

DREAM Board Meeting Agenda

December 20, 2006

DREAM Office

5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

Chair Report

(old business and new business)

Chair, Jon Harris

(5:30pm)

Q & A*

(answers to questions brought up through homework)

Executive Director, Mike Loner

(5:40 pm)

Discussion #1: DREAM Staffing

Mike Loner

(6:00)

Mike Loner has weighed DREAM's staffing options with current staff, and he will discuss DREAM's future staffing with the board

Executive Session: Discussion #2: "What is the role of the board in DREAM?"

Jon Harris

(6:45)

This discussion will begin to answer the question "What is the board's role in DREAM?" We will take a big step back from our monthly work and asking ourselves, "Are we a reactive or proactive board?" Each board member should prepare for this meeting by reflecting on your experience – this meeting will be the time to voice the things you love about the board or the things you would like to see improved!

Question to consider

- Do you feel like we are inspiring and directing DREAM?
- What is DREAM's board-staff relationship?
- What is our forward movement with the Carver Model?
- Do you feel like you understand DREAM's vision or strategy to achieve that mission?
- Are you inspired by your volunteerism on the board?

Comments from the December HW

1) Last Meeting Minutes – Accept

2) State of DREAM Report – Mike Loner

- For some reason I thought that the goal for the appeal was less than \$45K, but oh well, aim high! Seems like Daniel has done an outstanding job running this, working crazy hours, and it's great to see his effort paying off. Glad to hear that you're moving forward with the AmeriCorps staff option... looking forward to more discussion on this.
- That's a lot of great news on one page! I'm excited to see the possibilities that may exist with new landlords at Armory Square. So much other excitement to catch up on, with expansion and growth plans underway...

3) New Policy Monitoring

EL 9

EL 9.1 reject

- It's clear that DREAM is succeeding on all of these fronts. Awesome.
- I'd love to get more detail on how DREAM is "increasing/strengthening membership," "improving financial ability," and "building ownership among all its stakeholders."

EL 9.2 – 9.4 Accept

- Comment to EL 9.4 - What do you do to evaluate mentors who leave DREAM mid-year or mid-college career?

EL 9.5-9.9 Accept

- Comment to EL 9.9 - Contagious energy is what runs DREAM's engine, but I have a small concern that contagious energy in the office can occasionally create a mob mentality... so just make sure there is room for dissent.

EL 9.10 Accept

- Comment to EL 9.10 – Seems more appropriate for the Board Chair to do anyway.

EL 9.11 Accept

- We can probably train more, or require, the Board to study the model.
- If this is not something that you do and is now a board member's responsibility, perhaps we should move this policy to where it will be monitored as such (i.e. as part of the Governing policies).

EL 9.12 Rejected

- Let's discuss it
- That sounds like a huge amount of work for the ED, and probably unnecessary.
- Good question – I would think that gathering the perspective of the staff and mentors could be invaluable in some instances. They are a great resource and have their own strong beliefs in how DREAM operates.

- I wrote reject because I agree with Mike L that this policy is vague. I would suggest that we reword this policy to say, " The ED shall not fail to notify parties discussed in a policy report to the board under the following circumstances:
 - the ED makes a personal judgement that notification of relevant parties is necessary for the policy report
 - the board requests information from the relevant parties
 Any decision for notification should be held enough in advance of the policy discussion to allow comment from the relevant party. If desired, people affected by the policy should make their opinions about the policy known to the Board Chair. Comment does not mean that changes will be made to reflect comments, just that comments will be heard and noted."

EL 10

EL 10.1-10.2 Accepted

Governance Process

GP 1.1

- I look forward to discussing this. A good majority of this Board is new – now is the time to look towards the future – now that we are caught up with how things operate.
- It's been a whirlwind of learning!

GP 1.2 Rejected

- I agree – I am excited to talk about proactive vs. reactive work and how we can help engage in DREAM's crafting of long-term plans/vision
- But close to Accept. In some ways, the Board is reactionary. But with more long-term projects, I believe the Board helps to be a sounding board on decisions, helps to develop long-term goals. The Board Priorities activity was certainly geared this way – ensuring that policy reflects the long range plans of DREAM.
- I feel that the EL monitoring has taken up too much of the Board's time and makes us more reactive than proactive. I'm glad we'll be changing our approach in 2007.

GP 1.3 - Accepted

- Kudos to Jon for setting a very high bar when it comes to participation.

GP 1.4 Accepted

- We used to have forms for self-evaluation by individual board members to complete at the end of each meeting....not sure where they are....

GP 2.1 Rejected

- I'm not convinced that we should be the ones 'producing' the link. While it's important for us to understand the link, and to make sure that the organization is serving its owners, I think it's more practical to let the staff actually form the link with owners.

GP 2.2a-2.2b Accepted

- Comment to GP 2.2b We'll be tight with Staff Ends

GP 2.2c-2.2d Accepted

- Comment to GP 2.2d - I don't have any previous Board experience, but I do feel that communication lines are wide open between the board and the ED.

GP 2.3-4.1 Accepted

- Excellent job, there's a lot to juggle!

GP 4.2 Accepted

- The individual attention Jon gives each of us is wonderful and I think it helps to make us better Board members.

GP 4.3-4.6 Accepted

GP 5.1 Accepted

- Just curious, what sorts of conflict of interest might we encounter? Not sure what I should be looking out for.

GP 5.2a-c Accepted

- Um, yeah. I don't know that law either. Again, I'd like to know more about potential conflicts of interest since I'm not sure what form they might take.
- Agree, I'm not familiar with this policy also...

GP 5.2 d Accepted

- Where are my f-ing gifts.

GP 5.2 e Accepted

- Chad Butt is my brother. Fire him immediately.
OK, sorry, it's late... I'll be serious now.

GP 5.2 f Accepted

- What about staff? Daniel or Jen may run for office. It seems to me that they should be able to use their DREAM experience to establish credibility.

GP 5.2 g-i Accepted

GP 5.2 j Accepted

- Again, I'm curious about other potential forms of conflict of interest.

GP 5.2 k-5.6 – Accepted

GP 5.6a.i – Accepted

- More training is always welcome. I'm still working on a more detailed understanding – I get the basic model but can not always apply the philosophy

GP 5.6a.ii. – Accepted

GP 5.6a.iii – rejected

- I'm not convinced that we make enough of an effort to get to know our ownership or provide them with a means to share their values/viewpoints.

GP 5.6b.i – 5.6b.iii. – Accepted

4) Board Proposals

A) Karen Hendy: Staff Ends – rejected

- Thoughts: I think this could be a great starting point to creating staff ends that embody the knowledge, personal/professional growth, skills, changes in life direction that we would like to see. It seems a little hard to measure (and more like a job description) here, but could be revised to reflect these ideas in "Ends" language. I would recommend a board member take the next crack (following discussion on Wednesday) and present this back to Mike, Jen and Chad.

B) Jon Harris- Community Ends – rejected

- First, they look great. (Reject sounds so harsh!) Just a couple of comments:

For Ends 5B – Would we want to add a “support” statement similar to 5A.3? (Or expand on 5B.2?) Is it part of the mission to encourage the colleges to support the mentors and their programs – financially or through other resources like meeting space, activities, fundraising on campus, etc.? And while we’re at it, let’s energize our partners, too! (5C) It’s certainly been a side effect here at Ben & Jerry’s, but maybe that’s just the after glow, not a planned result. ;)

- Looking great! Worth the extra discussion we had at the last meeting, I think. One very small suggestion – change “realize” to “recognize” in C2.
- Can we take out the word unit? Just make it subsidized housing communities? In A. 2., I suggest changing the word *feel* to *are* and in B. 3., changing *feel* to *is*
- I really like defining this in three parts. A1, A2, and C2 seem hard to measure....perhaps this is something we can capture through survey data (like we did with children’s ends)??