



Nominating Committee Meeting Minutes - January 25, 2018 Ten Pin Building Mezzanine

Present

Board: Mary Ella Anderson, Ed Smith, Cheri Strong, James Kloor

Staff: Emily Walter, Melanie Bettenhausen

Members: None

1. Welcome and Review

The meeting commenced at 6:00pm by Cheri.

2. Approve Minutes

MOTION: Approve the November 9, 2017 minutes.

Motion passed by consensus.

3. Member Correspondence

The group discussed a letter from John Lucas proposing to include surveys with the election ballot.

- Ed – including a survey with the election ballot could be confusing.
- Cheri – member surveys would work better with other membership mailings, such as the patronage refund.
- Melanie – Marketing is planning on doing more focused member surveys. Overall, we currently have a good process for getting member feedback, when needed, before the board makes decisions.

The group decided to continue surveying members in multiple ways, but not with the election ballot.

ACTION: Emily will draft a response letter to John Lucas for Cheri to sign.

4. Election Timeline

The group decided to keep an election timeline similar to the 2017 timeline with minor adjustments. The group discussed what type of “meet the candidate” event to have. It was decided to host an election kick-off and meet the candidate event at Arts Alive in Eureka on Saturday, October 6.

MOTION: Recommend to the board to hold the Annual Membership Meeting on October 21, 2018

Motion passed by consensus.

ACTION: Emily will provide a draft 2018 election timeline for review at the February NC.

ACTION: Marketing will look into a venue at Arts Alive in October to host an election kick-off event.

5. Board Application Process

The group discussed the idea of requiring a candidate to gather a determined number of signatures from members as part of the application process. Some thought requiring this would encourage candidates to engage with members and some worried it would deter people from wanting to apply.

The group then discussed qualifications, and what could disqualify a candidate from running for the board.

- Melanie – the topic of qualifiers is not about power but about not compromising the Co-op if someone applies that is clearly not qualified. There is nothing in the Board Policy Manual that says that the NC shall use discretion. If the NC had discretion, then they could disqualify a person based on what they felt disqualified them. They could then inform the board in a non-public setting of any disqualifications and the board could make a final decision.
- Ed – NC discretion is very important.
- Mary Ella / Cheri – let the members make the decision. This is a democracy.

It was noted that our current application asks if someone has committed a felony. Laws around asking this question for employment recently changed and we need to find out from legal counsel what information we can ask of candidates.

- Melanie – suggests getting rid of the candidate statement and instead have members answer a specific set of questions that would then be published in the Co-op news.
- Emily – from reviewing the application processes of other co-ops I have seen it is very common to have specific questions on the application that are published instead of a candidate statement. This way members are more easily able to compare the answers of candidates. Another common required qualification is that a person must have been a member for a certain amount of time (i.e. 6 months) prior to submitting an application.

ACTION: Emily will bring a list of sample applicant questions to the next NC meeting.

The group reviewed example conflict of interest (COI) forms that James provided. Part of the intent of the COI forms is to educate applicants about the different types of conflicts of interest to help make them aware of any they may have as well as set an expectation of conduct. The group discussed if there is a need to include a COI with the board application. It was also suggested that a COI be filled out annually by board members. The group liked the short version of a COI. It was decided to continue this discuss at the February NC meeting.

6. Election Process

The group discussed if the employee election should remain as it is or if it should be changed so that there is no longer a separate employee election. Meaning, employees would all run in the general election and the employee with the most votes would win.

- Melanie – now is a good time to discuss this topic since there is no employee election in 2018.
- Emily - would more employees run if they didn't have to go through an employee election? This would eliminate being voted on by their peers which could be more of a turnoff than being voted on by the general membership.

Discussion will continue on this item at the next NC meeting.

7. Board Recruitment

- Cheri – all board members need to help recruit. Just announcing that applicants are wanted it in the newsletter doesn't get the job done.
- Emily – a common requirement of other co-ops is that a member must attend a board meeting prior to submitting an application.

The group would like to have a reception for potential board applicants immediately prior to the June and July board meetings. The reception would be 5:30 – 6pm with refreshments. This would allow potential applicants to attend a board meeting prior to the application deadline at the end of July.

8. Board Training

The group discussed what they want to be part of board orientation. It was decided that a list of what should be covered at board orientation be generated at the February NC meeting.

ACTION: Emily will contact the California Center for Cooperative Development to see if they have any training programs that could be offered to the board.

9. Agreements

Next meeting: February 22, 2018

10. Next agenda items

- Election process continued
- Board training – orientation checklist
- Conflict of interest continued
- Review election timeline
- Employees running with the general election
- Review board application questions

Meeting adjourned at 8:05pm by consensus

Minutes by Emily Walter

Floating Items: How many employees should be allowed to hold a board seat?