

**Journey Toward Wholeness Transformation Committee**  
**Conference Call Meeting Notes**  
**January 8, 2010**

**Present Members:** Helen Boxwill; Taquiena Boston, *President's Representative*; Connie Brown; Natalie Fenimore; Michael Sallwasser, *Co-chair*; Arthur Tackman; Wendy von Zirpolo, *Co-chair*; Tracy Ahlquist, *Staff Support*

**Not Present:** José Ballester, *Board Liaison*; Scott McNeill

**Start Time:** 12:00 PM Eastern Time

**End Time:** 1:43 PM Eastern Time

Topic	Discussion	Decisions/Actions
Opening Words – <b>Wendy</b>	<b>Wendy</b> offered opening words from W.E.B. DuBois.	
Reading from Our Covenant – <b>Connie</b> and <b>Scott</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>assume the best of intentions from all committee members as we share in this work together – <b>Connie</b></li> <li>commit to sharing responsibilities, attending meetings, honoring deadlines, and communicating /negotiating changes to the best of our ability – <b>Michael</b></li> </ul>	
Check-in – <b>Michael</b>	The committee members checked in. <b>Wendy</b> shared her observations that, in group meetings, it seemed distracting at times to pass facilitation back and forth—she and <b>Michael</b> would like to alternate facilitation between meetings, rather than changing facilitators multiple times within any given short meeting.	
Approve Minutes /Agenda Review – <b>Michael</b>	Minutes and agenda were approved.	
Report Back: Meeting w/CoC Chair – <b>Wendy</b> and <b>Michael</b>	<b>Michael:</b> Co-chairs and Janice met with Elizabeth Greene, the chair of the CoC. They had an initial conversation and then a follow-up conversation—these were worthwhile, intentional conversations. The three of them had agreed to have an additional conversation, which hasn't happened yet. <b>Wendy:</b> There was a collective feeling that in addition to being heard, there were lessons for the CoC to glean, as well as for any other committee that has co-chairs. One of the next steps is to try and document it as a case study. Are there lessons that might be passed on? <b>Arthur</b> feels that there needs to be more transparency during this process—the rest of the committee	

	<p>hasn't really heard very much about the content of these conversations. Also, the JTWTC has had the tradition of selecting its own co-chairs; did the CoC not understand that? Or did they make the decision to override that agreement? <b>Wendy</b> believes that there are a variety of perceptions—the choosing of chairs may have been perceived differently by the JTWTC and the CoC. There's a wish for clarity about that. <b>Helen</b> feels like there's a difference of historical understandings and perceptions; there's also the piece about one chairperson not feeling heard or addressed. <b>Michael</b> says that was addressed very forthrightly in their meetings with Elizabeth. All three JTWTC members present expressed that there were failings in the way the CoC dealt with communication with the co-chairs. Elizabeth took ownership of the best practices that weren't in place. <b>Wendy</b> and <b>Michael</b> also noted that they're both acutely aware of the need for continual communication and making sure both co-chairs are included. <b>Wendy</b>: it was even more important because one of the co-chairs was a person from a historically marginalized identity, and especially so considering the work of the JTWTC.</p>	
<p>Status: Current Assessment</p> <p>Interview Report – <b>Wendy</b></p> <p>Focal Issues – <b>Arthur</b></p> <p>Introduction – <b>Connie</b></p> <p>On-Line Survey Analysis – <b>Michael</b></p>	<p>Susan, <b>Helen</b>, and <b>Wendy</b> will speak next week regarding which stories should be included in the final report. <b>Connie</b> asks for clarity in the report as to how many committee members and chairs—current and past—were interviewed.</p> <p><b>Arthur</b> didn't receive any responses to the question he raised regarding what the focal points of the report will be.</p> <p>The suggested list of issues to be covered (from <b>Arthur</b>'s original list, added to during this call):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Recruitment &amp; selection</li> <li>2) Awareness and training of ARAOMC by NomCom and CoC members, and lived practice/ internal processes of committees</li> <li>3) Orientation, support &amp; retention - Awareness and training of selectees</li> </ol> <p><b>Natalie</b> still hasn't received complete demographic data. <b>Arthur</b> suggests that the committee choose foci and start writing—at that point, the folks writing those sections may discover that they don't have a great deal of data on particular subject areas. <b>Michael</b>: what does orientation mean? <b>Arthur</b>: it can focus either on the people who are appointed or elected, or it</p>	<p>Co-chairs and Tracy will finalize the contract for Susan Gore for the additional \$1000 to include follow-up stories.</p> <p>Committee members will read <b>Connie</b>'s draft of the introduction and will give feedback.</p> <p><b>Wendy</b> will draft an email to the current &amp; past chairs of NomCom &amp; CoC to ask who resigned and who was not reappointed during their tenure.</p> <p>Co-chairs will contact <b>José</b> and the Moderator to pose the question of delaying the report to the BoT.</p> <p><b>Wendy</b> will take a stab at the questions to committee chairs re: members who weren't retained, and the rest of the committee will make suggestions. Once the list is finalized, <b>Helen</b> will put it into Survey Monkey.</p> <p><b>Connie</b> will add the documentation and the</p>

	<p>could focus on the NomCom &amp; CoC committee members. <b>Wendy</b>: also, is there any orientation for the committee that has a new incoming member who may have an identity that the committee hasn't come into contact with. <b>Taquiena</b>: the training for appointed &amp; elected leaders fulfills some of that orientation piece, but the needs of various committees differ. There are probably many different kinds of ways in which committee members are oriented to their duties. <b>Connie</b> did a first pass at the introduction for the report. She kept some of the last report's language (headings, etc.) and put in additional language that was specific to this study. That said, the new subject areas will need to be incorporated/expanded as the report develops, since the introduction focused on recruitment, selection and retention. She also needs information about the limits of the study. <b>Helen</b> said that, in speaking with Nancy Lawrence, she asked whether it would be possible to determine how long members had stayed on a given committee; it's not very possible to do so, given the way the data is organized.</p> <p><b>Arthur</b> suggests that the committee decide which members are working on which foci; the Susan Gore interviews will provide the meat of the data. <b>Wendy</b> asks if there's a way to go back and try to determine the reasons why retention did or didn't happen. <b>Natalie</b> says this is a discussion of different kinds of data—lived practice/anecdotal information is one thing, but that won't necessarily be supported by data in the same way as other parts of the report are. <b>Michael</b> says that the committee has already explored many avenues of collecting data, and it might be difficult to get further information at this point. <b>Connie</b> agrees, but says that the retention piece might end up being the crux of the issue. It's a very instructional piece if the JTWTC can add to their understanding—it's the area where we'll fall most short of data. <b>Natalie</b> would also like to see it included, but it's not going to be able to be done in the same way in terms of getting data—is there a way to find a few people and create a narrative, then acknowledge that this is a different way of assessing? <b>Wendy</b> suggests calling the recent chairs and asking which members resigned during their tenure. She also asks whether the April deadline was self-imposed, or assigned by the Board. Could the committee delay and distribute the report in June? <b>Michael</b> and <b>Helen</b> agree that the retention piece is crucial, and that it might be appropriate to extend the deadline.</p>	<p>online survey to the introductory piece.</p> <p><b>Michael</b> will check in with <b>José, Scott,</b> and <b>Natalie</b> to ask what their preferences are in terms of the report.</p> <p>Teams will work on writing the introduction/standardizing what they include in each definition.</p> <p><b>Michael</b> will also send out comprehensive information on the survey to date, and the survey questions.</p>
--	--	--

	<p><b>Connie</b> asks what other committees do—<b>Taquienna</b> isn't familiar with other committees that do this work. <b>Michael</b> asks if the committee could present the results of the report without first sharing it with the Board at the April meeting—is that required? Could it be sent to them a month before GA?</p> <p><b>Taquienna</b> suggests that the question be submitted directly to the BoT. <b>Michael</b> says that raising the question of retention may be the value of the report—pointing out that the information isn't readily available, and there might be value in figuring out what makes people leave. <b>Wendy</b> doesn't disagree, but also thinks that the report will just sit as a result. <b>Helen</b> asks if there's a way to send out a short online survey...<b>Wendy</b>: that asks who resigned or wasn't reappointed. <b>Connie</b> would like to ask whether there was any follow-up. <b>Arthur</b> would like to ask whether the person in question was from a historically marginalized identity group. He also points out that it's already been two years that this assessment has been going on. He's comfortable if the BoT is ok with it. Prior to this, the committee had two products, two years in a row. The JTWTC is here to serve the BoT. <b>Wendy</b> thinks the final report from Susan Gore will most likely come at the end of January.</p> <p><b>Michael</b> suggests that teams take a look at what information is available on each of the focus areas and then start compiling that information.</p> <p>1) Recruitment &amp; selection—<b>Arthur</b>, maybe <b>José</b>?  2) Awareness and training of ARAOMC by NomCom and CoC members, and lived practice/ internal processes of committees—<b>Scott</b>?  3) Orientation, support &amp; retention - Awareness and training of selectees—<b>Connie, Helen, Wendy</b></p> <p>Each team will work on writing a definition/explaining what they're doing &amp; looking at. "X" includes/involves...</p>	
Planning: GA Program – <b>Everyone</b>	<p><b>Michael</b>: This program had centered around presuming that the committee would have a report in-hand. What does the program look like if that's not the case? <b>Wendy</b> asks if a significant part of the March meeting might/should be devoted to planning the workshop. <b>Connie</b> says that the committee already has information about most of the report—it's only the retention piece that remains to be determined.</p>	<p><b>Michael</b> will review options for the GA workshop, and will send around an email to gauge opinions.</p>

Status: New Member Guide – <b>Scott</b>	<b>Scott</b> wasn't on the call.	
Status: Meeting w/BoT – <b>José</b>	<b>José</b> wasn't on the call.	
Meeting Schedule – <b>Michael</b>	It's much more convenient to have a set time to meet every month. It makes it easier to plan, and to protect that time.	Committee members will send their availability to <b>Wendy</b> —what days of the week/month/times are best, and what will never work? <b>Wendy</b> will then send out a Meeting Wizard request with more specific information.
Review of Action Items – <b>Tracy</b>	The committee reviewed the action items generated on the call.	Committee members will book their travel for the March meeting in Boston.
Covenant Observation – <b>Connie</b> and <b>Michael</b>	<b>Connie</b> and <b>Michael</b> gave covenant observations.	

Respectfully submitted,  
Tracy Ahlquist  
January 8, 2010