

The Interim Board met at 2:15 on April 2, 2011 at Jorge's restaurant. In attendance: Diane Owens, Mike Ignatowski, Joanne Richards, Martine Torres-Aponte, Stewart, Snider, Teresa Taylor, Dave Rawlins, and CP Austin friends Russ Owens and Jeannine Caracciolo. Absent: Tanya Tussing.

A. Joanne raised the question of where to store meeting information including board meeting minutes, meeting summaries, speakers, and educational materials. By acclamation, the board agreed to store all electronic information on the CP Austin website.

B. Joanne asked about regular board meetings, and Diane suggested that the board regularly meet the first Saturday immediately after the MIP meeting. All agreed.

C. Joanne raised the question about how to handle CPM USA's calls to action, and whether or not this will divert attention from CP Austin goals. Diane suggested these action requests are not mandatory, so there is no requirement for Austin to "drop" anything to comply. Stewart suggested that Austin handle these requests by any of the following actions: posting them on the Austin Facebook page, writing a blog post, and announcing these actions at our meetings. There is no need for us to repeat any National emails to our Austin list, since many people subscribe to both lists. All accepted this approach. Diane, who currently serves on the national leadership team, asserted that National asked the meeting attendees to consider volunteering in the national effort right now. The transition team is currently determining the tasks needed for a solidified CPM USA structure.

D. Dave suggested that we create unique email addresses for topics and events the group is promoting. For example: [redistrictingreform@coffeepartyaustin.org](mailto:redistrictingreform@coffeepartyaustin.org). If we send multiple email blasts on the subject of redistricting, we should send it out using this address as the reply-to. This will help catch the attention of the recipient and underscore the nature of the email, and will also make it easy to direct responses to the person responsible for that issue/topic. There was a question about the expense of adding email addresses, and Joanne will ask webmaster Ham about this. If the cost is reasonable, all accepted this idea.

E. Stewart expressed a desire to standardize an email blast format and timing schedule. Attendees agreed that for any Saturday meeting, the first email should go out the afternoon of the Monday before, then a short reminder the morning of the Friday before. Emails should have only one topic, and reminders should only contain the topic, speaker name and time/place, and should have an embedded link to the first email in case the recipient needs all

the information. Creative subject lines will help our open rate. Different approaches should be tried and any resulting open rate differences should be noted. Joanne mentioned that we should make a better effort to reach out to UT students by sending key UT organizations o announcements of our meetings.

F. Joanne asked how our permanent board members should be selected. She suggested that CPM USA is using a BoardSource document to guide them in that process and suggested we might follow that lead. Dave, Joanne and Martine agreed to study the BoardSource document and our national bylaws and create a procedure for CP Austin to select and maintain a permanent board. Martine suggested that the CP Austin interim board create a list of needs and that this list be regularly maintained. Joanne suggested that any potential board member, including interim board members, fill out an "application" form that lists their skills and desires. Thereafter, the board member selection process should largely be an effort to find the best skills/needs match.

G Martine advocated that any board decision be based on consensus instead of majority rule, because she has seen so many cases in other organizations where differences decided by majority vote tended to be very divisive and created factions that were subsequently adversarial. Diane and Joanne expressed concern that requiring unanimous agreement could prevent the board from making important decisions if one member were to abuse the power of their vote. Martine replied that there are parliamentary ways to deal with such a board member, and that this will be exceedingly rare because members will know from the outset that board participation will require a high degree of collaboration. Martine also suggested that it is possible to strive for consensus but after two attempts to reach consensus has failed a vote could be taken. Mike volunteered to review the bylaws, with Martine, in connection with the consensus model. This discussion closed with Martine promising to draft a formal proposal and present to CP Austin's interim board.

Afterthoughts from composing and revising these minutes:

Stewart: One of the strengths of our community discussion plan has been the fact that they will be consensus-based. Our board should "walk its talk" and conduct our business this way, too.  
Also: The decision to decide by consensus must itself be made by consensus.

Joanne: Shouldn't such a major change to the bylaws (consensus) be proposed to and considered by the permanent board?

H. Joanne asked when our annual meeting should take place. Martine questioned the need for an annual meeting. Joanne stated that members of

some organizations never attend regular meetings, but do attend annual meetings, and that we should capture all the member energy we can. This discussion closed with an informal agreement that such a meeting is a good idea.

I. Dave asked about check signing authority, and suggested that any check written in excess of \$500 must have two board member signatures. This proposal was agreed to by acclamation.

J Diane presented CP Austin's financial ledger, and asked if Joanne, Diane and Stewart should be reimbursed for some major expenses they had paid out of their own pocket. Dave moved for payment, Stewart called the vote and there was unanimous agreement to reimburse these expenses, which leaves \$299.43 in our account. [Total net received - total reimbursable expenses: \$1329.66 - \$1030.23 = \$299.43] The one certain budget item we have right now is the Constant Contact yearly renewal, which costs approximately \$250 and is due in October.

K There was some discussion on how to manage relationships with other organizations. In particular, how will we partner with LWV-TX on the community discussion project in light of the fact that LWV will be the de-facto lead on this effort and will collect all grants and donations under its (c)(3) education arm. Stewart agreed to create a guideline that outlines the responsibilities of each organization to minimize any misunderstanding of this partnership. He will present this to the CP interim (?) Austin board and upon agreement, will present to the LWV-TX board for approval.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.