updating membership lists
- * Update the board book for the 2011-2014 board
- * Creation of the branch book protocol
- * Increase both funds and membership numbers
- * Complete implementation of the Strategic Plan
- * Generate enough revenue to hire National Director

Robin read the Alice Walker poem *Call on the Grandmothers*

Welcoming statement

Introductions of meeting participants and guests

Review of Agenda

2. Co-Presidents' Report 9:20 a.m.

Laura discussed the recent JAPA board meeting and Book Event. Two important decisions were made at the JAPA meeting: first, JAPA will work on drafting a joint letter with US WILPF regarding the status of the NY Metro branch, and second, the JAPA board has proposed holding a three-day, facilitated collaboration meeting before the June congress with JAPA, U.S. Section, and International Board all represented. A Board Evaluation form from the 2002- 2005 Board was discussed and commitment made to utilize it again to pass on to the next board. Discussion was held on a revised version of last year's branch survey instrument intended to make the instrument "evergreen", or reusable year after year. The board discussed the need to build in some type of feedback mechanism. Questions 1-4 were updated by the Membership Committee this time. Discussed need to add questions on fiscal practices and co-ordinate survey with the 'Best Practices' document. It would also be helpful to know who filled it out, one person or several branch members together. There was discussion about our dues policy.

3. Director of Operations Report 10:20 a.m.

- a. We now have D & O insurance, costing \$1,000 annually with coverage up to \$1 million.
- b. Since the last board meeting, the physical office has made some important improvements. We now have locked mailboxes, front door locks, a working intercom system, a smoke alarm system, and soon a sprinkling system will be installed in the public meeting areas bringing the building up to Boston fire code. Still needing repair is work on the 2nd floor, but electricity has been restored to the other half of the office and air conditioning works. These improvements make the office livable, but we are still on renting on a month-to-month and looking for an alternative space.
- c. Laurie really enjoyed mentoring the UN Practica women and feels that the Practica are really successful in terms of building WILPF's visibility and younger membership.
- d. Two representatives from the Membership Council spent time in the office, which took a great deal of staff time for preparation.
- e. Laurie is developing instruction sheets for DIA updating by local branches. Each branch needs a person dedicated to learning to maintain membership lists on the DIA. Discussion pointed to need to get Laurie out in the field to do trainings at places like cluster meetings, Congress, and other group gatherings.
- f. WILPF National is low on cash and our International Assessment is coming due as well as deposits for Congress. We will need a large infusion of cash or she will need to dip into savings. The Annual appeal needs to be finalized and sent. Carol commits to producing a program brochure including the mini-grant program; this project will be assigned to the next Program Intern hired.
- g. Interns are vital to staff support in the office and program interns need more supervision to complete their tasks. There was a discussion of how to allocate funds between program and administrative interns for 2011. One of the suggestions from the auditor this year was relevant to financial security in the office, and the need to create a system of checks and balances whereby more than one individual sees all incoming checks. This could be accomplished by having the administrative intern interface with the bookkeeper in opening the mail. Laurie reports that her administrative intern works

15 hours a week, 2 days a week, but ideally the mail would be opened daily. Funding for 2011 will allow us up to seven intern slots, which can be divided half and half between admin and program over the three-semester segments. We need to ensure that these internships are valid training positions and not part-time jobs.

4. *Audit and Financial Report – Laurie and Ellen 11:30 a.m.*

- a. The 2009 audit was a long process that started late because of the visit by membership council representatives in June. During the process of working on the 2008 audit, we were able to bring our Bookkeeper, Sharon, into Boston for a day. We didn't do that this year but it would have been a good idea. We will bring her in next year. Two adjustments were made to WILPF balance sheet: one, the principal in the Marjorie Shaffer Fund (which WILPF inherited from the Chicago branch in 2006/07) has now been added as an asset and, two, our equipment list has been updated to reflect furniture and equipment sold or given away in the move from Race Street. This new auditor books contributions in year written, not when received. Another adjustment (to our Income and Expense Statement) to be coordinated with JAPA affects funds given in previous years but not disbursed to WILPF until 2010. Mini-grants allocated in 2009 but paid out in 2010 will be adjusted in the other direction on the Income and Expense Statement for 2010. Discussion on various figures in the audit, the current budget figures, where the 'other contributions' income came from (very large in past years), the fact that we have not 'asked' for contributions this year in advance of the Annual Appeal. There was some confusion as to money coming into the office – how we book the money vs. how we count membership. It was clarified that monthly pledgers get the benefits of membership.
- b. Mini-grant policies. In 2010 we allocated \$14,000 for mini-grants. It was all spent in Spring 2010, in the first round of grants. Discussion took place about whether we want one or two grant cycles so we are sure to have money for what is advertised. We need clearer direction about what funds carry over. There was more discussion on best practices on financial accounting for grants. It was affirmed that receipts are to be required for all grant funds spent. We also need to be clear that unspent money needs to be returned for reallocation. Further discussion is needed for best practices for deciding if the money needs to be returned to the general fund of WILPF national, or does it stay in the mini-grant budget. It was clarified that funds for issue committees and for branch mini-grants are treated differently.
- c. Planning for 2011 Budget. Ellen reports that she has based the draft 2011 budget on the 2010 budget. Only one practicum will be held in 2011. There is a need for discussion on the Kay Camp Funding for transportation to meeting. This is not included in the WILPF budget. The document used (and distributed to board members) has some errors. It only shows the first six months actual vs. full year budget with no percentages applied to either. The best column to note is the 2011 budget line by line. Board donations are not tracked in a separate budget line, because these can be individual gifts, foundation gifts, branch contributions, etc., and need to be booked into those accounts. Ellen

believes we need to consider allocating more money for program, decide what WILPF will pay for Board travel to the WILPF National Congress, how much funding we want to make available to support our delegation to the International Congress next summer.

Saturday Afternoon

In attendance:

Board members: Sandy, Ellen, Nancy, Pat, Laura , Georgia, Robin, Audley, Carol

Staff: Laurie, Linda

Guests: Linda Green, Cyndi Roberts

5. *Racial Justice – Pat 2:25 p.m.*

Pat reports that the UNAC Plan of Action contains a very strong statement in support of Palestine and was overwhelmingly approved in Albany: “End US Aid to Israel: Military, Economic, and Diplomatic.” U.S. Labor Against the War (USLAW) objected at the time and after Albany withdrew from the continuance committee. Peace Action and UFPJ have also left the continuance committee but perhaps for less explicit reasons. UFPJ actually didn’t endorse the Albany Conference, although Michael McPherson from UFPJ served on the planning committee, spoke at the plenaries, and ensured that UFPJ played a strong role in the October 2 Rally in D.C. Peace Action, USLAW, and UFPJ have traditionally been weak in attracting members of color. Meanwhile, many Muslim, immigrant, and Palestinian-based groups have affiliated with UNAC, changing the racial and cultural makeup of UNAC.

(Deb arrives to the afternoon meeting.)

It’s an interesting situation and it seems to Pat to have a lot to do with internal racism. She says we need to try to understand the situation and how we would want to respond if confronted with these dynamics at the local level. This also has implications for the recent FBI raids as those who have been raided seem to be people with strong ties to Palestinian causes. Do we think this is a tension that could split WILPF or, that WILPF members could be potential targets for future raids? Frequently, at WILPF congresses, the majority would pass strong resolutions about arms sales to Israel, etc. Then, following congress, a number of members would quit the organization. They may have eventually re-joined, but this is an issue that has historically been divisive within WILPF.

Pat asks: Is there any question that WILPF is aligned with the UNAC position?

Is ANSWER a part of the UNAC coalition?

What is “diplomatic aid”?

There is an element of ethnic/racism at play within Israel itself.

How can we make UNAC stronger? Should we use our organization to support this new unity through mobilization at the branch level? Or financial support? One of the original goals of the WCUSP Campaign, adopted in 2005, was to build bridges with the Arab and Muslim women’s community. The speakers at the Albany conference included lots of women, in particular

international and women of color. There will be an organizing meeting on Nov. 6 in New York City. All are invited.

Pat has been trying to project WILPF as an ally to Arab and Muslim women in her committee roles. Robin would like to see us work with the End Wars committee to raise money to create a speaking tour for an Afghan woman or similar. Sandy would like to see both the April 9 rally and any other action be part of a long-range strategy. Pat reports she has joined the End Wars committee. The action plan has specific tasks to build towards the April 9th event. The End Wars committee received a mini-grant to participate in the Albany conference and adopted a goal of direct action on October 27, but the timeline was pretty compressed. Carol and Georgia could discuss the UNAC action plan on a Program Committee call to see what each issue committee can do toward realizing it. Georgia hadn't seen the Action Plan as giving her "the words" to reach out to local immigrant groups and she sees that it is very rich. Hasn't Obama stated that he wants to begin withdrawing troops from Afghanistan in March 2011? If so, the April 9 rallies should be tied directly into U.S. policy as gratitude for what has been done and a push to do more.

In preparing the Racial Justice segment for the spring 2011 board meeting, Pat will consult with Audley and Georgia and perhaps further consult with the Building Beloved Community (BBC) committee. This may be an opportunity to encourage the End Wars and BBC committees to work together as well as the Middle East committee.

We agree to use electronic communications to mobilize members on both sides of the country and to bring committees together to work toward April 9. It was pointed out that we could fund travel or banners through mini-grants as well as funding travel to NYC or SF rallies. March 8, 2011, is the 100th anniversary of International Women's Day. Could Program Committee use SMART planning to devise a plan for WILPF involvement in April 9?

Carol noted that the US comes up before the Human Rights Council for its Universal Review in November (2010). We are a part of the US Human Rights Network that is coordinating the shadow report. This is another coalition very inclusive of people of color groups. Robin attended the International Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, and Xenophobia in Durban in 2001 and shot 24 hours of tape. She's been offered money to edit the footage and believes she can subcontract Paige and Sha'an to edit the tape, for some unclear purpose. She doesn't want to do it unless the purpose is clearly aligned with WILPF.

Pat discussed FBI raids and grand juries in the mid-west. She states these not limited to members of Freedom Road but at least one, possibly more than one, member of Women Against Military Madness, has been subpoenaed. How should we respond? We could write to John Conyers to ask him to hold a hearing to expose what is going on. Do we have enough intelligence? Should we and how might we support the people this is happening to? Carol will raise this with the Program Committee, but thinks we should go see Conyers in November when he's back in D.C. Carol reminded us of how Women Strike for Peace responded to the

House Un-American Committee in the 1950's. Peace and Justice Studies Association issued a three-point statement on the raid on October 4; we could borrow from that. Are there women on the judiciary committee to whom we can appeal as a group, on the basis of shared womanliness? Ellen and Robin agreed to work on the statement.

6. Building Membership 4:05 p.m.

a. NY Metro Communications

It is our intention to be proactive. There were difficulties between NY Metro and the national office that predate the Bergeson bequest, primarily around the sharing of members' contact information. More recently, this has become a non-issue and WILPF U.S. is able to communicate directly with members in the NY Metro region. Our difficulties now stem from an agreement put into place by Linda Belle in 2007, whereby NY Metro (represented by Molly Klopot) agreed that it must be an active branch in good standing in order to receive its portion of the Bergeson bequest. If NY Metro is unable to demonstrate its status, then its portion of the bequest is split between WILPF US and WILPF International. In determining the status of a particular branch, WILPF can rely on its National-Branch Relations document, approved by the board in spring 2007. NY Metro has repeatedly (Oct. 2008, Oct. 2010) sent out newsletters claiming that it is a non-profit corporation when this is simply not true, according to the Secretary of State of New York. Like many branches, NY Metro has in the past kept an account at JAPA, whereby it could receive donations from individuals wanting a tax deduction, but such donations need to be made out to the Jane Addams Peace Association for deposit there. In November 2008 Laura and Nancy met with 10 women from NY Metro Branch to talk about the steps NY Metro would need to take to demonstrate its active, good-standing status. Communications broke down in April 2009, when Linda sensed there was disagreement over whom on the WILPF board was authorized to determine NY Metro's standing and wasn't clear whether or not she should release the Bergeson funds JAPA was holding for NY Metro. In October, 2009, Laura and Nancy met the new co-chair of the branch at the JACBA event in NY. Linda Belle, a New York Metro member, says she has not been informed about any branch elections or meetings, that the branch's website is down, and that when Nancy and Laura tried to set up a meeting with them this past spring and summer, the branch declined three times. Therefore, it makes sense to approach this situation more assertively to bring it to a resolution during this board term.

Discussion ensued. Laura said she needs everyone on the board to be 100% clear and in support of whatever action is decided upon. A number of concerns were voiced. NM concern, PO concern: Grannies Peace Brigade organizing out of NY Metro branch office seems more developed than WILPF work originating there. DG concern: legal footing; LB and SS met with branch in June, 2008, and decided to give \$10,000 of the money to the branch, after being assured that they would do everything necessary to become a branch in good standing. RL is communicating with branch members re: inviting to Madeleine's dinner party. GP: we do call other branches to account under the National-Branch Responsibilities Policy. Deb asked if we

have ever dissolved branches because they didn't live up to standards. Laura reported no, but never has an issue such as this arisen before. CU suggested talk to Jean V about calling Rene or Jackie about problem. Nancy relates that MN Metro branch incorporated as a 501c3 and were asked to dissolve the 501c3, which they then did, and we've had good relations since. LB: the memorandum signed by Molly represents a legal contract prohibiting JAPA from giving the branch funds unless it is deemed to be in good standing by WILPF. Laura contends that we should hold them accountable to By-laws, Branch Responsibilities. Sandy says it will not be difficult to determine guidelines. We should discuss the date by which the branch should comply. Laurie summed up: JAPA works together with US WILPF to finalize letter and give New York Metro a deadline date of Feb 1, 2011.

b. Dues restructuring:

It was decided that a proposal should be made now if we're going to ask members to vote on it in the spring; dues can only be changed by member referendum. A guest member spoke to say that she resents it when peace organizations set dues so high that she can't afford to pay it. It was suggested that we could retain low income dues at \$15 but raise regular dues, or promote pledging. Laurie reports that \$15 does not cover the cost of a member for a year: international assessment alone is \$15 plus \$4.50 for *Peace and Freedom* so direct costs alone (without e-news or e-actions or mailings or staff time to register their dues) are at a minimum \$19.50. Can membership be a sliding figure, like \$20-\$60, and use language like "pay more if you can." Proposal: "\$15 - \$150...find your place" a year, pay more if you can, less if you can't or some alternate language. Deb prefers a three-tiered approach of \$20, \$40, \$60. Or \$20, \$40, \$60-100. Referendum vote is simple majority of total voting in election. Sliding scale without "low-income" appellation might be more inclusive.

Operating Decision: The board consensed on submitting the proposal of "\$15 - \$150, find your place in WILPF" to the membership for a vote concurrent with the balloting for the 2011-14 board. (Unanimous, no stand asides)

Operational Decision: The dues proposal for ballot should say "Dues can be paid annually or by pledging. Find your place in WILPF. [] % of our membership is low income. It costs WILPF [] in direct costs to maintain a member for a year."

c. Branch Rebates.

Could we create categories for branch rebates? Branches with 10-20 dues-paying members get X dollars back at end of year; branches with 20-50 members get XX dollars back at end of year; branches with 50 or more members get XXX dollars back at the end of the year. Would that be simpler administratively?

Rebates to branches or branch dues split. One proposal is to give branches a rebate at a percentage linked to the total of overall new and renewed memberships (including pledges)

sold by branch on a date other than December 31. Currently, some branches think they get a cut for every new membership sold by branch, but not on renewals or on on-line membership sales. At least two of us don't think that branches should get any rebates at all, but to many members it is important in principle. Current structure provides a disincentive to branches to encourage on-line renewals. An alternative would be to provide incentives in the form of other goods, like WILPF banners or buttons. Stuff coming from WILPF to branches needs to be useful. The rebate could be structured like a dividend, dependent on the organization overall meeting its financial goals.

If we put this on the ballot as part of the referendum it would give branches an incentive to vote for the new dues structure. Not all branches take a cut of new memberships; there is no uniformity or enforcement. We need to figure out how to encourage those who can to give more so they can help support the memberships of those who cannot. Can we afford to give money back to the branches when we aren't bringing in enough to support our office? Branches are already able to get some money back through the minigrant program. Last year's membership drive suggested an incentive program in terms of distributing WILPF banners and buttons. Maybe incentives should be based on renewals rather than new memberships. There were arguments against the idea of giving back money, and it makes more work for the staff.

Operating decision: Finance committee will do research to investigate the feasibility of converting the (assumed) new member dues split between branches and national with an annual dividend program modeled on consumer coops, and make a recommendation to steering by its February 2011 meeting. (Informal agreement)

This timeline is set to create the possibility that the branch roles and responsibilities document can be updated and approved before the spring membership drive commences.

d. Discussion about raising the price of life memberships to \$1500.

Should we keep life memberships? At \$500 they cost us money, although several life members also give regularly. People use life membership to bond with the organization. Is there an assumption that life membership confers some sort of special status or privileges to individual? Special privileges run counter to our goals of radical democracy and member participation. We only gain about \$3,000-\$5,000 annually from sales of life memberships; it would be easy to make it up through new memberships and renewals. Is it feasible to discontinue the program? Won't discontinuing it leave us with a two-tiered membership structure? Special privileges or special commitment to organization, similar to a tattoo? Should we sell WILPF logo tattoos at the 2011 Congress? If it's all about commitment, could we go to an "honorary" membership that is conferred by someone upon someone else, which includes a life subscription to *Peace and Freedom* but not voting rights or rights to run for office. Would honorary members be included in our member count for purposes of international assessment? Development would like to continue to use it as a "fundraising tool." They don't necessarily cost us money, but all life members should be recruited on the basis that they won't stop giving.

There was consensus that this will be done after the WILPF National Congress, so that we can sell \$500 life memberships during Congress.

Policy Decision: New life membership fee is \$1500, effective June 6, 2011. (Consensus; Nancy Munger and Pat O'Brien stand aside)

e. Concerns about the Membership Council.

We discussed whether there is some way to contain the time consumed in dealing with the membership council? Addressing their very real concerns doesn't seem to bring them into a less adversarial stance. At least one person on their latest letter has not been in touch with them for more than 6 months and did not actively sign the letter. We should not have published their article in *Peace and Freedom*. WILPF West gathering was pretty much people aligned with the Membership Council; they have come a long way and now think of themselves as wanting to be helpful. Some are active on the Program Committee. They are planning another meeting for Philadelphia soon. However, they still have not responded to our direct request to hear their grievances. One member in particular is reportedly very antagonistic and disruptive. Maybe it's good that we printed it; if we didn't we'd be accused of being bad people.

Sunday, October 24, 2010

In attendance:

Board members: Deb, Sandy, Georgia, Pat, Nancy, Audley, Laura, Robin, Ellen, Carol

Staff: Laurie, Linda

Guests: Purnima Bose

Agenda review and adjustment: 1) nominations report and discussion (process and recruitment); review of YWILPF by laws? What do we wish for future of YWILPF?; break; membership discussion; by-laws; new program for bringing women to CSW?; manifesto project in Bolivia; program review

7. Nominations report and discussion

Pat has prepared a report on the status of outreach and recruitment of nominees, but not of selection. Board members were confused about Nominating Committee Report. There was only one nomination for International Board Representative. Randa Solick is the chair of the Congress Committee. A question was raised about the mandate of the Nominating Committee. Does the Nominating Committee solicit nominations, vet candidates, then come up with a slate, and make recommendations if there are multiple candidates for a position? Pat reports that process includes soliciting nominations, recruiting people, interviewing, and making a recommendation to the board in the event that there is a midterm vacancy or on the International Board. At an International Congress, the nominating committee typically does prepare a slate with recommendations. US WILPF usually only has one person running for each position. No one wants to run a slate of candidates. Anyone who wants to run, and is eligible,

will be on the ballot. Criteria for eligibility for running for the US board is 2 years of being a WILPF member (defined as paid dues) prior to the election, submission of a completed application by the deadline (including a certain number of recommendations), participation in an interview with a member of the Nominating Committee, and writing a blurb on the candidate's vision for WILPF, except for the president or co-presidents, who are elected by the board. The committee lists the candidates for 2011-2014 board and each will be contacted by assigned committee members.

There were further questions about the process of electing president and co-president. Pat explained that there are two elections. One is by the whole membership. This is self-nomination, the candidates are vetted by the Nominating Committee, and their blurbs are sent to the whole membership. President or co-presidents are generally selected from the previous board but people can self-nominate for this position by meeting the deadline set for board candidates. The outgoing board then selects the new President(s) at the Spring board meeting prior to the National Congress. A question was posed about whether the Nominating Committee makes a recommendation for the presidential positions. There have been no hard and fast rules about the selection of presidents but rather the election operates by precedent. Pat encouraged the board to make the criteria tighter if that is what the board wishes.

Nancy left room for the moment.

Policy Decision: "Anyone who has been a member in good standing for 24 months immediately before the election deadline and submits a completed application with three references from current WILPF members, by the deadline, and participates in an interview by a member of the Nominating Committee shall be included on the ballot for election to the WILPF National Board." Proposal was made and consensed. Pat pointed out that the Fall *Peace & Freedom* (page 14) has board descriptions and qualifications.

Nancy returned to the room.

7. YWILPF

YWILPF was created in 2004 at the International Board meeting in London. During the 2007 strategic planning process, it was decided that one way to recruit young women was to allow them representation on the board. YWILPFers in the US were asked to constitute a core committee empowered to make decisions on behalf of the whole. But the individuals, chosen to represent YWILPF on the National board during the WILPF National Congress in 2008, quickly felt overwhelmed by Board work, and asked that they not be required to formally participate on the Board until fall, 2010, when the issue would be revisited. They were still welcome to attend Board meetings, which they did until spring 2010. YWILPF core committee members had their own internal struggles, contentious meetings, and eventually dissolved. They went from having a core committee to a dwindling committee, to no committee. YWILPF has a mailing list

of 140, but isn't really a virtual organization or a "real" organization either. The question was asked: "Do we want to focus on recruiting young women and how do we attract younger women?" Sandy reported her involvement in 1996 in Colorado to recruit women under 30. Were successful with recruiting 2 women, but they dropped the organization after 6 months because the amount of work. They then went on sabbatical to reflect on their experiences, but didn't come back to the organization.

The question was raised as to whether young women join YWILPF or WILPF? Answer: no YWILPF—they join WILPF. Audley spoke in strong support of recruiting young women. Deb stated that lots of effort and resources (as in the Saint Louis meeting and efforts toward getting them to attend Board meetings) have been directed at YWILPF with little practical payoff. Maybe it would be better come up with age-specific activities such as activities in high schools etc. rather than making it part of the organizational structure.

Pat wants to table discussion. Nancy wants to continue the discussion, 30 minutes left on the clock in terms of the agenda. Carol wants to continue the discussion—part of the problem is the older membership which is resistant to new ideas; opening practicum to inter-generational members is very productive. Kate Hawley in Oregon was a dynamo, but didn't involve older women. Giving young people responsibilities can be really good for the organization, as in the Reaching Critical Will initiative. This young generation has good organizing skills, Carol reports. Find room for them and let them make whatever contributions they want.

Georgia states that campus chapters only work if professors or staff are involved because of turnover among student leaders. The YWILPF have two positions on the board. We didn't integrate them. We should try to harness interns, aim for empty nesters, who have more time and are more willing to take risks. Young people have lots of things going on in their lives that make it difficult to be active.

Laura summarized discussion and asked if this board was arguing that we should focus resources and efforts to middle-aged and older women. Strong disagreement came from Carol, Georgia, and Nancy. Robin said the onus could be on local branches to recruit young members and on the practica staff. Audley suggested we encourage young women to join WILPF and she is enthusiastic about possibilities at Wellesley. Nancy states Y-WILPF came to the agreement that college/university chapter organizing was not the way to go because of turnover. UN Women are young and successful. How were young women brought into activism? Laura responded that it emerged out of work from Women's Studies and International Studies Program that educated women into the issues. Linda noted that many of the women came into the organization through the (unpaid) intern office. The interns are given free rein to determine their own agendas and follow their own passions. There is a generational disconnect: younger women have great organizing skills while older women come to it out of emotional commitment to the issues. The older women often squash the younger women's initiative, and treat them as secretaries and coffee gophers at international meeting rather than appreciating the resources they bring to the table.

Two proposals were floated by Laura:

1. Create a caucus so that young women can communicate with one another; can also have a Raging Grannies caucus, revive the GLBT, and institute a caucus for veterans and military families.
2. Converting two YWILPF positions to “promise positions” on the board. As outlined in the by-law proposals, these positions would be set aside to nurture emerging WILPF national leaders.

Ellen noted that current YWILPF structure doesn't seem to be working. Can the Branches do something about recruitment, to provide them with autonomy, space and development? Audley suggests inviting two women to the board meetings without any strings attached. Pat reports having received an email from a former YWILPF organizer expressing her disillusionment about how WILPF members treat one another at Board meetings. Deb suggests need to provide branches with ideas to recruit and involve young women since some branches might be better than other branches in this area. Carol states that in the past, the US National office gave young women very little responsibilities other than web design, in contrast to the Geneva Office which gave the younger women lots of responsibilities: one young woman heavily involved in Cluster Bomb Treaty. We need the young women and they need support. Try to nurture young women so that they affect change in the future, regardless of whether they remain WILPF members.

Sandy mentions that we typically push the recruitment off on the local branches, which assign grunt work to newer members. The Board models this bad dynamic. She sees WILPF as an incubator to nurture future activism. Nancy states that the problem of youth membership also extends to general diversity (fewer women of color). She is sympathetic to the desire to leave it to the local branches, but says there is a wide variety among local branches (some are active, others are not). She likes the caucus idea, action committees, set up YWILPF as virtual; nurturing young leadership.

Purnima wanted to know if WILPF has a Facebook page and suggested an intern could be assigned the task of increasing the visibility of the Facebook page.

8. Membership Council (relationship);

There was discomfort among board members about the decision to publish their piece in *Peace and Freedom*. The Membership Council cost WILPF National \$5,000 by using the staff and office for inspection of records and postponing the audit work. It was reported that they are holding a meeting in Philadelphia soon. It was requested that the board have a conversation about the relationship with the MC, since individual members are also WILPF members.

Ellen left the room.

Laura mentioned that some of the women are productive members of WILPF. She is worried that they channel most of their efforts toward the Membership Council, are abrasive in tone in their communications (she herself spends a lot of time doing damage mitigation), and siphon off resources. Robin was unaware of how much damage control is required of Laura. Robin doesn't see the published piece as controversial. She is outraged by the \$5,000 that WILPF expended. (Laurie reports that Millie recognized that this money was a burden, and suggested that they would try to reimburse the funds, but none has been forthcoming as of yet). She's hoping that the Congress can address this issue. Pat reports feeling bitter about the Membership Council. She feels attacked and noted the "vitriolic feedback" to WILPF's decisions.

Ellen returns to the meeting.

Nancy does not want to legitimize Membership Council as a group. They are non transparent and non accountable, along with being deceptive (aren't truthful about the nature and size of their membership). The co-presidents were "evicted" from their Transparency Meeting (!) in Des Moines, she reports. Nancy's request, on behalf of the board, in December 2009, for a meeting to discuss differences between the board and the Membership Council was never acknowledged. She says she has little respect for the group. There seems to be fundamental disagreements about the structure of WILPF and the organization, which disavows our status as a corporate body even though we are a corporate body. Deb agrees with Nancy's assessment. She adds that she has little tolerance for people who have been invited to meetings, but ignore the invitation to dialogue. They act like children holding a grudge. Ellen replies that she has known many of those activists for decades, one of whom she has had a relationship with spanning 40 years. She alluded to regional organization of WILPF. Many of these activists claim that WILPF has lost its vision. She says one of the MC members wanted to know why WILPF had to hire a lawyer as opposed to getting a pro-bono one. It was explained that we only had 5 days to respond, including the weekend, to find a lawyer, given the limits imposed on us by Pennsylvania state statutes.

Linda reminded the board that WILPF members have been a community and family, and suggested that these women are finding their sense of community in opposition to WILPF. She is sorry about this dynamic. Sandy, speaking as a WILPF member and not as a JAPA member, says she asked them at Palo Alto why they hadn't responded to Nancy's letter. It became clear that they had not really come to a consensus on how to respond. Sandy also described the dynamics surrounding the WILPF West Gathering and her decision not to attend. She is upset that a WILPF staff member had to devote so much time to organizing for their visit to the National office to view and copy records. Sandy also noted that the publication of their email and website in the *Peace and Freedom* could also siphon off WILPF membership. Audley states she is dismayed at seeing some WILPF members behave this way, and is sad.

Laurie finds it appalling that the board can't stand together and come to a collective decision to protect the use of our leadership's time. Our audit was delayed by the amount of time Laurie devoted to collecting information and meeting with them. If we get another request from

them, it is our understanding that Laurie is compelled by law to comply. But if this organization is to continue, the Board has to figure out how to stand up to them for the betterment of the organization at-large. Carol notes that there is a consensus about the Membership Council, and is sympathetic to Laura and Nancy for putting up with them. But she wants to note that in addition to Jeanmarie, who serves as the Membership Council representative, a number of those on the Membership Council also serve on the Program Committee. Carol feels that they work together well in spite of their antipathy toward Nancy and Laura for their involvement in the 2005-08 board. Carol doesn't feel that the Membership Council (MC) is undermining WILPF. Apart from a few members, who have built-in resentment, Carol feels like it is a functional relationship. Carol "wants tremendous energy" going into "fixing the world not destroying each other." Georgia feels that some members of the MC became upset when the regional structure dissolved because they felt that the grassroots were left out. We need to deflect and engage them in the real work, she advises. She noted that WILPF West is top-down structure even though they champion a grassroots organizational style. Their real agenda, she believes, is to bring down current WILPF leadership. She is worried that MC has drained WILPF efforts at the US Social Forum and UN. They are mean-spirited, which is visible in all their communications.

Laura summed up the discussion, and also reminded the board about the mini-grants that have been used to underwrite the travel expenses of some individuals named as part of the Membership Council. Deb noted that this problem is too difficult to solve in one weekend, but emphasized that the board needs to come up with a proposal that speaks with a unified voice. Robin encourages the drawing up of a timeline. Action proposals: 1) work to healing at Congress; 2) plan to protect the time of our co-presidents and staff; 3) draw up a timeline.

9. By-Laws (Discussion toward consensus)

a. Are there any by-laws that are important to put in place before elections? Laura suggests that notices of suggested by-law changes be sent to membership and invite them to join a conference call. Ask members who are present on the call to comment, then close comment session while the board has a discussion, and then consense. Board meetings that are scheduled outside the regularly scheduled two a year, require 60 days notice to the Board (but not the general membership).

b. There is no requirement that general membership be notified of by-law changes, but WILPF has tried to notify general membership out of desire for transparency. Decision was taken that notices be sent to the membership, about a board meeting that would be held by conference call in 60 days. Ask members who are present to comment, then close comment session, the board has a discussion, and consense. Carol stepped aside from the decision out of concern that MC are being shut out of the decision-making process. Others explained that MC can participate in the conference call and are thus part of the process. They also explained that it is within her right to propose by-law changes to be debated during the conference call. This operational decision was consensed and passed (CU stand aside).

Laurie left room

c. Nancy went through by-laws in the board package page by page.

[1] “Any member of the US Section may attend and participate in decisions the programming and proceedings.”; tagged as potentially difficult.

[2] Replace YWILPF with two Board Members; Phrase “Governance Committee” should be highlighted in green; this is tagged as potentially difficult.

[3] Meetings: B1, change one meeting to a virtual conference.

[4] D3 Clarification of terms: JAPA clarified the terms in their by-laws and Nancy thinks this is good. (Robin, Deb, Ellen, Mary and Georgia came in mid-term, and would be eligible to serve two additional terms). Add a “nine-year period” after “two consecutive three-year terms.” PO raised a question about the removal of titles from the version of by-laws that are being discussed. An updated version of the by-laws will be circulated.

[5] GP noted that the change dealing with the qualifications for the presidency will be contentious, in light of Ellen’s and Mary’s already declared candidacy for the position.

[6] Changing the concept of the Nominating Committee to a Governance Committee, NM urged people to look at THE BOARD CAFÉ for clarification of these terms.

By-Law changes generally are proposals based on experience. The By-Law changes under consideration here originated with the Board and by individual members.

- * When Libby attended, some by-laws were adopted, some were not.
- * Membership representation has been considered twice and rejected by the Board by those who consider membership development the responsibility of all board members.
- * Regina’s comments, submitted by e-mail before this meeting weren’t proposed changes to the By-Laws; they were just comments.
- * LB asked if there is a By-Law committee to go over the changes. LR responded in the negative, noting that the Board had to achieve consensus on all items.

[7] Board Meetings: won’t obligate the Board to meet in Boston and will allow audio or video conferencing.

- * DG read a comment from a member stating that at least 50-100 people should be able to log on and watch the meeting.
- * ES noted that some software allows 25 to log on, subject to \$15 per person.
- * PO suggested that a decision could be left to the Board discussion of the virtual meetings when they schedule a meeting of this nature.

[8] Discussion of the possibility of a Board member serving four consecutive terms (2 as Board member; 2 as President). NM pointed out that the Board has the capacity to limit some terms since it elects the Presidents.

[9] III. E regarding National Congress. NM feels this sentence is messy because it isn’t clear who is calling the meeting and proclaiming a quorum. Congress no longer makes policy decisions because it is a self-selected group, which has the money to travel to the Congress. MC has

feedback on this wording. LR inserted the language because lots of time went into responding to people who thought the Congress would be a decision-making body. Discussion about whether the sentence about the 50 quorum could end up hijacking the meeting. International Congress open to attendance by all but has delegates who can vote. ES said that if 50 people constituted themselves as a quorum and weren't accountable to a larger membership, this would be scary. Proposal agreed upon: change the sentence to "The National Board shall call a National Congress every three years and shall decide the dates and place. Any member of the US Section... may attend and participate." People at the Congress can make statements. NM stated that MC has concerns about the recourse for people to protest certain decisions. But she isn't sure about possible mechanisms. LR thinks that the place for recourse is in other places, and mandating some of the steps towards transparency (such as posting on the web the audit, minutes of the board, etc.). LR suggested that some of these issues be discussed at the spring 2011 Board meeting. PO urged everyone to move on.

Ellen left the meeting.

It was pointed out that there are two important issues to consider before the election, but these will be tabled for now. NM proposed that the next steering call continue to discuss the By-Law changes.

Ellen returned to the meeting.

Board members had been notified 55 days ago that By-Laws would be discussed so WILPF has followed its By-Laws. In the interests of transparency, however, there will be another 60-day notification period. The Steering Committee call must be held before November 4 because of January elections. Decision was made to consider 4 of the By-Law proposals this afternoon so that the Nominations Committee can do its work.

Nancy enumerated changes impact Nominating Committee:

P3 remove YWILPF wording

P6Va2 Two board members.....

LR increase capacity intended way to bring new leaders in---gateway

LBB..."to diversify" clarify

ES lack of clarity may be virtue....could be any number...MC comment....want job to be membership

LR elected positions additional pathway to participation for continuance and growth of the org

RL language...development of or charged with developing leadership

GP suggests language..."apprentice positions"with full voting rights...

P6

CU thinks ok if not previously on board

RL thinks ok if not previously on board

SS thinks ok if not previously on board

?intent...has come up before

Vibe: Laura

P8 VI6

Governance Committee in place of Nominating Committee

ES evaluate?

DG feels the change is not appropriate. We should be critiquing ourselves.

NM notes it is a struggle to keep committees full...this is being there all the time, having more responsibility, evaluations, dropped important things because no one paying attention, continuity for organization's sake

LBB reports JAPA evaluates every year, not complicated

GP like feedback loop good task, re-craft

PO change the job description for the committee and but keep the name Nominating

Others agreed upon 'Continuity' Committee or 'Continuations' Committee

Moving forward

Operational Decision: Board meeting via conference call to discuss by-law changes on December 28 at 9 a.m. PST/12 noon EST. (informal agreement)

10. Membership outreach and recruitment.

At best, we've received two memberships from the 5000 piece Social Workers outreach mailing.

In June, 1600 postcards mailed to WILPF members whose e-mail addresses we do not have. In July, we saw a bump up of about 110 new addresses registered with DIA. The monthly average otherwise is 40-50 sign ups. Also, we had an unusually high level of donations in July, which Laurie relates to the co-presidents' branch visits.

Presentation charts illustrating DIA open and click rates for e-messaging sent through that system. Open rates are very respectable and click through rates are excellent. The board is urged to support Laurie in learning more about the capacity of the DIA system and to make more effort in 2011 to reach out to non-WILPF constituencies, something that was included in the 2010 membership drive plan. If we send more e-mails, more WILPF e-mails will be opened and read; we want to bring more people to our website and in as subscribers and members.

At the last spring board meeting, we committed to updating and publishing (partly in paper and partly on line) a branch organizing packet. Audley and Pat have sorted through the documents in the office, but Pat never followed up to bring the project to a conclusion. Members in Greeley, CO, and Toledo, OH, are waiting for a branch organizing kit. The task has been passed on to the fall Program Intern. Ellen thinks that the membership committee might have some input for this, and she would like to involve them.

Action plan for limiting interference from the so-called Membership Council. Find a pro bono lawyer to explore steps we might be able to take to keep them from interfering with the day to day operations of the organization. Write them a letter laying out the costs, and telling them to not interfere with the work of WILPF staff. We are a corporation and corporations have some legal protections from those who try to sabotage their bottom line. Can we invoke that? But if the MC members are deeply integrated into our program structure there is no way to segregate them from our communications staff. We were surprised by some of the names Carol listed as women involved with the membership council; not one of those people are costing the organization in the ways we are enumerating. Our whole discussion of the bylaws today was shaped by our fear of the MC, and that shouldn't happen. Our fear is causing us to make decisions that are bad for the organization and wasting our staff's time.

They say they were concerned with the laying off of "their staff" and yet they are bullying and harassing our staff. Should the personnel committee be involved? Some have heard the MC is thinking about taking additional steps and holding it over our heads.

The board agreed to write a collective letter to Membership Council that all will approve and sign. Robin and Ellen will try drafting this and the NY Metro letter in hope that we have consensus on the text tomorrow.

11. Executive Session:

Topics: International Board Rep for 2011-14; JAPA concerns about JAPA personnel matters. No decisions were reached in Executive Session.

Monday, October 25, 2010

In attendance:

Board members: Audley, Deb, Ellen, Laura, Nancy, Robin, Sandy, Georgia, Carol

Staff: Laurie, Linda

Guests: Linda Greene

Agenda: Letters to Membership Council and NY Metro ; Collaboration (3-day); Editorial Policy Committee Report; Women at the CSW; Annual Appeal; Revised Draft Budget; Break; Program review; Schedule phone meeting to approve budget; 20 minute check out

9:00 open with Welcoming Statement.

12. Review of Letters written.

a. Letter to NY Metro Branch composed Saturday night by Robin and Ellen regarding coming into "good standing". Set three criteria the branch must meet:

1. Send out notice of and hold a membership meeting within the next 3 months, confirm/elect officers, discuss with your members ideas for using the bequest and send the minutes of this meeting to the WILPF office and JAPA.

2. Let them know they cannot be a 501c3 nor claim donations are tax deductible in any publications. Send documentation of these changes and show on the website when it goes up.
3. If Metro has members who have paid dues and who are not on the list recently sent to WILPF National, please forward their names and contact information and their dues payments.

These three requirements need to be accomplished by Feb 15th, or the funds will be dispersed as previously agreed to. Discussion took place around question about whom to send the letter to and if the three points are sufficient to demonstrate activity of a viable branch. Linda reports she is a member of Metro, but is totally unaware of any activity on the part of Metro beyond the October newsletter with the insert maligning WILPF national and JAPA regarding the distribution of money. Send it to all members in DIA or put it on the 'officers' to accomplish?

Operational Decision: If New York Metro defaults on the Bergson bequest, WILPF National will commit energy, resources and time to help members in the NY area to organize a viable NY metro branch. (Unanimous, Consensus)

b. Membership Council letter - composed on Sunday evening by Ellen and Robin. Board discussed what is happening now. The question was raised why we couldn't rely on corporate shield laws? Need to do more research to find out. Let the letter content perk and come back to it.

13. Editorial Policy subcommittee –

It was reported that the subcommittee has met a few times. Marge Van Cleef evidently does not want continued responsibility for convening it. Mary Bricker-Jenkins and Nancy Price offered to serve as volunteer editorial board if there are questions about using articles submitted. Some people were concerned that some articles are rejected without enough time to respond. Some material was submitted without research, expecting Theta (*Peace and Freedom* editor) to complete the article. Laura had sent 2 pages of suggestions including asking Theta to create three documents about how to write for each publication/e-news. Robin agreed to write up Carol's report, add Laura's material and create a document, relay that to Theta, and then it will come back to the board for approval.

Operational Decision: Authorize Laurie to contract with Theta (not to exceed \$900) to produce a series of three style sheets and offer a training via conference call to members of the Program/Issue committees on how to write for our various communication methods. (Sandy stood aside. Consensus)

14. Collaboration

Discussion of Collaboration meeting with all entities: JAPA, International, National – to take place over three days – as soon as possible/before congress. WILPF U.S. joined International in

requesting a collaboration meeting following JAPA's request to remove the voting privileges of ex-officio members of its board. No mention of venue was in the original proposal. The Collaboration Team would consist of the Co-Presidents + Staff. = 9 members + mediator. There was discussion to whether to commit to having the collaboration, although no details are available at this point.

Policy Decision: If we were to find an agreed upon facilitator, we are willing to make a 3-day, in person meeting happen of key staff and co-presidents before June 1st, 2001. Approved by consensus (Unanimous, no stand asides).

Operational decision: Authorize Laurie to move forward to work with JAPA & WILPF International to hire a facilitator. (Informal agreement by consensus.)

15. Development Committee, Robin

In anticipation of 100th anniversary, we need information to find grantors. It was suggested that Robin approach the Left-Tilt Foundation for a multi-year grant to help subsidize the salary of a National Director, but she wasn't sure how to write a capacity building grant and so did not apply.

Felicity Hill has asked us to help her approach US donors to support her research toward a biography of Edith Ballentine and associated interactive website which could be used to encourage branches to write their histories or to further develop and refine the manifesto for the 100th. Discussion was held on the function of Development Chair as traffic cop in terms of fielding requests to US-based WILPF donors (International has agreed that US WILPF is gatekeeper with regards to "asks" of these donors). Laura remarked that the interactive website in Felicity's proposal is essentially redundant with our own www.ja1325.org website in its capacity to capture stories of women peacemakers. WILPF is not solely about our legacy/history. Funders may be more interested in our potential to affect policy. Robin asks for more information on what to ask money for. Ellen says ask for money to do our work, as already defined in the draft budget. We have to raise money in 2011 for – Congress, etc.

16. 2011 national WILPF Budget, Ellen

Ellen presented the draft budget: She reports need to raise some money for scholarships to the WILPF congress. We are short \$11,000 at this point. Ellen thinks income projections are optimistic, but still conservative. There will be fundraising projects at Congress (henna tattoos, etc.) Details will be discussed at Finance Committee meetings, and then presented. But, she requests of other board members, be sure that the committees submit known projects that impact the budget. We are currently using a project-budgeting process. We need to move it over into our budget and allow for 10-15% overhead in expenses.

Break

In attendance after break:

Board members: Georgia, Carol, Ellen, Laura, Nancy, Sandy, Audley, Deb, Robin

Staff: Laurie, Linda

17. Program, Georgia and Carol.

Carol: Changing Every Nations' Thinking About Security (CENTS) is coming from Geneva and reflects WILPF Secretary General Madeleine Rees's approach to things which is to look at things through a human rights lens. It doesn't change our priorities but rather how we frame them. We have all these important human rights treaties, in part due to the work of Edith Ballentine, which include the economic justice issues that don't directly appear in our program priorities. Carol has written to Geneva to ask if we can begin disseminating CENTS, which is now being called Operation 26, referring to Article 26 of the UN Charter which mandates that UN member states spend as little as possible on defense (and nothing on aggression). Carol would like to send it around to the branches, but first to the program committee, as both PowerPoint and document to think about as they set their goals for the coming year. It is a reconceptualization of what security means; getting away from national security to human security, human rights, human development and care of the earth. This is consistent with programs some branches, like Portland, have done, on women-defined security. Also fits into what other groups are doing around redefining security. Laura likes CENTS because it is outcome-based: the challenge for the US Section is to agree on a specific goal that will reduce the US military budget. Consistent language is important in building unity and identity.

CENTS can help us disseminate the SMART planning model, which is outcome based. Carol would like Nancy and Laura to send the program co-chairs the PowerPoint on SMART so that they can reinforce use of the SMART model among issue committees. We can also do a workshop at Congress and think about how to train the branches in using this tool. These materials could be mounted on the issue committee webpage. Even at AFSC, where they are also trying to use SMART, people keep having problems setting achievable goals. The new version of the Issue Committee annual report includes asking committees to set measurable goals, against which 2011 performance can be assessed. In a sense, we are already asking the mini-grant recipients to use this planning model in writing their grants and reporting on them. Maybe the board should be using it, too?

Issue committees are supposed to give a report at the end of the calendar year, but this is not the best time to ask for this. It might be better to build the issue committee calendar around the "programming year" so that "year-end" reports are due in May or June (although we'd definitely want them before Congress). It gets complicated because some issue committees also have minigrants and minigrant projects do not follow any standard "year"; each is unique in its activity timeline. This year's issue committee report form is much clearer about racial justice considerations to encourage issue committees to seriously reflect on this dimension of their work.

We are learning by doing with the minigrant program. We have made some mistakes, in particular around figuring out how much money we've committed vs. how much money has been allocated to the program in any budget year. In 2008, \$14,000 was allocated to 5 branches and 4 issue committees. Of the issue committees, two of them failed. It is harder for issue committees to fulfill their grants because they don't have the camaraderie or accountability of face-to-face community. A third, to DISARM, was planned to last 18 months and did. It has been difficult to gather all the materials needed for the final report but the results are good. When this is filed, all the 2008 grants will be closed. Taking off from the DISARM minigrant, a question could be added to the 2010 branch survey about participation in the Nuclear Free Future campaign. We should also ask minigrant recipients to discuss the impact of their project on WILPF US Section as a whole.

Should we be concerned about the failure of PADWIC and the weakness of BBC (Building Beloved Community)?

The report on the 2009 projects is still in process, and 2010 has just begun. Program Co-chairs have submitted a table showing timelines for the various projects still active. The 2009 minigrant program did not disburse the full \$14,000 budgeted because of a misunderstanding on the part of Carol. Georgia is now following up with 2009 recipients to complete their reports. We've received a beautiful report from Ashland, and their activities are replicable. We also have a report from Prop 1, the bulk of expenditures going to support a walk from D.C. to the NPT.

Issue committee retreat was very productive and program recommends that an issue committee retreat be scheduled in conjunction with the National Congress or near the beginning of the next board term. The synergetic WILPF workshop was terrific for building WILPF solidarity as an organization and working relationships among our issue committee people. In terms of drawing external audiences, it may be better to offer workshops on a specific part of our agenda rather than all of it. Laura has spoken to Terry Fotvoye Micus about a story on the Social Forum process and People's Movement Assemblies for the spring issue of *Peace and Freedom*. Carol believes that all members of the program committee will want to have a voice in that.

Program committee listserv is being used as a discussion forum by some members, and this is frustrating some committee members. The proposal passed earlier today will help accommodate the program committee's request for training in using the DIA tools (e-alerts, actions, and newsletters).

19. Development Committee Continued:

Preliminary figures on ND fundraising calls—as of right now we have almost \$3000, and Robin has a pledge of \$3000 by end of year.

Whose word is final on Annual Appeal? Development committee plus Laura and Nancy. Needs to go to printer by end of this week.

Robin is planning an event in NYC on Human Rights Day, December 10, to honor Peggy Lipschitz. CUNY will provide auditorium for screening of film and refreshments. Center for Constitutional Rights has established a fund in honor of Rhonda Copeland. Robin will propose that Peggy receive the first award from the fund. May Jerry, the producer of the film, will fundraise among Peggy's friends in the Chicago area to pay for Peggy's travel. Robin would like to see WILPF have a long-term partnership with the Center for Constitutional Rights around our human rights work. This will not cost us any staff time or money, it is merely a matter of association.

20. PARKING LOT ITEMS:

Explore advantages of dissolving inactive branches?

Should we let MC accusations about by-laws stand unchallenged?

12:15. Georgia left.

Continued discussion of NY Metro branch relations vis-à-vis national/development events in NYC. Robin has invited two members of NY Metro to a small catered dinner with Madeleine Rees. It is fine for a large area like Manhattan to have more than one branch, but is now the time to assist in the formation of a new NY branch? Could folks be asked to join the Rhonda Copelan Human Rights committee of the NY Metro branch?

Policy Decision: We ask that any effort to establish a 2nd branch in NYC be postponed until after the Bergeson bequest matter is closed. If the US section sponsors events in NYC during the interim, we will use the US Section brochure and encourage on-line payment of dues.
(Unanimous)

Meeting adjourned 12:40 p.m. Monday.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Deborah Garretson, Secretary of the Board
January 25, 2011

