

POLICY DISCUSSION MEETING. SATURDAY 16<sup>th</sup> JANARY 2020 at 9.30.

Chairpersn; Bruce

Minutes; Nityama

Present: Chris, Louise, Kevin, James, Callum, Sattwa, Rob, Harvey, Atmo, Belinda, Roger,

Petra, Bronwen, Dan, RalphV, Denise, Dennis, Sam, PeterO, Mog, Steve.

Bruce introduced the meeting as a starting point to discuss what the community wants in

terms of changing and reviewing existing policy, creating new policy where needed.

The following points were raised and discussed.

That ALL policies would be reviewed annually.

It was agreed that the Complaints management policy would be the priority to review and redo.

Discussion around present Complaints Management Policy : (CMP)

It was pointed out that the board of directors are 7 human beings living on this community

and cannot possibly be impartial, to act in judging the actions of fellow community members.

The CMP in its present form is not about problem solving, its mostly punitive.

People who have been complained against expressed their frustration at not even being

shown the complaint against them, and not knowing whom had made that complaint.

It was pointed out that members have a responsibility to follow the Code of Conduct.

The CMP should be a mechanism to deal with issues such as site borders, too much noise etc where members have failed to resolve the issues on their own. But this policy should not be used for personality conflicts / disagreements. That kind of issue

should go to an outside mediator.

Complaints management committee was put aside and complaints management was taken over by the directors.

5 Board members must vote and agree on any given issue to make a valid decision.

A long time Goolawah member pointed out there always have been disputes between members, that got resolved. The policy as it stands is way too bureaucratic, and too procedural.

How to practically start process of re doing Complaints Management Policy?

All members are encouraged to share their ideas.

Maybe a start is to print out the present policy, then take a red texta

and mark parts you would like to be deleted, write any comments in margin, or on a separate paper together with any new suggestion / points you wish to be included.

Anyone who prefers to talk thru their ideas ( rather than writing them ) is encouraged to

connect with one of the policy committee members, that being, Bruce, Denise, Sattwa +

Peter, with the addition of Steve and Harvey.

There was then raised some questions and issues about our present Membership policy,

which is presently being reviewed.

Idea that the requirements for a guest or joint member, who is your partner, or a member

of your immediate family, be more lighter and minimised, is part of that review.

Applicants should be guided to read through the Code of Conduct, and ensure it is fully

understood.

Diversity is an important quality that keeps a community healthy and growing.

Our new members coming in, embody that diversity.

As with the CMP all suggestions and ideas from members re the membership policy are welcome and should be given to the membership committee.

There was then discussion about directors 'portfolios', function of committees, and how

this relates to the whole community, monthly meetings and the process of decision making.

Points were made that the Portfolio idea, although made in good faith some years back,

is not meant to cement in a hierarchy where the directors are seen to be making decisions

FOR the community, and that members feel excluded and disempowered.

It is the membership of this community that make decisions.

The original idea was that it's the committee members who carry out any work needed,

and that the director who has that 'portfolio' keeps an overview of that area. It was meant

to make for more efficiency, NOT another layer of hierarchy.

It was suggested that committees could have (if they wanted) a team leader, but that would not be the director.

All committees ( including the Board of Directors committee) are small working groups.

These committees meet as needed, to use suggestions from the community as a way of

responding and working on policies and events occurring. These committees take more

specific suggestions for proposals back to a community meeting for discussion and

possible refinement. The final step after this discussion is publication and notification of

proposals to be voted upon by the whole community.

A suggestion was made that this voting kind of meeting should only be a 3 monthly event.

It was suggested that all committee meetings to be open to all members. Therefore time and place of committee and directors meetings to be notified to community well in

advance. This transparency can only be good, and reassure members that their presence

and contribution is welcomed.

It was expressed by previous board members that they did not feel appreciated for the role

they took, and indeed quite the opposite, often felt abused and harassed.

It was also expressed by a member, that the way in which directors speak (and email )

about members is disrespectful and derogatory, and inappropriate for people holding the

office of a director.

It has in previous years been sometimes difficult to rustle up 7 directors, but maybe that is

changing as the number of residents is growing.

A suggestion was made to limit a directors term to 2 years ( or 3? )

Then a break of 3 years before that person would be eligible to stand again.

To try and encourage rotating of roles. To welcome people into those roles.

Also chairing of meeting could be rotated amongst more members.

There have been 28 members acting as directors over the last 6 years.

Some wise person suggested that if the directors were all women we wouldn't have

the problems we have now?!

Meeting closed at 11.30