

May 13th, 2019. 7pm.

Present (9/10): Jered, Brian, Drew, Dan, Kendra, Liz, Talena, Blake, Frank

Remote:(1/10): Julia

Absent (0/10):

Leads / Guests: Tarn, Missy (remote), L-Train

Minutes recorded by: various

Google Meet link: <https://meet.google.com/xiu-eimn-omo>

## Agenda

1. Approve Old Minutes
2. Review Old Actions
3. New Actions
4. [art project]
5. Well Proposal
6. Thank You Note Signing for Art Donors
7. New Board Candidate Review
8. Discussion of Goat-Related Disciplinary Actions
9. AltBurn
10. Other
11. Next Meeting Date

### Approve Old Minutes (5 min)

Approved.

### Review Old Actions (45 minutes)

- Review Longstanding Actions here: [url redacted]
- Gowdey: take lead on information sharing with other organizations about potentially dangerous people
  - Suggest a conversation over drinks or a meal to develop a more concrete proposal?
    - Work on a template based on people who are interested in sharing.
  - Did get some responses
    - Some declined to participate

- Some feel FF ConComm is too harsh (looking for restorative justice)
    - Some were interested in sharing lists, with some editing.
- Blake: write to board regarding [redacted]
  - Blake trying to track down who helped him with the issue last year.
  - Drew to follow up with Blake and write a ban letter prior to ticketing close.
    - Not done yet. (Doesn't look like they've registered for a ticket yet.)
- Survey data [redacted]
- [participant] ConComm issue kicked to board
  - [redacted]
- Blake will follow up with [volunteer] on making radio core more transparent.
  - [radio core discussions]
- Frank, Gougey, Liz to take next steps re: perpetrator of goat burn
  - In progress: Dan's observations at the fire (already in progress) did not lead to any specific people to interview. Follow-ups suggested with [camp] re: [participant]. (Also ascertain they were unticketed, and action if so.) Make a google doc (or similar) compiling our known information, some of it is in the AAR.
  - Multiple sources say that [other participant] has taken credit for the goat burn.
    - [redacted]
- Talena and Drama will co-author statement re: unplanned burns
  - Done, reviewed by Board and Safety leadership and published.
- Frank to lead, Jered to assist: name FestComm/ people in the chain of command as officers for coverage under our insurance.
  - Outstanding still
- Dan to take lead, Frank to assist: Create a sheet that says "I have read these items (check) (check)" for leadership folks to all complete.
  - Org Chart & contingency plans &c.
  - Sent -- review next meeting.
    - [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hnEf4Y31o0yIx9ir4dbMnD6kO3Gtit0U-8I9M\\_deGhg/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hnEf4Y31o0yIx9ir4dbMnD6kO3Gtit0U-8I9M_deGhg/edit#)
      - Everyone please review by next meeting.
- Send a doodle poll about a non-monthly meeting on big-picture long-term planning
  - Added to long term actions doc to follow up after event.
- Frank: reach(ing) out to work weekend core to align expectations regarding work weekend attendees' participation
  - Done.
  - Ongoing discussions between Leads, Speedbump, Missy. Follow-up to happen with Speedbump. Missy to do.
- Frank: Articulate feedback on existing LNT artifacts
- Frank: reach out to Board prospectives
  - Done
- Frank: send out sound/placement contact
  - Solid plan back from [camp].
    - Frank to check in that it's okay with SoundCore

- Then Board to send acknowledgement to [camp], ask them to work with Sound.
  - Acknowledgement from [camp], still waiting for plan.
    - L Train says they're taking it seriously.
- Frank: recipient to 1-year ban notification should see specificity in their letter
  - Done
- How do we provide oversight to changes that sneak in while improving our communications? (brought up by changes to Survival Guide)
  - Pushed to Communications Committee (if there are bug reports, please let them know: <https://www.fireflyartscollective.org/suggest-updates/>)

## New Actions

- 

## [Art piece]

Frank talked to [participant], will follow up further this week. We want to ensure that it is as safe as reasonably possible given the constraints of the art. [redacted details]

## Well, Actually Discussion

Straw poll: consensus is Pro-Well

Feasibility discussion: What if it's a dry year? Making sure people understand they have to pump it themselves, and it may not be able to keep up. Not a total replacement for bringing water. First year considered highly experimental!

Discuss in community forums, get community buy-in, pass the hat. Kirk is on board with this.

## Thank You Note Signing for Art Donors

Signing, and passing over to art grant committee. (Searching for their address.)

## New Board Candidate Review

We have a bunch of very thoughtful responses to our call for new board members. Please, *please* find the time to read all of the candidate responses and full and consider them so we can have a meaningful discussion. I'll see if I have time to wrangle them into a more convenient format, but for now they can be found in this spreadsheet:

[\[URL redacted\]](#)

While there are many candidates that I like personally (and/or their answers), I think we should put a lot of weight on identifying board members who will further advance our organization. Some criteria I suggest are important:

1) Ability to devote a meaningful amount of time to Firefly Board work on an ongoing basis.

This is both core to our future and to retaining current board members. We've been flexible on this in the past, but it's driven away valued contributors and I'd like to make sure new members view this as a real job and not a sinecure. (NB: That is not a statement on any present company!)

2) Experience in organizational dynamics. I'd like to balance participants with no management experience with those who have, as we expand our volunteer base and need to understand how to constructively offer feedback and motivate our participants.

3) Diversity, in points of view and demographics. We need people who can keep us from falling into routines, but...

4) Understanding of our process and our mission. We added specific questions on these topics, because our consensus approach means we don't want people who are contrarian for its own sake.

We can discuss process in advance and at the meeting. My strawman to start:

- Discuss each candidate briefly. Identify any that are consensus reject or consensus move forward.

- Identify, by consensus and straw polls, our "top" candidates. Given such the large pool, I think we want to only consider 3-5 at a time.

- Invite top candidates (time permitting) to the June board meeting for discussions.

- Send regrets to consensus reject candidates.

- Send a note to group 2 candidates saying that we have many excellent applications and have to break up into groups; we are still very interested in talking with them.

- Candidates from first who are still interested, invite them to "ride-along" at the event this year. Engage them in daily briefings and private discussions during the event.

- Candidates from second group we will engage in discussions at the event.

- Resume consensus decision-making post-event.

Straw Poll spreadsheet (if useful):

[URL redacted]

Want to move forward with first five:

- [redacted]

Want to consider in the future:

- [redacted x2]

## Discussion of Goat-Related Disciplinary Actions

I recommend all board members review section 9 of our Bylaws (<https://www.fireflyartscollective.org/firefly-arts-collective/bylaws/#section9>) on decision-making at meetings, and (by reference) the sections 6, 7, and 8 on specific decision-making processes.

Discussion on inherent intentional conflicts in bylaws, e.g. 5F, Mission, and 5I.

Frank suggests: Do you believe (more likely than not) (Straw poll):

- 0) Dan burned the goat himself? 0
- 1) [other participant] burned the goat? 0
- 2a) Dan withheld information from safety volunteers about the nature of the goat? (All)
- 2b) Dan misled the safety volunteers about the nature of the goat? 2
- 3) Dan withheld from safety information concerning the identity of the arsonist? 0
- x) After seeing/understanding, who thought it was likely (>50%) that goat would burn? 4
- 4) Dan created a conflict of interest between his responsibilities as a board member and his aspirations as an artist? 3
- 5) Dan colluded with the arsonist - i.e. gave approval or just didn't stop the arsonist? 0

Frank proposes removing Dan from the BoD. Straw poll: 2 in favor.

Frank argues that he does not want to see Dan leave the board, but thinks that it will offer closure and provide accountability to the community, and does not see another action that would have this effect.

Counter-arguments is that this would simply ignite further divisiveness and represents a punitive measure rather than accountability (which has been delivered through his account to the community and apology); having Dan and [board candidate] serve on the same Board would better demonstrate healing of divides in the community.

No compromise options were found acceptable by Frank and Talena; they did not see any options other than removing Dan as showing action. Compromises suggested included Dan being suspended from voting in Board votes for 3-6 months, Dan being disallowed from holding named Board positions for [duration], Dan may receive no art grants or art placement in [year], and others.

Frank calls a vote of removing Dan from the Board of Directors. Talena seconds. Results 2-7-1; motion fails.

Discussion about [participant]. Tabled.

f

## AltBurn (5 min - 10 years)

Jered will write up a proposal for us to review.

## Other (5 min)

## Next Meeting Date (team, ~5min)

Will send a poll for the next meeting (hoping to include the candidates).