

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MSU STUDENT HOUSING CORPORATION

Agenda

Monday, June 19th, 2006

7:00 PM

328 Student Services

I. Call to Order

- A. Attendance
- B. Agenda Approval
- C. Minutes Approval

II. Reports

- A. Officer Reports
- B. Staff Reports
- C. Board Members
- D. Committees

III. Presentations

New consensus based meeting process - Presented by Barb Ebel

IV. Member Time*

V. Business

- A. Consent
 - Approval of Miles and Hedrick Board Reps
- B. Old Business
 - Adrien's Review
 - Pet policy revision

C. New Business

VI. Discussion Items

VII. Announcements

VIII. Adjournment

Next Meeting:

Monday, July 10th, 2006

7:00pm

328 Student Services

* Member time is a time set aside for members to voice any concerns about anything that they want the Board of Directors to hear.

Report to the Board of Directors
June 19, 2006
Jess Dalman – President

The last two weeks have flown by. Things in the office seem to be moving right along and house projects seem to be moving full steam ahead. Members of the board who volunteered to do a second review of Adrien met last Monday at Toad Lane. The minutes from that meeting are attached for your reading pleasure. Also your Executive Vice President has brought us a very interesting meeting procedure idea. While at a Nasco Board meeting, she had the chance to use a consensus based process that stole some ideas from Robert's Rules. This process allows everyone's voice to be heard and will help alleviate the issue of members getting voted over. The 'temperature' of the room, sort of like a straw poll, will be taken frequently and those not in agreement with the group will be asked to voice their feelings or opinions. I have asked Bard to help talk us all through the process at Monday's meeting. I think we should give it a try and also find a way of giving members who attend the meetings more of a roll during the meeting process.

Thank You,
Jess

**Physical Development Committee
Board Report for Monday June 19, 2006**

Since the last meeting, not much major has happened with/to our houses. *knock wood*

NASCO Board of Directors – look for an article in the next Pine Press

Last weekend I went to Toronto as a first-time Director for the NASCO Board of Directors. For those who don't know, NASCO is the North American Students of Co-operation, based in Ann Arbor, MI. NASCO is committed to spreading the co-op movement through education, consulting, legal assistance, and financial assistance for co-ops throughout the US and Canada. They serve all types of co-ops, from student housing to food co-ops to worker co-ops.

Two major programs they run are the NASCO Institute, which is a weekend of co-op workshops and conferences, and Anti-Oppression Action Camp, which is a deep-woods crash course in learning to fight oppression in your own community. Institute will be held this Nov. 3 – 5 in Ann Arbor. Camp will be held this August 20 - 24 in the High Sierras of California. Please check out www.nasco.coop for more info on the programs, their costs, and scholarship resources. Also look out for a regional Action Camp to be held in the Midwest in March.

Article X: It does a co-op good!

One maintenance-related point of interest from the NASCO board meeting:

Johnny George from the Berkeley Co-ops told me that his student co-op system, the largest in the nation, is living in collective squalor. That is, they have nothing even resembling our Article X sections of the Code of Operations, and therefore no compelling reason to keep their houses clean and maintained. SHC's Article X: Maintenance basically says that if houses regularly fail monthly maintenance inspections, they can be placed on probation and eventually recolonized if no improvements are made.

Thankfully (?) we have a strong rental housing code in the City of East Lansing that provides the authority we need to enforce our own inspection rules. So your house is run-down and dangerous, but you don't want to clean and fix it? They'll just take your rental license and go on their merry way.

At USCA they don't have a strong city code, and the co-ops don't have their own methods for enforcing a standard. I showed Johnny the Article X section of our Code of Operations and he nearly squealed with delight! I'm excited to see what the effect might be on their co-ops, if Johnny can get them on board with this kind of inspection system.

Co-op Wide Work Weekend

Once again, a reminder that the Co-op Wide Work Weekend will be this weekend, June 23 – 25. Check out the back page of the latest Pine Press, or look on the website under 'Upcoming Events'. We'll be working on Bower's front yard, including a new patio, flowerbed maintenance, outdoor lighting, and completing a half-finished set of steps in the hill. We will also be doing outdoor maintenance work at Toad Lane. Snacks and drinks will be provided. Email me for info at ebelbarb@msu.edu

Security Meeting:

Our last meeting will have been about home security. I'm sure it will have been great! Future perfect tense hard in Spanish, but imperfect subjunctive is even harder.

Here is the list of Membership officers for each house:

Name	House	Phone #	E-mail
Matt Kaiser	VPM	(517) 775-3166	kaiserm3@msu.edu
Ian Smith	Raft Hill	(517) 648-6063	smithia3@msu.edu
Eileen Roltsch	Miles Davis	(517) 303-1474	roltsche@msu.edu
Kat Roltsch	Toad Lane	(517) 862-6623	roltschk@msu.edu
Justin Ketterer	New Community	(734) 612-0412	kettere2@msu.edu
David Wilson	Hedrick	(517) 614-1722	wilso417@msu.edu
Scott Day	Orion	(517) 332-2817	dayscott52@hotmail.com
Sarah Card	Elsworth/Avalon	(248) 593-7889	inugrrl@gmail.com
Tommy Simon	Vesta	(313) 378-8897	simonth1@msu.edu
Tommy Riddle	Bower	(517) 351-4490	tmmy_rddl@yahoo.com
???	Phoenix		

Membership Committee Board Report #2

Matthew Kaiser, V.P. of Membership

Our first Membership meeting took place on May 18 at Bower house. Attendance was low, mostly due to the short notice that was given for the first meeting. We made introductions and discussed why each of us became membership officers. We examined the situation at Bower and discussed ways to improve its membership. After that we covered the duties and responsibilities of a membership officer, and had a discourse about what we would be doing over the coming months. The meeting ended with our first practice house tour provided by Tommy Riddle of Bower. The tour was subsequently critiqued by all. This exercise was well received and everyone involved seemed to get something out of the experience. Overall the energy and enthusiasm involved in this meeting was extraordinary.

At our second membership meeting on June 1st all houses were in attendance with the sole exception of Phoenix. Introductions were briefly made to accommodate those who missed the first meeting. A brief re-cap of our last meeting was given. Bower was recognized for filling for the fall since our last meeting, and the number of vacancies system wide was discussed. We discussed various methods for advertising our houses, places to advertise and handed out flyers. We discussed a possible amendment to the pet policy to adjust the nonrefundable charge of \$25 (out of the \$100 pet charge) based on how long the pet was going to be in residence in the house. We also conducted our second practice house tour provided by Sarah of Elsworth/Avalon. This exercise was noticeably harder to coordinate with more people present, but still seemed to be a valuable experience, as was the subsequent critique of the house tour. This meeting was not as energized as the first, and some officers clearly had their minds elsewhere. This has been noted, and I will endeavor to engage those who seem uninvolved more in future meetings.

House	Summer Occupancy	Fall Occupancy
Avalon	CLOSED	13 of 21: 8 vacancies
Bower	7/6 of 18: 11.5 vacancies	Full!
Elsworth	18/17 of 21: 3.5 vacancies	Full!
Ferency	CLOSED	Full!
Hedrick	13/12 of 21: 3.5 vacancies	Full!
Miles Davis	Full!	Full!
New Comm	Full!	14 of 15: 1 vacancy
Orion	12/11 of 16: 4.5 vacancies	Full!
Phoenix	Full/18 of 20: 1 vacancy	28 of 29: 1 vacancy
Raft Hill	4/4 of 10: 6 vacancies	10 of 12: 2 vacancies
Toad Lane	Full!	Full!
Vesta	Full!	Full!
SHC TOTAL	30 vacancies total	12 vacancies total

Education Board Report
6-19-2006

Hello Everyone!

The Education Committee met last Monday, June 12th. We decided on themes for the next few issues of the Pine Press and brainstormed and assigned a few article topics for the next Pine Press which is all about the Environment. Upcoming Pine Presses will be about food and the history of SHC. We discussed SHC t-shirt designs briefly, as well. Also, the Pine Press came out last week!

Thanks!

Laurel

Education VP

MSU Student Housing Cooperative, Inc.

541 East Grand River Ave • East Lansing, MI 48823

PHONE (517)355-8313 • FAX (517)355-9576 • EMAIL coop@msu.edu

Executive Director's Report Meeting Date: 06/19/2006

June is proving to be almost as tranquil as May and April were hectic. The reprieve is couldn't have come at a better time. We're getting caught up on some deferred bookkeeping and filing. We're also just now doing some administrative tasks that would normally have been done in May. Our email lists, for instance, are finally beginning to reflect our summer membership, and committee lists are mostly in.

Not *everything* is coming up roses. We're having a tough time getting the member accounting and eviction cycle back on track. Several of the house treasurers have not sent us charge sheets, and without charge sheets we cannot assess late fees, nor can we send out notices to quit. We're nudging the treasurers, and if that doesn't work, we're hoping that fines will do the trick.

Some of our former members left without handing in checkout forms. Typically members who do not submit checkout forms don't get any shares returned until we do final share returns (six months after the end of the period), but I may take advantage of the summer reprieve to get those done early. If you have any questions about the share return process, please contact the office.

Evan has been helping out in the office for the last few weeks. His presence has allowed us churn through a significant backlog of deposits. We've been all caught up with those now for a little more than a week, but a steady stream of incoming work remains. Evan has been happy to help out, but he also has another job, and his time is limited. We should try get our MSC search wrapped up in the next month, if possible.

Avalon and Raft Hill have both had problems with trespassers. We're in the process of getting the issues at both houses resolved. Please remember that open windows when nobody's home, can leave you and your housemates wide open to theft.

We'll have financial statements at the next board meeting. Bring your slide-rules.

One final note: Hillsdale is officially full! We're enjoying it while it lasts, because we may soon have to evict Dave Gibbs for non-payment. For the time being, however, we're one big happy family.

NASCO Board Meeting Facilitation and Decision-Making Process

Agenda

- Five types of meeting space have been identified for NASCO board meetings:
 1. Information, announcements, and reports; some time for clarifying questions.
 2. Brainstorming and creative dialogue; no decision-making is necessary.
 3. Simple ratifying-type decision-making; little expectation for dissent or discussion.
 4. More involved discussion and decision-making around complex or controversial issues.
 5. Emotional check-ins, check-outs, or discussion that is focused on how the meeting process is feeling.
- For each agenda item, the type of meeting space will be identified. This can be determined by:
 1. The proposal writer.
 2. The people setting the agenda.
 3. The group during a review of the agenda at the start of the meeting.
- A space will be provided in the agenda for:
 1. Emotional check ins at the start of the meeting;
 2. Emotional check outs at the end of the meeting;
 3. A meeting process review/evaluation at the end of the meeting (just before the emotional check out).
- The agenda will be arranged so that items with similar types of meeting space are separated such that the same approach isn't being used for too long at any one time.

Facilitation

- Four roles have been identified for use during NASCO board meetings:
 1. Guide: responsible for the 'stuff' on the agenda.
 2. Shepherd: responsible for the 'people' in the meeting.
 3. Gate Keeper: responsible for keeping meeting participants informed if they leave the room or arrive late.
 4. Process Observer: responsible for observing how the meeting process worked and leading the group through the meeting process review/evaluation at the end of the meeting.More detailed descriptions of each of these positions can be found at the end of this document.
- An additional role that has been identified that can be used after we see how the Shepherd role works and depending on the nature of the agenda item is the Vibes Watcher. More details about this position are also at the end of this document.
- The role of Note Taker, a non-participating member of the meeting, will remain in place to assist with minute-taking and recording of proposals and decisions.
- For the first day of the meeting the role of the Guide will be filled by Cary; the role of the Shepherd will be filled by Spence. If others are interested in assisting with the facilitation on the second day of the meeting, please let us know so that we can coordinate this.
- We will need volunteers to fill the Gate Keeper and Process Observer roles for both days of the meeting.

Decision-Making

- A two-tiered approach to decision-making will be used at NASCO board meetings:
 1. We will first strive to achieve 100% consensus.
 2. If rounds of discussions and proposals continue for too long without being able to reach 100% consensus, the group will move to a secondary process regarding the proposal. When this occurs, we will strive to achieve 85% agreement on the proposal.
 - o The decision to move to a secondary process on a particular proposal can be made by the Guide. Individual members of the group can suggest that we move on to the secondary process. The group as a whole can decide to overturn the decision of the Guide regarding moving to the secondary process when two-thirds of the group is in agreement.
 3. Should the group continue on with rounds of discussion and proposals without being able to reach 85% agreement on the proposal, the Guide can propose that the issue be revisited at the next meeting or in a space outside of the meeting. As with the decision to move to the secondary process, individual members of the group can suggest that we move on to the secondary process; the group as a whole can decide to overturn the decision of the Guide when two-thirds of the group is in agreement.

- In order to determine where the group is at regarding the issue on the table, the Guide will ask how everyone feels about the proposal. The group will use a set of five hand gestures to indicate their opinion:
 - o Thumb Up = complete support and good feeling; no doubts, questions, or concerns.
 - o Palm Up = high support and definite positive feeling however has some small questions, doubts, or alternative ideas.
 - o Vertical Hand (hand is positioned vertically between palm up and palm down) = perfectly neutral feelings.
 - o Palm Down = strong negative feelings, doubts, or concerns however has some small positive feeling or support.
 - o Thumb Down = complete doubt, discomfort, or negative feelings with many questions, challenges, or concerns.

- Additional hand gestures will be used to assist with meeting process:
 - o Process point (first fingers of both hands together in a point) = used to voice procedural concern or criticism when someone in the group who is not facilitating feels there was a mistake or a problem in the consensus process.
 - o 'C' for clarification (fingers and thumb form a 'C') = used to ask a question that will help the group participant clarify or understand the proposal or discussion.

- When using the secondary approach, three hand signals will be used to indicate support for the discussion item or proposal: Thumb Up, Vertical Hand, and Thumb Down.

Procedures for Implementation

- Before the meeting information regarding the new approach to facilitation and decision-making will be distributed via e-mail and in the board packets. The purpose of this information distribution is to seek feedback about the proposed approach for the June meeting.

- During board training and orientation on Friday, June 9th, we will review and discuss these new procedures to allow everyone to fully understand the approach to be used. We will follow this review with a brief (15 to 30 minute) mock meeting to allow everyone to practice the new approach before the actual meeting begins. We will also debrief about the processes following the mock meeting.

- At the end of the first day of meetings the Process Observer will lead a meeting review/evaluation. This will give us an opportunity to look at how the new approach is working.
- Time will be put into the agenda for the second day of the meeting to make a decision regarding the meeting procedures. If the group feels comfortable with the new approach we hope to approve its use for all future meetings. During discussions, suggestions for change to the procedure are encouraged. It is possible that a small committee may need to come together to revise the procedures for the next meeting.
- A small committee may be struck to document the agreed upon procedures and rationale for this new approach. This small committee may need to make recommended policy changes, as necessary, to reflect the new approach to facilitation and decision-making.

Next Steps (to get ready for the June meeting)

- Policy review to identify if certain vote counts are required for specific types of decisions.
- Circulation of materials to board for review and feedback.
- Preparation for Friday training/orientation and business meeting.

Facilitation Roles (taken directly from Spence's document "A Process for 100% Consensus)

GUIDE:

1. Familiarize yourself with the agenda before the meeting to get a sense of length of length of discussion for each point and flow between points.
2. Quickly present the agenda or the structure of the discussion at the opening of the meeting and invite brief feedback.
3. Keep the discussion and decision-making focused on agenda items throughout the meeting.
4. Act as an overall meeting time-keeper and interrupt the meeting to alert the group when discussion stretches on longer than the expected or allotted time.
5. Proactively phrase and rephrase proposals and try different approaches to questions or issues to help guide the group through difficult discussions and decisions.
6. Experiment with different approaches to a discussion or decision such as splitting a larger group into small groups to begin to work through a difficult issue or question.
7. When using hand signs for consensus it is your responsibility to make sure that all the participants have clearly indicated their sign and in the case of consensus, to announce to the group that 100% consensus has been achieved and a decision has been made.

SHEPHERD:

1. It is your responsibility to pass the speaking turn at the meeting carefully and equitably around the group.
2. Take careful note of the nature of contributions from all participants and strive to maintain a diversity and equality of opportunity for discussion contribution for all participants. For example if participant W tends to dominate the conversation at the expense of other participants, then the Shepherd may adopt an approach to speaking rights that privileges the contributions of other participants over those of participant W.
3. Try passing the space to speak around the group through such means as:
 - o Speakers Stack in which participants indicate their desire to speak and are placed on a speakers list to be called on in turn.

- Go-around in which the turn to speak is passed circularly around the group.
 - Duck Duck Goose in which the Shepherd passes the turn to speak around the group at random or at their discretion.
4. Do not be afraid to focus on a single meeting participant to enable and encourage them to speak. Some people need this kind of explicit space to be able to effectively contribute. Remind everyone that they can always pass if they do not feel like speaking.
 5. Keep track of overall energy, emotions, and tensions in the group and interrupt the discussion to suggest breaks, group hugs, periods of silence, or anything else that is needed to maintain a positive and focused meeting environment.
 6. When using hand signs for consensus it is your responsibility to call first on participants whose signs indicate the most dissent from the overall feeling of the group. (When using "process point" and "fist" hand signals, remember that these signs take precedent over all the rest.)

GATE KEEPER:

It is the responsibility of the Gate Keeper to keep careful track of the content and flow of the discussion and to note important decisions that are reached so that when a person arrives late to the meeting the Gate Keeper can pull them aside for a moment and quickly catch them up to speed.

PROCESS OBSERVER:

It is the responsibility of the Process Observer to carefully note how the meeting worked. Were there problems with speaking, listening? Did the group follow the decision-making process? Did an individual abuse a facilitation role? It is up to the Process Observer to identify weaknesses or problems in the meeting structure and to suggest improvements to help the group and the consensus to evolve.

VIBES WATCHER:

In the case of an especially emotional or tense meeting it may be useful to create a separate Vibes Watcher role to help the Shepherd with the responsibility of monitoring emotions and tensions in the group.

Why is there a proposal for the NASCO Board of Directors to change its approach to facilitation and decision-making towards more of a consensus-based process?

Context:

Many of the co-op systems and houses that make up NASCO use a more consensus-based meeting process than that currently used by the NASCO Board.

Many of the members of the NASCO Board are personally familiar with a variety of consensus-based meeting processes.

The NASCO Staff and the NASCO Coordinating Committee are already using co-management processes and consensus-based approaches to decision-making.

Stronger Decisions:

- (1) Consensus-based decision-making will help to safeguard the Board from spending too little time on important issues -- instead of quickly voting and sweeping over people's opinions, the Board will have to address everyone's concerns.
- (2) Making decisions unanimously will create a stronger, more united organization. It will force the board to clearly define as a group what the goals, objectives, and focus of the organization are.
- (3) The more ownership that the entire Board feels over decisions, the greater the longevity of the decision, and the greater the motivation for individual Board members to move the decision forward between Board meetings.

Inclusion:

It is important for the NASCO Board to strive for a decision-making process that is as inclusive as possible because:

- (1) Each member of the NASCO Board proportionally presents hundreds of members and so the exclusion of one NASCO Board member may reflect the exclusion of hundreds or thousands of members.
- (2) It is hypocritical and counter-productive for NASCO to exclude the power and voice of Board members from decisions explicitly regarding issues of inclusion.
- (3) Many of the issues considered by the NASCO Board are complex and demand the creative and critical perspective of every Board member to best-anticipate the long-term and large-scale implications that may result from the decision.

Approaches to decision-making can be analyzed by the degree of inclusion or exclusion experienced by participants involved in the decision as well as the degree of ownership that participants feel over the outcome of the decision:

- **Exclusion:** the power and voice of some participants is totally excluded from a decision as in a simple majority vote where 49% of the group may disagree with a decision which is taken. *No ownership.*
- **Concession:** the power and voice of some participants is limited to a yielding capacity as in a consultative process where there is a token level of inclusion without any real decision-making power. *Marginal ownership.*
- **Compromise:** the power and voice of all participants is included in a decision as in a negotiation in which all participants have the power to shape the decision but may not fully support the outcome. *Partial ownership.*
- **Consensus:** the power and voice of all participants is explicitly included and all participants must fully support the decision before it is taken. *Total ownership.*

Intention:

Regardless of the form or orientation of the meeting process adopted by the NASCO Board it is important for this process to intentionally reflect the broader context within which the Board is working and the priorities and values which shape the long-term development of NASCO.

- 1.) What do you specifically enjoy about your job?
- 2.) What has been the most challenging aspect of your job here at MSU SHC?
- 3.) What do you find to be the easiest part of your job?
- 4.) When considering the changes that you have made in the past to office hours, what factors did you take into consideration? Did you feel the changes would be beneficial to our members and how?
- 5.) How well do you feel you communicate?
- 6.) What do you feel are priorities to communicate to our membership (i.e. Nasco job postings and updates, house monetary issues, member issues, office hours)?
- 7.) Members have said that it often takes you days to respond to e-mails. It has also been noted that reviewing office voice messages does not get done daily. For example when Jack quit SHC by leaving a message on the answering machine, the message was three days old when it finally was listened to. How often do you check messages and respond to them, and do you feel that this is frequent enough?
- 8.) In a board meeting in the spring you stated that you find time management to be very hard for you and that you were working on getting a good process down to deal with your work load. What steps have you taken to manage your time and do you feel these have been effective?
- 9.) When interviewing members, many said they feel you do not take our organization seriously. Some reasons they felt this way were: 1. During our membership crisis our office hours were spotty and inconvenient for new members. 2. Your use of vacation time during your first six months in the position (this violates the E.D.'s job description in our code) 3. The lack of communication with members, new members and staff. 4. Putting deposits off for the entire month of May
- 10.) How were your past salaried positions structured? Was the use of comp time warranted? Do you understand our policy on comp time and do you feel your use of comp time has been appropriate?
- 11.) How do you see us financially? Do feel any of your uses of our money have been extravagant or irresponsible
- 12.) What was the hold up on getting yourself health insurance? Do you understand the risk of not being insured to our company?
- 13.) When you first interviewed for the position, you told us that you should be up to speed in one month and proficient in 6 months. However, six months later you say you still need three more months to get proficient. Did you fully understand what the job entailed when you accepted it or is it different than what you expected. If you understood the job and believed in your ability to do it, then please explain the change in the amount of time required to reach this goal.
- 14.) What do you feel are your strengths and weaknesses?
- 15.) Is there anything you feel you do not understand about our organization?

Executive Director Review - Take Two: *Some feedback from the E.D.*

An employee review process is underway, and as I understand it, it's soon to enter the second draft stage. Reviews are important mechanisms for staff improvement, and I welcome mine. They function to the benefit of the employee, providing direction and feedback, allowing staff to perform better for the organization.

As an employee that does this work, not just to subsist, but because I value the impact that my work has on the lives of our members, I am deeply motivated to learn how to do what I do better. I want to help the board get as complete a picture of my work as possible, and I want the board to give me constructive feedback and measurable goals to help me serve SHC to the best of my ability.

The initial review conducted by the Executive Committee and presented to the board at the June 5th board meeting was, I believe, a sincere attempt by the EC to address recent concerns about workflow in the office and to complete a task many months overdue. They appear to have been very industrious about collecting information from a wide range of sources. I trust that the degree to which they were secretive about the process is only a reflection of the gravity with which they remember the dark days of SHC embezzlement. That said, the fruits of their labor suffered from the approach. Many of the failings listed in the review are overstated or inaccurate. I specifically disagree with most of the accusations regarding accounting procedures, legal procedures, and time management.

When asked and given time to deliver, I can provide detailed information on the completion of routine office tasks, and that is what I would like to offer the board. As you revisit this review process, please feel free to *ask for the data that you need* to make an informed evaluation.

Almost 200 people are being asked to search their heads for critical feedback. I cannot anticipate every criticism, but I'm sure that there will be plenty. On the next two pages I will briefly touch on some broad areas of concern that have already been identified. I am not going to debate specific items from the original review (water cooler, email time, etc)—those really require a dialog. Instead, please accept these thoughts as supplements to the information you have already gathered and as starting points for a future discussion about SHC's staffing needs.

Time Management

As jobs become more sophisticated, as they demand critical thinking, creative approaches, and sensitivity to many professional variables, the learning curve increases and with it the time it takes to bring an employee up to speed.

Time management is *absolutely* a struggle for me in this job. I believe that it is reasonable to expect a learning curve in specialized professional employment. I never imagined that I would slip into Joan's chair and immediately run the organization with her degree of familiarity and efficiency. The entire first year will be a process of learning and adapting to SHC's peculiar needs and systems. I imagine that in some ways SHC will also subtly change in ways that reflect my own strengths and weaknesses. We'll grow into a smooth working routine, fitting increasingly well together. The membership sometimes forgets this and expects things to be the way they always were. We're getting there, but we're not there yet. Among the steps already taken to improve efficiency are the return to contract signing schedule, the batching of routine tasks (like bill paying), and the involvement of an increasing number of people in getting non-routine problems solved.

Accounting

With a history of financial mismanagement, SHC has a well cultivated sense of anxiety when it comes to the books. When you had a retired accountant crunching the numbers there was no cause for concern, but now your administrator is not a CPA.

Joan Bulmer, your former Executive Director, conducted a financial review at the E.C.'s request. Joan's report stated, "My review found no significant accounting irregularities". The most noteworthy issue identified in her report, deferred account reconciliation, is one that I have been keeping Jess informed of for several months. In fact, I'm working on the reconciliation now.

Accounting is not my greatest strength. It has been suggested that we outsource more of the accounting, freeing up more of my time for the kind of organizational development and project management that I do best and increasing the checks and balances in our accounting system. It's an idea that the E.C. likes, Joan likes, our accountants like, and something that I'd like to try.

House Transfers

Nothing breeds discontent like financial distress.

A number of houses have had problems with their house accounts running low at the tail end of the 05/06 contract period. Concerned about this myself, I reviewed the transaction histories and asked Joan to do the same. We haven't found anything irregular in the invoicing or payment processing. At present only two houses are owed small sums by SHC, and on Monday those two small balances will be zeroed during the standard transfer process.

May was tough month for house accounting. We were understaffed, and as a result deposits and transfers were pretty much put on hold, while new contracts were signed, bills were paid, and share returns were issued. That hit the some of the houses hard and created confusion that I wish we could have avoided.

I'm interested in doing some digging to see just what has happened to some of those depleted house balances. It may have been overspending. It may have been something else. Doing that research will have to be a team effort involving house treasurers, and it will have to fit into the organization's other demands on staff time.

Office Hours

The light's on, but nobody's home!

There is a fairly widespread perception that I haven't been working enough hours. Perhaps that's because the office hours have varied and the office was sometimes closed during normal hours. Perhaps it's because the membership was used to Joan, who used so little of her sick and vacation time. I've been tracking my time, mostly to keep myself from falling into an old habit of working too much. I've only logged time that was actually spent working or at lunch, any personal schmooze time has been off the clock.

The most important thing here is that the membership gets the service that it needs. I've reshuffled the office hours again to better accommodate. We'll still be closed when I'm at court, in day-time meetings, home sick, or on vacation, but the E.C. and I hope that having the office open 10-5pm five days a week (with an hour for lunch) will meet the needs of the membership, while still leaving me time to attend evening meetings.

Communication

Anyone who has ever played the telephone game knows that coordinating communication in an association of 196 semi-autonomous members is a complicated proposition.

Communication in a member driven organization is one of the most difficult and essential aspects to attend to. This review process has made me reevaluate the depth and breadth of the communication system that I have used thus far. I had hunkered down to meet the challenge of the office workload, depending heavily on the MSC to communicate with the membership, and assuming much in terms of trust and confidence.

The membership and the E.C. is now saying, "*That confidence must be earned!*" I hear you, loud and clear. I can certainly go beyond writing board reports, speaking at meetings, and emailing the E.C. It will take more time, but keeping the membership well informed about the state of our organization is very important, and outsourcing some of the accounting should create a little more time for just that kind of work.

Employee Evaluation Discussion for Adrien Vlach
06.12.06

Office Hours:

- ☞ Jack: He appears to have been changing the office hours for his own convenience. Especially around important times. He wasn't there for the Tuesday after reservations were up. Lilly, our next door neighbor, asked me on numerous occasions why the office wasn't open. He would schedule appointments with people from the University (advisors and such) and then just not show up.
- ☞ Mike: Jess's latest request for a change to more regular office hours was her third request. He didn't change them the first two times, so this isn't really the most immediate of improvements.
- ☞ Jack: And he complained about changing them.
- ☞ Babs: Two women came in asking about a release and a signing and Adrien wasn't there. They said they had looked for him several days and he wasn't there. They were pissed.

Communication:

- ☞ Babs: He has taken days and days to reply and respond to voicemails and important emails.
- ☞ Mike: He seemed proactive at first about dealing with houses directly. However he doesn't seem to know what is important to send out over the listserv. He has sent numerous useless emails to the membership.
- ☞ Babs: He is much more open than Joan. Adrien is wasting time doing maintenance work that is not his job. He felt the need to go to Phoenix after Stu and I had already examined the situation. Kevin was fixing the situation on his own the whole time.
- ☞ Jack: Re-sent email after everyone left about fining houses. He doesn't communicate well with the lawyer about STOPPING the evictions he needs to. Tells members misleading information about the board and about houses.
- ☞ Babs: He stigmatizes houses when people walk in. He should tell people houses change every year. It is a betrayal to the individual houses.
- ☞ Jess: He went to the make up NMO is short shorts.
- ☞ Mike: House tours are for members to give and he should be informed of that.
- ☞ Babs: NASCO and the SHC are nothing alike. He needs to realize we are not project oriented, we are membership oriented.
- ☞ Jack: We need to make sure he actually holds the office hours he has promised.
- ☞ Babs: We should look for an apology. He needs to own up to what he has been falling short on.

Time Management:

- ☞ Babs: Sending out NASCO emails is not as important as sending houses financial information.
- ☞ Dani: He needs to make appointments for contract signing. He tried to jump between a bunch of different people and their problems in the office. It doesn't work. He gives them all ten percent and everyone comes up short.
- ☞ Jack: Not answering emails and phone call in a timely manner. Used office hours to study for the course we are paying for. Needs to check NASACO emails at home, have separate accounts.
- ☞ Jess: Messages sit on the answering machines for three days. Jack's quitting and not finding out for three days. The EC is not the MSC's boss.
- ☞ Babs: Ripping CD's from FBC onto the computer. It takes time. Shopping for a car, a water cooler, fruit baskets.
- ☞ Dani: A lot of these issues are about trust and integrity.
- ☞ Matt: We need to separate between things he has done just for himself, and things he may have done potentially for the office.

- ☞ Kat: We should not have to baby sit him.
- ☞ Mike: Discrepancy between how long he said it would take him to learn Joan's job and how long it has actually taken. At first he said a month, and now he is claiming closer to a year.
- ☞ Jack: He used email time to run for food cooperative's board and not to answer important emails about rent.
- ☞ Babs: Re-shuffling of deadlines and learning curve.
- ☞ Jack: A lot of people were in favor of losing the "uptight" Joan, they liked his enthusiasm. He has betrayed that enthusiasm and been secretive and confrontational. No one expected him to be Joan, but he has been Joan in all they ways we didn't want.
- ☞ Babs: It is great that he tries to stay past his hours and finish his work.
- ☞ Kat: It would be great if he keeps those new 're-shuffled' hours.
- ☞ Aaron: Do we know if there will be a regular lunch hour?
- ☞ Babs: I am glad he is trying to make and keep schedules for himself. Like paying the bills once a week.
- ☞ Jess: Good that he is asking Joan questions about time management.
- ☞ Babs: Is looking at the schedule suggestions Joan gave him. Weekly and daily tasks.
- ☞ Jack: He is using office hours for virtual tours of Hillsdale.
- ☞ Mike: Hillsdale is a slippery slope. We don't know what our relationship with them should be.

Accounting

- ☞ Jess: He has NOT been keeping me up to date on finances. He has been more up to date with MSUFCU, it is easier. Falling behind with LaSalle.
- ☞ Mike: I don't like the use of the word, "deferred."
- ☞ Dani: Has issues with Bower's specific financial issues. Acts like it is my fault.
- ☞ Jack: When Trevor from Bower was trying to figure out fine money, Adrien had no idea how to deal with it. It appears he doesn't really care to learn about house finances.
- ☞ Babs: Would like a written statement from Cass about her offering to do the deposits for him, and him saying he would take care of it.
- ☞ Mike: Bower's screwy deal with shares returns and them writing themselves checks when they left. Adrien allowed it.
- ☞ Jess: He has falsely evicted Colleen four times. She had to pay court costs each time and each time was a mistake.
- ☞ Jack: Members he attempted to evict were generally members in good stand. He ignored issues of members who were constantly delinquent with rent.
- ☞ Mike: The health care issue. Not taking care of getting the plan and then charging the SHC an exorbitant rate.
- ☞ Jess: I asked for a check for at least 10% of those expenses and have not received them.
- ☞ Matt: EC must authorize non-ordinary office expenses. Over \$20?
- ☞ Babs: We need a detailed list of all checks he wrote to himself. What they were for and when they were written.
- ☞ Matt: What about funds that were being diverted to Hillsdale?
- ☞ Jess: Adrien and I had a few "altercations" when he purchased things for Hillsdale. He has been using SHC money and not getting expenses approved.
- ☞ Mike: Hillsdale is a gray area... It is in our financial interests to see it succeed.
- ☞ Babs: NASCO loves Adrien and thinks he is great at project management.

House Transfers

- ☞ Dani: He issued all the share returns to former Bowerites. He said he HAD to.
- ☞ Babs: If we have indicated that we are square with old Bowerites by issuing share returns we have no way to recourse.
- ☞ Dani: Shares returns forms were signed WAY ahead. Before the maintenance and membership officers even looked at anything.

- ⌘ Jess: He was informed to wait on Bower. \$100 is reserved until after audits.
- ⌘ Jack: Kind of shocking he would get all of those share returns back on time when he had everything else he had to do. Should deal with day to day operations first.
- ⌘ Kat: He is saying there was nothing irregular about what he did. Why would deposits be put on hold?
- ⌘ Jack: I had everything ready to be deposited.
- ⌘ Mike: He is refusing to take personal responsibility in this section. It is insulting to our intelligence.
- ⌘ Babs: People were not overspending at this time. It is May. That month is never overspending.
- ⌘ Dani: Adrien is using Bower for this paragraph specifically.
- ⌘ Jack: Thing he is saying were done were not done.

June 5, 2006

I. Call to Order: 7:24 PM

a. Attendance

Avalon	Closed
Bower	Danielle Berry
Elsworth	Kyle Pentecost
Ferency	Closed
Hedrick	Brian Cooke
Miles	Jessalyn Seramur
New Community	Laura Western
Orion	Anthony Recca
Phoenix	Mike Langdon
Raft Hill	Em Ketterer
Toad Lane	
Vesta	
At-Large	Aaron Mosier
President	Jessica Dalman
Executive Vice President	Barbara Ebel
Vice President of Education	Laurel Koenig (absent)
Vice President of Membership	Matt Kaiser
Corporate Treasurer	Cass Hausserman
Executive Director	Adrien Vlasch (absent)
Member Services Coordinator	- none

b. Agenda Approval

- i. New Business: Phoenix Assessment, Pet Policy, Work Weekend
- ii. Discussion Item: Security
- iii. Motion by At-Large, Seconded by Phoenix

c. Minutes Approval:

- i. Motion by Phoenix, Seconded by Raft Hill

II. Reports

a. Officer Reports

- i. All reports were as written. There was one comment during this time.
- ii. Hedrick: Can Adrien's office hour be from 1pm to 2pm to be more accessible?

b. Staff Reports

- i. As written.

c. Board Members - none

d. Committees - none

III. Presentations -none

IV. Member Time

a. Sarah from Elsworth, soon-to-be resident of Avalon

- i. Concerned about water in Avalon's kitchen and laundry facilities. Leaking is unsanitary and smells bad. Afraid it is something

- serious. House water is not being used, might be rainwater. As membership officer, tours are a hard sell with standing water.
- ii. EVP – Might be a pipe. There is a work order for this. Stu said it's not serious. Will look into it.
- b. Greg from Elsworth
 - i. Stu is currently part-time. Greg wants to be considered for a part-time position, as he lives in the co-ops.
 - ii. Toad Lane – Mike (maintenance from Metzger) has been around for a year.
 - iii. President – Mike works for Chris Metzger. We contract him out from her. Metzger provides his healthcare.
- c. Jack from Toad Lane
 - i. Wants to provide rebuttal to Performance Review. Was in to work [as MSC] everyday he was scheduled. Called in resignation, never called in sick. Took three days for messages to be checked to see he had quit.
- d. Tim from Hillsdale
 - i. Status report from Hillsdale Community Co-op. One vacancy right now. Usually contract through Adrien. Doesn't know their house phone number.

V. Business

- a. Old Business
 - i. Committee Appointments - tabled
- b. New Business
 - i. Phoenix Assessment, presented by Phoenix House
 1. For five days, a room in Phoenix was uninhabitable, as water was coming through the roof and wall. Bed was unusable. Member asks to have their assessment be reduced by \$40 for this month, calculated by prorating rent for five days.
 2. President – As Phoenix is in a historic district, altering the roof to avoid this problem would be difficult.
 3. Phoenix – Not to mention expensive and lengthy.
 4. Executive Vice President – Would be cheapest to hire someone to cut down the branches that cause the gutter clogs.
 5. **Motion 36.3.1** Be it resolved that Kevin J. Smith receive a reduction in assessment of \$40 for the month of July. The money to cover this loss will come from the maintenance budget.
 6. Motion by Raft Hill, seconded by Phoenix.
 7. Roll call vote:
 - a. In favor: Bower, Elsworth, Ferency, Miles, New Community, Phoenix, Raft Hill, Toad Lane, Vesta
 - b. Opposed: Hedrick
 - c. Abstain: none.

8. Motion passes 8-1-0
- ii. Pet Policy, presented by Toad Lane
 1. Vice President of Membership – Who has undisclosed pets, and why do we think that this is the reason why they have not been registered?
 2. Toad Lane - \$100 deposit, \$5 in maintenance per month.
 3. Phoenix – Needs to be in code language for a code change.
 4. Vice President of Membership – This money’s purpose might be something like carpet cleaning?
 5. Phoenix – A theory: Members are going to do this or that. Isn’t this second option costing more?
 6. Elsworth – Looking at other apartments, pets cost even more there.
 7. Executive Vice President - \$25 per term?
 8. Toad Lane – That still costs more.
 9. Bower – We charge less. Agree with Phoenix, wear on the home happens over time. Seems like a lot of finagling for such a small thing. Is it so worth it to change the code? What about the difference in damage between little cats and big cats? Do we want to go into that?
 10. Hedrick – Might be paying for ownership. Pay less for less time, if it can be done easily.
 11. Corporate Treasurer – Registering is the issue. Need to make sure they are interested.
 12. Straw Poll: In favor – 3; Oppose – 4, Undecided – 1
 13. Motion to table, New Community. Seconded by Bower.
- iii. Work Weekend at Bower, presented by Maintenance Committee
 1. Hedrick – What do I say?
 2. Bower – Lemonade.
 3. Corporate Treasurer – How much have we spent in the past?
 4. President – Lots.
 5. Vesta – Is there a problem with not attending?
 6. Executive Vice President – Not mandatory. Pretty cheap in comparison to other projects.
 7. President – Took out driveway @ Ferency, Miles. \$1400
 8. Bower – Terraces? [came out like ‘terrorists’]
 9. Elsworth – Choose words better if you want your money.
 10. Executive Vice President – Will it get finished? Hedrick used their retaining wall wood for a fire.
 11. Phoenix – In favor of double/triple the budget to have a sweet Bower yard.
 12. President – We are putting our THIRD roof on this summer. Money is tight. Can we approve between two and four hundred dollars?
 13. Vice President of Membership – How about two or three.

14. Phoenix – We will need receipts, of course.
15. Executive Vice President – Proposes a motion to approve wiggle room. Will revisit later if more is needed. Will break own legs if necessary.
16. **Motion 36.3.2** Be it resolved that \$250 is allocated for capital improvements for the Cooperative Work Weekend at Bower.
17. Motion by Raft Hill. Seconded by Hedrick.
18. Roll call vote:
 - a. In favor: Bower, Elsworth, Ferency, Hedrick, Miles, New Community, Phoenix, Raft Hill, Toad Lane, Vesta
 - b. Abstain: none.
19. Motion passes 9-0-0

VI. Discussion Items

a. Adrien's Review

- i. Hedrick – Does Adrien know about this review?
- ii. Executive Vice President – Yes. And aware of our discussion of it tonight.
- iii. Elsworth – What is 'bank reconciliation'?
- iv. Corporate Treasurer – Checking bank records vs. your own records
- v. At-Large – Like balancing your checkbook.
- vi. Toad Lane – If we farm out the accounting, will we still pay the ED the same salary?
- vii. President – If the ED and MSC merge, same money. Money from MSC used to farm out accounting.
- viii. Phoenix – Would members mail the accountant rent checks?
- ix. President – No, we would do the deposits, then mail the numbers to NASCO.
- x. Phoenix – Seems like a lot of our issues are not in accounting.
- xi. Raft Hill – Would they be doing reconciling? Sounds like he's just not doing his job.
- xii. Elsworth – Heard he got a good accounting grade.
- xiii. President – Have yet to see transcripts.
- xiv. Executive Vice President – Seems slow.
- xv. Elsworth – Lots of money blown. We debate late over \$500. This is more than that and not discussed. Not good.
- xvi. Hedrick – Where is this money coming from?
- xvii. Phoenix – Seems like a non-accounting problem.
- xviii. President – If he does continue, we must get him insured.
- xix. Executive Vice President – Where does that leave us, as he was left to find insurance.
- xx. Bower – In place for a good counter-suit?
- xxi. Raft Hill – Can we structure this discussion? For example, finance pros/cons

- xxii. President – Pros: If we farm, we don't have to pay for classes. They're professionals.
- xxiii. Raft Hill – Does he have to do this? Will he be pissed? Can we change his job description mid-contract?
- xxiv. President – can talk to a lawyer
- xxv. Phoenix – Plus, he's up for review.
- xxvi. Corporate Treasurer – Con: Might still have non-accounting problems.
- xxvii. Executive Vice President – Joan says the Executive Director does not do much. She already had finance background when she came in.
- xxviii. Toad Lane – How much will it cost for outsourcing?
- xxix. Corporate Treasurer - \$300/mo says Joan.
- xxx. Phoenix - \$10,400 for MSC all year, with solid wage.
- xxxi. Executive Vice President – MSC pay rate should go up with minimum wage.
- xxxii. Vice President of Membership - Should look at his response.
- xxxiii. Corporate Treasurer – Another thing: reviewed in a month. He says this time frame is too short. I'm scared to wait longer.
- xxxiv. Raft Hill – I don't like his tone. No respect for boss. Defensive. Defending what was said about him. Response is offensive and not professional. Disrespectful, reason for firing.
- xxxv. President – Farming possibility?
- xxxvi. Raft Hill – What are our options?
- xxxvii. Toad Lane – Before? Had ED, finance, MSC? Pay raise?
- xxxviii. Elsworth – If Adrien quits, could we find someone else?
- xxxix. Executive Vice President – Could go to something like Manpower.
 - xl. Elsworth – For MSC.
 - xli. Executive Vice President – Can't afford CPA straight out of school.
 - xl. Elsworth – For MSC.
 - xlii. Executive Vice President – Can't afford CPA straight out of school.
 - xl. Elsworth – For MSC.
 - xlii. Corporate Treasurer – Can get someone with 4 year degree.
 - xliii. Bower – Should be able to find someone in this economy.
 - xliv. Phoenix – What happens during months for rehire?
 - xl. Elsworth – For MSC.
 - xlii. Corporate Treasurer – Can get someone with 4 year degree.
 - xliii. Bower – Should be able to find someone in this economy.
 - xliv. Phoenix – What happens during months for rehire?
 - xl. Elsworth – For MSC.
 - xlv. Executive Vice President – Should be quick to find position for books. 2 students for MSC.
 - xlvi. Toad Lane – Are there any duties not covered by MSC? Two part-time MSCs, could raise their wage?
 - xlvii. President – Communications and staff management.
 - xlviii. Raft Hill – If Adrien can't continue.
 - xlix. President – 3 month and 6 month reviews. Still an At-Will employee. Feasible to let go. Is this a repairable situation?
 - l. New Community – Have you talked to him?
 - li. President – I think he's intimidated. Lots of putting off.
 - lii. Corporate Treasurer – says he lacks experience.
 - liii. New Community – Is he still learning?

- liv. Jack Langdon – My impression: incompetent. Hours to reply to e-mail. Lets messages pile up on answering machine. Had five jobs under Joan, had fifteen under Adrien. Brought personal life into the office. Lack of priorities. Pretty sure he knew about Comp Time. Ignores code. Told people at NASCO to e-mail the co-op address. Jack set to sorting out personal e-mails. Discuss Hillsdale at office. Trips planned on office time.
- lv. Hedrick – Talked to housemates: not up to par.
- lvi. Executive Vice President – Checks not deposited since April 22.
- lvii. Raft Hill – Seems inexcusable.
- lviii. Vice President of Membership – Doesn't mean outsourcing is a bad idea.
- lix. Phoenix – We should outsource accounting.
- lx. Bower – Should see when Adrien is here. Can't expect him to be Joan.
- lxi. President – Understand that the EC has learned his job and is going it in his absence.
- lxii. Toad Lane – Said he could be proficient in one month. Why is he not asking for help?
- lxiii. Vesta – I need to hear his defense.
- lxiv. President – The Board sets charges. Executive Director provides defense. Prepare specific documents.
- lxv. Phoenix – Prepare a conservative estimate of how much he's costed us.
- lxvi. President – Questionable, due to mislabeling.
- lxvii. Phoenix – Money in question and he explains. How much per hour of comp time?
- lxviii. Executive Vice President – He has transcripts. Joan did do lunch and go to court.
- lxix. Phoenix – He has radically reconstructed our hours.
- lxx. Hedrick – He does not communicate.
- lxxi. President – Outsourcing? With or without Adrien?
- lxxii. Bower – Outsourcing can be decided. Adrien needs time.
- lxxiii. Phoenix – Let him rebut, then table. If not, then further discussion.
- lxxiv. Corporate Treasurer – 1 month review?
- lxxv. President – Straw Poll on outsourcing.
 - 1. Pro - 6
 - 2. Pro, if NASCO – 3
 - 3. Against - 0
 - 4. On Fence – 1
- lxxvi. Elsworth – Would really like more information on this.
- lxxvii. Executive Vice President – NASCO might be better oversight.
- lxxviii. President – NASCO top floor of a house. 2nd floor is ICC. 1st floor is lobby. Jim Jones said Joan could do this for co-ops our size.
- lxxix. Phoenix – So we might be outsourcing to Joan?
- lxxx. Executive Vice President – Already paying her consulting fees.

- lxxxii. President – If nothing new happens, how do you feel about a review in one month?
 - 1. Pro – 9
 - 2. Against – 0
 - 3. Undecided – 0
- lxxxiii. New Community – Ways of solving problem?
- lxxxiiii. Phoenix – Might not be that the job is the problem.
- lxxxv. Toad Lane – Why did we lose the other applicants?
- lxxxvi. Phoenix – Willing to pay more for more qualifications
- lxxxvii. Corporate Treasurer – SAG goes for \$35,000 for good accountant.
- lxxxviii. Bower – Should be someone interested in the movement.
- lxxxix. Executive Vice President – Can advertise nationwide through NASCO.
- lxxxix. New Community – Should table that discussion until after done with Adrien discussion. Needs to be done fast.
 - xc. Motion to table outsourcing discussion. New Community Motions. Phoenix seconds.
 - xc. President – Is a week to prepare okay?
 - xcii. Hedrick – yes.
 - xciii. President – e-mail Jess (dalmanje@msu.edu) if you have any issues. Call after five. The board will compile those documents. Aaron, Kyle, Jack, Mike to help with discussion. Meet by Sunday. Good/Bad any thoughts. Member names will be anonymous, but it would be best to have names if we need them. Names will not be disclosed to Adrien. 8 PM Monday at Toad Lane. Open to all of SHC.
 - xciv. Raft Hill moves to table Adrien Review. Vesta seconds.

10 MINUTE BREAK

- b. Raft Hill
 - i. President – Who wants to open this up?
 - ii. Executive Vice President – Evict and bill, or five them til June 5. One turned in a check for less than their balance. Not planning to sign. Squatter is a hold-over from another co-op. What to do about assessment?
 - 1. Issue 1: Squatter
 - a. Hedrick – Talk to lawyer?
 - b. President – Works for a lawyer. Options:
 - i. Leave. If not, then he’s trespassing.
 - ii. Lawyer gets trespassing paperwork started, sheriff contacted.
 - iii. Call cops and remove person.
 - c. President – If he has a verbal contract with someone in the house, this gets sticky.

- d. Executive Vice President – Make squatter welcome, then evict?
 - e. Raft Hill – Move in around May 6 or 7. Saw dude hanging out at day and night. Except when hanging with his friends. Does his laundry there. “Told you of my friend, right? Well, he’s cool” from the squatter’s friend. This is our understanding. Complaint from legal member of the house who knew trespasser. Friend wants him to stay for free. Homeless? No, transient. Stays with friends.
2. Issue 2: Non-payment
- a. Raft Hill – Said he’s staying. Said would sign contract. Has not done so. Other three members work Full Time. Had no idea of trespasser status. No one knew history. Baffled.
 - b. President – E-mailed by guy w/out contract. Kind, gentle squatter. Friendship is a neat emotion. Treated them all unfairly. SHC does not know what a co-op is.
- iii. Elsworth – Got to be strong about this.
 - iv. President – Don’t need Hotel Bower again.
 - v. Bower – Three good members. 1 unpaid member. 2 friends of delinquent?
 - vi. President – Raft was slated to be closed.
 - vii. Raft Hill – Current members were not told anything of possible house closure.
 - viii. Toad Lane – The transient was already evicted from a SHC house?
 - ix. President – The long way is preferable here.
 - x. New Community – Why can’t we just take legal action?
 - xi. President – If not a contract, not visible, hard to prove squatting.
 - xii. Phoenix – Long, same process for both non-members. Bad debt for the third.
 - xiii. New Community – Can’t just kick out three good co-ops.
 - xiv. Raft Hill – I have to talk to my housemates.
 - xv. Bower – Security Risk.
 - xvi. Executive Vice President – At least with guest contracts have some liability.
 - xvii. Toad Lane – Two people in violation of contract. One by not paying, one by staying past their stated end-date.
 - xviii. Executive Vice President – If we evict them all, what happens to last three? Trying to be open, fair.
 - xix. Hedrick – Needs to talk to housemates.
 - xx. Toad Lane – Can you remove trespasser belongings?
 - xxi. President – Not if there is a verbal contract
 - xxii. Executive Vice President – Talked to lawyer. Proceed as usual for Bad Debt.

xxiii. Move to table Raft Hill discussion to next meeting. **Motion?**
Second?

c. Security

- i. Bower – Security. Car theft. Other places offer security features. We make good prey? Talked to a PI friend about a deal on consulting. Where there are problems? Sucks that things happen. Unfortunate. Could get quote for services. Dummy cameras, House walkthroughs.
- ii. Executive Vice President – This has already been discussed with the police.
- iii. Vice President of Membership – Need more info.
- iv. Bower – Don't need a full time security staff. Go back to doing background checks.
- v. President – Checks are very expensive.
- vi. At-Large – How much will this help if our own members leave doors open? Even apartments with intercom entry as security are foiled by their own members.
- vii. Phoenix – Good outdoor maintenance could help a lot. Give the houses a maintained look, so people won't think there's nobody around to see any misdeeds
- viii. President – Push button locks?
- ix. New Community – House security officers?
- x. At-Large – Could people talk about this on the website?
- xi. President – Talk to cops, increase community involvement.
- xii. Toad Lane – Maintenance committee can talk about it?
- xiii. Move to table discussion until Maintenance discusses it. Motion by Toad Lane. Seconded by ??

VII. Announcements

- a. Executive Vice President – Bike Project in Demonstration Hall basement. Tuesdays at 5:30
- b. Phoenix – Danielle from Bower should be commended for her work in filling the house.
- c. Vice President of Membership – Got married on June 3rd.
- d. Bower – Party, keg on Friday night.

VIII. Adjournment – 10:18 PM

- a. Motion by Toad Lane. Seconded by Hedrick.