

August 27 – Notes from brief meeting to delay action approved at July Board Meeting.

David Wiebe - Assume we agree on the goal of some strategic planning.

Glen Yancey – Not necessarily. Believes that fundraising would fundamentally change the character of the organization and where the groundswell was that drives the issue of strategic planning. Don't really believe that a brief planning session will get us there. If you want to see the mission of the organization, look at the bylaws. It includes education and that would be a

Rick Cagan – my interest is not in the c-3 discussion. I don't believe we need to establish a c-3. The mission-only kind of propels us out into the world. I think a substantive strategic planning process is in order. It is not premised on the c-3 thing.

Glen – what are the dramatic changes that have taken place?

Rick – the organization and the environment.

David – to me, the core question is whether or not we should expand our membership base and not fundraising.

Glen – the thrust of what Jim suggested was fundraising based on

Sue – feels like the tail wagging the dog. Broader membership would generate revenue and more contacts and ability to educate the public. I am staunchly opposed to developing another 501 c-3.

Carol – what is the problem we are trying to solve? Look at all of us scurrying around to respond to a proposal that was brought to us. We had quite a discussion in our advocacy group in June about what we do and how much we can do based on the time constraints of the members who do the work. We all come for the education and information but as far as signing up to do much more, not sure I can sign up for that.

JoLana – would need to discuss the issue of full-time staff. Is that part of the issue? Time is a precious commodity these days.

Glen – a 501 c-3 subsidiary would have to have its own staff.

Rick – this is not the strategic planning session. I think we are confusing the discussion with the c-3.

Carol – shouldn't there be a conversation about

Glea – can't we just look at the bylaws and talk about how we want to move forward without facilitators? I'm also against the 501 c-3 part because I don't want to take on more.

Glen – would like to know what our creators intended.

Steve – no point in looking back. Our history is in the bylaws.

David – is it worth sitting down in a guided discussion to cover some of these topics?

Sue – why not just review the bylaws at our next Board meeting for an hour and a half. We shouldn't need a facilitator to do that. Then, we could talk about whether or not we want to move on and do anything further.

Jolana – bylaws aren't set in stone.

Could we defer to October? Rick doesn't want to bump the Advocacy Committee.

Start with the Bylaws Review at the next Board Meeting in September.