

I. CALL TO ORDER

Trish Abbate called the virtual meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Board member attendees: Dorsol Plants, Kaitlin Heinen, Amy Kangas, Linda Smith, Maju Qureshi, Ryan Disch-Guzman, Uche Okezie, Andrew Calkins, Idabelle Fosse

Board members absent: Aaron Johnson, Jennifer Hurley, Menka Soni

Others in attendance: Dana Ralph, Trish Abbate, and Angela San Filippo

II. WELCOME

Welcome from SKHHP Executive Board Vice-Chair and Mayor of the City of Kent Dana Ralph, gratitude for the work that Board members have signed up, part of original vision was Advisory Board so that we could connect to those most impacted by housing crisis and inform our decisions.

III. ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS / OPENING

Go around the virtual room and respond to the question what is something you are looking forward to in the coming year?

IV. GROUP AGREEMENTS FOLLOW-UP

Questions and follow-up from last meeting. What happens when someone violates the group agreements, what is the extent of repercussions? Would it be helpful to create space within agenda to revisit?

Support for going over group agreements at the beginning of the meeting, helping to ground the group.

Acknowledgement of the difference between in person and virtual meetings and suggestion for use of break out rooms to receive feedback in the moment. Example provided and it came down to who controls the mute button, mute button was almost weaponized. Might be essential to use the mute button but it can also escalate rather than deescalate. Suggestion for using the chat function to send a private message to staff asking for time out and use of break out room.

Suggestion for collective break and time for anyone who wants to have a one-on-one with staff or with others in the group.

Kaitlin shared lessons learned from conducting virtual court including following body language, and when there is a need to stop something, do it quickly and as nicely as possible.

Recognition that conflict and disagreement can be a good thing and they will be part of the process, try to be realistic and open-minded about it. Part of the power of the group is the different experiences and ideas.

General agreement to raise hand as a mechanism to pause the group and take a collective break when necessary to address a conflict.

V. DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Last month the group expressed wanting a more collaborative decision making process rather than majority rules. Consent principle in essence is a form of consensus that is widely used, formal consensus can be very rigid, many are approaching this using a zone of tolerance.

Trish shared video of consent principle followed by an overview of the consensus process. Review of block versus stand aside/objection with the goal that blocks come up during the discussion. Stand asides/objections are essentially an abstention – don't disagree but not going to block consensus.

Also heard from the group to avoid Robert's Rules of Order. Want to be clear that we aren't just using different words and that we are responding to the concerns that were brought up about Robert's Rules of Order. Trish presented a slide with a side-by-side comparison of decision by consent principle versus Robert's Rules.

Clarification on how the facilitator opens up the floor for a proposal under the consent principle. General agreement from the group on use of consent principle.

VI. BYLAWS

Trish went over the draft bylaws and examples that were sent out to the group. Trish reviewed sections that were already approved by either being part of the SKHHP Interlocal Agreement or Advisory Board Resolution.

The SKHHP ILA requires a simple majority to establish a quorum, does the group want to require more than a simple majority?

Discussion around simple majority versus super majority. Concerns raised about making decisions with only a simple majority. Concern that going higher than 60% it might be difficult to get things done. General agreement for 60% of members would establish a quorum. Staff will look into how 60% would work when fractions result.

Discussion regarding having a we're stuck clause built into the decision making process. Concerns raised on how to define getting stuck. Suggestion to take a simple majority vote to activate the get stuck clause.

Concerns about having a get stuck clause and potential to default to taking a majority vote. Suggestion for tabling decisions for the next meeting. Staff will include both a get stuck clause and the ability to table decisions into the draft bylaws for further discussion at the next meeting.

Discussion on attendance and potential boundaries around excessive absenteeism. Suggestion to incorporate excused and unexcused absences, clear difference between someone just not showing up and having a legitimate reason. Suggestion for communication with member about their attendance before there is a recommendation for removal from Board.

General agreement if a member has missed 3 consecutive meetings there's a check-in that happens with staff and if member misses 4 consecutive meetings or more than half the meetings in the year this would lead to a recommendation for removal from the Board.

Discussion on officer positions. Expression of support for a rotating liaison position to the Executive Board. Some support shown for Co-Chair model because it helps balance the work load.

Suggestion to make sure there are folks interested in taking on this type of leadership role in terms of Co-Chair positions.

Trish will send out a poll gauging board member interest in serving in leadership roles.

Question regarding having a confidentiality clause, staff will research and come back with a proposal at the next meeting.

VII. ADVISORY BOARD RECRUITMENT

Tabled for discussion at February meeting.

VIII. UPDATES / ANNOUNCEMENTS

Minutes were included with the agenda as a draft, these will be included with each agenda and group will be asked to review and approve each set of minutes.

IX. CLOSING

Trish adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.