Theater of Change

PROPOSED AGENDA

Hello's
Agenda Review/New Items?
Fair Announcements
Consensus Rap
Host Rap
Bob's announcement re: Joules Graves
Potluck Committee
Council Selection Process 2011 Clarification
Council Selection Process Update Council Confirmation/Welcoming
35th Anniversary & Theme
Restaurant Committee Update
Construction Update
Camping Rap
Un-fair announcements
Goodbye's

CALENDAR

GENERAL MEETINGS 2011
7-9 P.M. 2nd WEDNESDAY: JANUARY-JUNE + NOVEMBER
Feb 9, **March 9 (6:30 potluck)**, April 13, May 11, June 8 at ST. MARY's EPISCOPAL CHURCH 13th and Pearl
(Childcare Room provided)
PLEASE park only where authorized!! Respect our Host.
Jan: Call for Council / Feb - March: Confirm Council
Council Meetings 3rd Tuesday
LAST MEETING BEFORE ELIGIBILITY DEADLINE: 11 MAY
JUNE Onsite MEETING/WORKPARTYS + OTHER DATES *TO BE SET*
Oregon Country Fair, July 8-10

Present Council Selection Process, in part:

SOMEONE MAY BRING UP A CONCERN ABOUT A CANDIDATE PUBLICLY AT THE FEBRUARY OR MARCH VILLAGE MEETING IF AND ONLY IF THEY HAVE PARTICIPATED FULLY IN THE VILLAGE'S GRIEVANCE PROCESS, AND WARNED THE CANDIDATE THEY MAY BRING UP THAT CONCERN. A CANDIDATE WHO KNOWS THERE IS A CONCERN ABOUT THEIR JOINING COUNCIL MAY STAND FOR COUNCIL IF AND ONLY IF THEY HAVE PARTICIPATED FULLY IN THE VILLAGE'S GRIEVANCE PROCESS.

This last sentence was edited at the Jan 2010 Village meeting, to read as printed below JUST FOR 2010. A committee has been established to work out different language. Contact Sam to join the committee.

A VILLAGE MEMBER MAY STAND ASIDE OR BLOCK A COUNCIL CANDIDATE PROVIDED HE/SHE HAS TAKEN HIS/HER EXPRESSED CONCERN THROUGH THE GRIEVANCE PROCESS.

(This is the previous version - not in effect for 2010) A VILLAGE MEMBER MAY STAND ASIDE OR BLOCK A COUNCIL CANDIDATE PROVIDED THAT THEIR EXPRESSED CONCERN HAS GONE THROUGH THE GRIEVANCE PROCESS.

(Grievance process: If someone has a concern about a council candidate they need to contact the candidate or have an "advocate" do so. They should contact the candidate within the week following the January Village meeting. Hopefully, those people can come to an understanding (perhaps using mediation); if not, the candidate and the person with the concern _must_ attend the January council meeting, no exceptions.)

Grievance Process:

The goal of the Grievance process is clarification, understanding, and resolution as early in the process as possible.

The person who perceives a problem 1) talks with the person seen as causing the problem or not following an agreed upon process; 2) talks with their Booth coordinator; 3) talks with their Booth as a group; 4) talks with their Council Booth liaison; 5) talks with the Council as a group. The Council has the authority to impose consequences; 6) brings the issue to a Village meeting to appeal a Council decision, consequence, or for further discussion; 7) files an OCF grievance procedure if needed. The OCF Grievance Committee can often help you with a neutral mediator if needed.

Consensus

We operate by consensus. We don't operate by majority rule. This means that we pass things that everyone agrees to and don't pass things that people don't agree to. A person can stand aside, meaning that they have concerns but won't stop the whole group. The block is an exceptional tool and should only be used in extreme circumstances. The facilitator is responsible for deciding how many stand asides end a proposal. If someone brings a concern, the group is responsible for trying to solve it. If you have a concern, state it and propose a solution. It's best to bring up concerns early in the process rather than throwing a clog in the works at the end of the process.

SAM: Last year, we addressed a disagreement as to the correct historical interpretation of the council selection process. Specifically, one group of people (*concern driven*) felt that the intent of the policy was that a concern, once brought through the process, was a fair reason to block or stand aside from the confirmation of an individual to council, whether or not the individual standing aside or blocking was the one who brought the issue through the process. Another group of people (*person driven*) felt that the intent of the policy was that the individual bringing the concern has to bring the concern through the process before earning the right to stand aside or block at the village level. The important distinction here is that in one view, the concern is what has to be brought through the process. In the other view, the individual is what has to be brought through the process.

Personally, I feel that if a concern is stated in a general meeting and I agree with that concern, I should have a right to stand aside or block based on that concern whether or not I go through the process.

TIM: We did it the '*concern driven*' for many years. That was part of the problem. Anyone could go through the effort of bringing their concern through the process, fail to resolve it, and bring it to the whole village – where people who had made no effort to engage the candidate or even think the issue through were left trying to make a yea or nay decision in the midst of high emotions, personal attacks and contradictory information. This is not fertile ground for consensus.

So the '*person driven*' way asks more of villagers than to just show up at a meeting and make a snap decision. It asks people to take responsibility for their community by going through the process. It's saying the consensus isn't just arrived at during a meeting of our community, but through interactions that our process describes leading up to that meeting. Processes designed to bring out the best in our community.

JENNEFER: I wonder how many Villagers have interpreted the council selection process as interpreted by *person driven* vs. as '*concern driven* all these years. I have a feeling that not all Villagers have been understanding the process the same way. So, how can we determine which interpretation is status quo if not all Villagers agree on what has been status quo?

DIANE: Or, we can go back to the way it was for over two decades. Which would be that folks who felt so moved would stand for council as a group, and the Village would give their consensus. Period. Then that leaves it up to council to deal with any inappropriate standees.

OMO: If I have a concern that you as say the council person in charge of sweep coordination have done a particularly bad job of it and someone else says"oh yeah the jerk..." they should be allowed to block without following process? Where then is that person's responsibility to have thought about each person standing for council before the acceptance meeting. Where is that person's re-sponsibility to understand the process and abide by it? If I recall, Sam, you expressed remorse in Nov. meeting that you had blocked or stood aside on impulse at one of your first meetings before understanding our process of consensus and the underlying issues. It is my un humble opinion that process matters, that we have been loading more process than we need on to selection and will we expect folks to follow through any more? And if we stepped back to self selection and MANDATED annual or biannual consensus and village process training--not just a rap--we would be living up to the high standards of the instrument of change Village was intended to be. Whoa, omo, step off of the soap box ; >)

JOHN: Michael, to use your example, if you bring a concern that the council person in charge of sweep allowed people in without a pass, and I say "This is the first I've heard of this, but I think this person shouldn't be on council if they're going to behave like that." Yes, I think it might be good in such a situation to allow me to block - certainly to stand aside,

BEN: I want to suggest that we as a group could change the language we use around stand-asides. What's coming to mind for me is to stop talking about a sufficient *quantity*, as though a certain number of stand-asides would count for a block. It doesn't. It's up to the facilitator to judge the temperature and alkalinity of the group.

SAM: The "person based" interpretation is not a Consensus process in my mind. Such a process precludes meaningful discourse at the meeting where Consensus is supposedly being reached. It limits participation in the decision making process to those who were aware that there were issues prior to the beginning of the process. It disenfranchises anyone who wasn't familiar with the issues at hand prior to their having been brought to a general meeting. Such a policy is not Consensus, because it doesn't value the wisdom of the group.

When participation is limited to those who have walked every step of our complicated process, we stand to make a decision that we call "Consensus by the Village" when in fact the sense of the Village may be deeply divided.

My understanding of the intent of the Council selection process is that it seeks to protect the emotions of those standing for Council by insulating them from the possibility of being confronted by surprise with serious issues at a general meeting of the Village. This is a laudable goal, and I believe that it is achieved through the "issue based" interpretation of the policy. It means that no one standing for Council will be surprised by an issue, while allowing the whole village to participate making a good decision. The "issue based" interpretation honors the wisdom of the group.

JENNEFER: One could interpret it, as I have all these years, that the whole group does participate. Even those who do not bring a concern to a candidate, even those who do not choose to stand aside or block- by default, *we consense unless we act otherwise.*

2011 Saturday Theme Poll - Which of these is your choice for a theme for Saturday of Fair? We would all try to dress to the theme, and do something in each booth to visualize the theme. Choose <u>two</u> themes, and/or write in your own ideas. **Tear off and turn in to Tim tonight!!**

○ Shakespeare / Elizabethan
○ Circus
○ Western / cowboy
○ Birthday hats (our 35th)

○ Almost naked
○ Pirate
○ Fairy
○ Ballet

○ Endangered species
○ Just a color (eg.: green)
○ _____
○ _____