

Attachment A

MINUTES

All Star One Chairs Meeting

The Guest House

Chester, CT

September 17, 2011

Present: Scott Stewart, Ben Soule, Debbie Weiner Soule, Paula Phillips, John Best, Bob Jorgenson, Jim Prochaska, Ray Hallows, Bobbie Jorgenson, George Easter, Sally Easter, Jan Prochaska, Charlie Close, Connie Lentz, Henry Powsner, Chris Gimpel, Dana Powsner, Phil Pierce, Roy Cook, Marion Cook, Ray Hallows, Barb Hallows, Jane Trudeau, Carla Osgood, David Osgood, Ned Tillman, Kathy Tillman, Bill Gimpel, Paul Jennings, Lisa Jennings, Deb Walton, Judy O'Keefe, Dennis O'Keefe, Pam Pierce, Larry Yermack, Elizabeth Yermack, Estelle Best, Tom Walton, Carl Sturken, Cheryl-Anne Sturken, Tricia Coleman.

Also present: Tom Griffiths, Moderator and Betsy Mena, observer

Tom Griffiths called the meeting to order at 1:40 PM.

Opening Words – Deb Walton.

Deb shared her tradition of offering a meaningful quote with her guests, imagining for a moment that all of us were gathered in her dining room. She shared the song “For Good,” from the musical “Wicked,” as one which spoke to her feelings for the group gathered.

Milestones – We remembered those members of our community no longer with us. Tom Griffiths particularly mentioned Bill Clegg, who had missed our last fall meeting. We mentioned Karen Close, missed for her wisdom and calm presence. We also mentioned with joy the wedding of Bethany Soule to Mitch Duyser, and the passing, this summer, of Casey Hill Mercer.

Approval of 2010 November meeting minutes and approval of 2011 on-island chairs' meeting minutes – Debbie Weiner Soule – M (R. Cook), S and VOTED: to approve the November meeting minutes. Moved (R. Cook), S and VOTED: to approve the 2011 on-island minutes.

Questions and Answers on Reports (posted on All Star One website in advance of the meeting):

- Star Island Corporation Board and Permanent Trust (Jan Prochaska)
- Council of Conferences (Jim Prochaska, Roy Cook)
- Children's Program and Planning (Waltons)
- Registration (Bill Tibbs – *not present at meeting*)

Tom Griffiths called for questions or comments on reports issued in writing.

* Board: Jan Prochaska noted that she will be at another Board meeting in ten days, and that there was a very good board retreat on island in late summer. The board is thinking a lot about sustainability. Deb Weiner Soule asked about the projected bed night shortage. Jan said that as of this time, she understands that there is still a 1200 bed night (each bed night, Tom Griffiths

commented, is valued at about \$100, so the total deficit for this item comes to about \$120K). Jan noted that there is an emergency reserve fund to cover losses related to hurricanes.

*Children's Program: Ben Soule asked how young adults are defined for the statistics cited in the report. Deb Walton replied that it covers ages 19-30.

*Council of Conferences: Roy Cook noted that the next Council of Conferences meeting is scheduled for October 15 "at an undisclosed location."

2011 reports, Questions/Answers:

- Chairs' Report (Scotty and Annie Stewart):

Scotty reported that the conference's volunteers were fabulous. The weather was perfect, the SIC staff was terrific. Special thanks to Deb Walton: it is a blessing, Scotty said, being able to run the conference, and knowing that housing issues and kids programs are set...Deb does a fabulous job. Bill Tibbs: Scott said, "It is sad but inspirational to note that the guy who replaces you is better than you. Bill was all over everything and did a great job." Scott continued, "Bill Gimpel sliced and diced the numbers in a great way."

Tom Coleman would call Scotty every couple of months to offer 'pastoral care,' Scott said. We were about to run out of beer and Tom took care of that as well. The Executive Committee was a fabulous group. Scott said, "I wish that anyone who has had concerns with the Exec could have listened to the love, thought, and effort and intent to do the right thing that was present in those meetings." He added: "Lois Williams get thanks for helping to lay out the week – she had great thoughts."

Lessons learned: "We loved the music director position that Adrian filled. We think it was a wise decision to have this position. We made an effort to plug in the young adult group. The future of the conference may focus on emphasizing programming for that group. We made Sunday more activity-driven. Thank you to all of you for volunteering." The group applauded Scotty (and, in absentia, Annie) for the great job they did.

Deb Walton said to Scotty, "Carl and Cheryl-Anne were a hard act to follow, and you did it. You knew what to preserve, what to tweak and you did it all so well." Scotty added: "Annie would have loved to be there. She has just started teaching, and she teaches emotionally disabled kids, and she is teaching JV hockey and a four hour graduate course. We're doing fine...she is sorry she isn't here."

- Financial Aid (Elizabeth Yermack):

Paul Jennings thanked Elizabeth Yermack for her leadership of the financial aid committee. "I appreciate the diligence, the hard work, the thoughtfulness that goes into this program." Paul asked Elizabeth to highlight the changes that are being proposed, and following this, there will be a motion to approve the changes in policy.

Elizabeth acknowledged Joy Close, Shelley Powsner, and Holly Hunnicutt for their work on the committee, which also includes the registrar(s) and the treasurer, ex officio. Elizabeth highlighted handouts G, H, I. G is the current policy. H is the proposed guidelines which we are being asked to vote on. Elizabeth said: "We want to give the committee as much flexibility as we need, hence the change for policy to guidelines. Second, we want to have an economically diverse community. This contributes to our conference's vitality; we don't want people who have fallen on hard times to not be able to come. We took out some things. As originally set up,

the committee included the framing chairs on the committee. To keep the confidentiality issue foremost, we have taken this out. There is no connection between decisions made by the chairs and decisions made by the financial aid committee. The other thing we changed was the three year aid limit. In our current financial situation in this country, many people have been out of work for long periods of time, or are under water with mortgages, etc. We wanted flexibility here. We had a division in aid offered to new shoalers and old shoalers. Bill Tibbs talked to new shoalers who had worked for years to get the money to come. And we felt that we should not distinguish between new and old shoalers, because we value new blood in our conference.”

Elizabeth noted that we also added language that reminds people that they are on the honor system: the financial aid system is based on donations from shoalers. People are urged to ask for only the amount their family needs to attend the conference. We hope that, when things are better for these people, they will give back to the fund.

M (Exec) and S: That the Chairs approve the recommendations made by the Financial Aid committee and endorsed by the Executive Committee.

Questions: (P. Phillips): Do people have to say why they think they need the money? Elizabeth: there is a space for people to state this, but they do not have to state this. Elizabeth: We also feel that this fund helps to fill beds. And that is important – this is good for the island to have all these beds filled.

The motion was approved unanimously.

- Treasurer (Bill Gimpel):

Bill referred people to attachment I, regarding Financial Assistance. He noted that there have been great contributions to the financial assistance fund through Texas Hold “Em, donations, Chairs retreat auctions and other parties and events. Bill noted that we will be carrying over \$12,700 into the financial aid fund for 2012. Bill noted that he is recommending that \$4,000 be moved from the on-island auction proceeds (2011) to financial aid. That will give us about \$25,000 available next year. With the financial aid committee’s recommendation of a pool of \$14,500 to dispense, that leaves us with a healthy cushion in the financial aid fund.

Paul reminded those present that the vote from last year authorized the Treasurer to take up to 50% of the auction proceeds to use for financial aid, so handout I is for transparency of reporting.

Jan Prochaska requested that we discuss the Annual Fund before we vote on the 2012 budget.

Bill presented the 2011 budget, acknowledging the generosity of the Miller grant and the speakers, who donated their honoraria to the Annual Fund. Bill noted that as a result of supplemental fund raising and generosity, about \$2300 was raised. \$325 was charged by SIC to use the Newton kitchen, Bill noted. \$1277 was netted from social hour. We are donating more than \$12,000 to the Annual Fund – more than ever before. Deb Walton noted that the total of \$14,457 is what goes to the Annual Fund from our conference (from not only the auction but other fund raising sources). Bill agreed, correcting his previous statement. Paula Phillips asked how individual donations are accounted for. Bill clarified that those donations go directly to the Annual Fund, although the conference total is credited.

Attachment K, the proposed 2012 budget, shows proposed income of \$30,545 and proposed expenses of \$29,268, for a net plus balance of \$1,277. We have over \$24,000 in reserves. Bill noted that Dug Miller and Barb Denno are retiring from children's staff. They have always paid for themselves and given the grant – we don't know if Dug will continue a grant -- we know that we will have to pay for two additional staff people. There will, therefore, be an increase in children's staff expenses.

Bill is projecting no increase in room and board rates at this time. Paula commented that she thinks it smart to budget for the actual expenses rather than hoped-for donations. Paul: We could budget based on costs if all had to be paid for, or we could make reasonable assessments. Given that estimating expenses as you think they will be might be the best approach, we still have a substantial reserve to depend on. Bill: I feel comfortable with what I am recommending and what you have in front of you. This last year, we only paid for seven people to park and I have budgeted eight parking fees. I have budgeted \$2500 for speakers. Other expenses I expect to hold. I budgeted \$1500 for other conference expenses. With a transfer of \$1500 from our reserves, we come out with at \$1277 surplus. We budgeted \$17,000 for staff expenses. If a surplus was not taken, there would be a net \$900 deficit. Tom Walton: The numbers are not fixed, and we have to go year to year, depending on children's enrollment which influences are staffing numbers. Deb Walton: The numbers are almost fixed. We have decided philosophically that we need two people per group with the exception of the babies, where we need more staffing. We haven't had a mid-teen group in a while because we have increased staffing in other groups.

George Easter: Let's say that we adjust the budget up a bit, and this results in something of a deficit. We are not required to present a balanced budget, just a realistic one. We don't have to show money coming from the reserves, we just represent it. We know we have the reserves, and we will dip into it, and I think that is what we should put up from approval (without a transfer from reserves). Paul: We need to recall that if the numbers pan out as projected, we will need to move money from the reserves.

As requested by Jan, we moved to a report on the Star Island Annual Fund.

- Star Island Annual Fund (Ned Tillman): "I reported that in the last two years we had raised \$90K each year. On island we had received about \$25K in cash, and a number of pledges. At this point the numbers are the same. Most of the money comes in in the last quarter of the year. I have talked with many of you who have indicated that you plan to continue giving at the same rate as last year, or perhaps a little higher. I am optimistic that we will make our \$90K goal. We have the \$14K that will come from the auction, and what is in hand, so we have just under \$40K. I would love to hear from others as to your plans, particularly if you plan to give a lot more, or less, but I think we will hold steady."

Ned continued, "Angela Matthews has also asked me to say a few things about the capital campaign, which David Yermack is essentially in charge of for our conference. The capital campaign is still in its 'quiet' phase. Our conference has contributed about \$250K – which includes \$10K toward the Permanent Trust and \$76K in planned gifts. If you look at contributions from all contributions, we are fifth in generosity. This was a little surprising." Paul commented, "It is nice to see other conferences stepping up." Ned: "I encourage you to contribute, before the end of the year, which may encourage others to give more in the future when the campaign goes public."

The other aspect is the challenge when the campaign goes public. Will it confuse people more about where to give money? The current thinking is that it will be a combined ask between the annual fund and the capital campaign, the goal of which is about \$5 million. We hope that people will begin giving to the annual fund. There is an opportunity to give money to some specific earmarked projects.

Are there other things that we should be discussing regarding the Annual Fund? Barb Hallows: Is one of the designated giving opportunities for funding support for the capital campaign focused on scholarships? Jan: I think this comes out of the annual budget. About \$21K was given for financial aid (through the Corporation) this year, for all conferences. Jan: The silent phase of the capital campaign will end at the end of this year. About \$50K in grant applications are also being submitted. How do we make an effective double-ask next year? This is something Angela asked us to discuss. (We agreed that we will discuss this under new business).

Tom Griffiths asked for a motion to approve the 2012 budget as recommended. M(Phil Pierce) and S. Discussion: Paul clarified that \$2,430 will be changed in the budget as distributed, to not move money from reserves, and increase the staff room and board to \$17K. Paul summarized, "George suggested showing income as expected, expenses as you expect, and the deficit as you anticipate. So there would be no transfer from reserves. That gives us \$2,430 as an anticipated budget deficit." Bill Gimpel noted that the conference received a 3K gift for program enhancement which will go into reserves (for children's programming) for 2012.

Paula: We have to make a motion to amend the budget as revised and presented. With no transfer from reserves, staff room and board to \$17K, and we therefore show a deficit of \$2,430. This was M (Phillips) and S. There was no discussion on the changed language. Judy O'Keefe suggested a clarification to note that the increase is to show the true cost of staffing. Agreed. The amendment was unanimously voted.

Jan: "The 2012 budget does not show financial aid transfers. But I am concerned about the annual fund. I want to remind us of Bill Clegg's recommendation that we not separate fund raising into Annual Fund and Financial Aid, but that we instead, as a group, decide on what the total goal is for the year--say \$90,000 and \$20,000 - and then work together to meet that total goal through all activities like the Auction, Poker, Donations etc." Paul suggested that this was more of a discussion to be taken into account for future governance and planning models. "Bill has reported on the year just ended, and the proposal to move \$4,000 simply acts on what the chairs voted last year. The conversation about the group's commitment to overall financial health of the island is another question," he responded. Elizabeth: We have no idea who is going to apply, so I want to have a safe enough cushion so that we won't have to turn anyone away.

Ben: Jan has put an idea out there and there is a sense that we should talk about this in the future. The way I see it, the \$4K that will go into the financial assistance budget is the only piece that we as a group have any handle on altering if we want to direct more to the annual fund. But the way it's written, that figure is to be determined by the treasurer based upon an ask from the financial aid committee. So the only way we could change this is to lobby the treasurer and financial aid committee to come up with a different number but we can't vote on that now.

Paul: The financial aid committee has a responsibility to tell us what the need is. We as a conference have a commitment to fund that need. That informs a decision about other needs including the annual fund and others. They understand the issues in a way that we don't and

they have made a recommendation for what is needed to form the base for a stable fund. We have an obligation to approve that, and also to meet our long term needs.

The budget as amended was unanimously affirmed.

Ratifying Actions Taken by the Executive Committee, November 2010- September, 2011 –
Debbie Weiner Soule:

This was M (Exec) and S. Discussion:

A question was raised about the item which noted that the Exec had affirmed a process for dealing with difficult decision in the conference. Jim Prochaska reviewed the processes, the role of the Healing and Reconciliation Task Force, and how to encourage right relationships throughout the conference.

Paula: How do we understand the detail of the summary notes that are provided in this document: Paul: We (the Exec) are acting at your request. Tom Griffiths: This is a typical business procedure. Stockholders ratify actions of the board of directors. Town meeting members ratify the actions of Selectmen. Typically about ten percent of information is known, and 90 percent is based on trust. And the authority of the Exec comes from the Chairs.

Jim: Most of what is there in the summary is quite specific. One thing is ambiguous and that was intentional, to deal with some confidentiality issues. Appropriate process was observed, however. Dennis O’Keefe: I have concern about the involvement of legal authorities in dealing with misconduct. Paul: If we are concerned about legal issues we do contact the CEO of the SIC. We are dealing with our own internal policies. To the extent that administration of those policies overlaps with the island, we contact the island authorities. Dennis: What if we do contact Vicky Hardy? I wouldn’t want us to get involved in a potentially litigious situation. Jim: I think that this is something that we should revisit relative to looking at our governance against the island’s governance. Paul: Yes, and part of our governance looks at where authority begins and ends with relation to the corporation.

The motion was passed with 2 abstentions (P. Phillips, D. O’Keefe).

BREAK

The meeting reconvened at 3:35 PM.

2012 Conference Planning (Elissa Best and David Epstein):

Estelle Best reported on behalf of Elissa and David. Estelle said Elissa is doing well following surgery (on Sept. 16). Estelle said, “Their speaker is Rob Williams. He and his wife, Kate, have two children, ages 13 and 10. Dr. Rob Williams is a Vermont based musician, historian, consultant and media education maker who founded *Higher Mind Media Works*. He teaches at Champlain College and Syracuse University, and is a publisher. He raised grass fed yaks for meat and agrotourism and plays pholk-funk music in a three piece band. Rob writes, “In my role as a Vermont based media education consultant educated in media history and education I am pleased to be able to talk ...about media literacy education. I am convinced that media literacy education is central to 21st century learning and fostering our culture and our democracy.” He will talk about understanding our media matrix and media brains, media culture trends, media matrix questions, and learning the language of persuasion. His talks will be very interactive.” See <http://www.robwilliamsmedia.com/> for more information.

Review of Conference Covenant Process – Kathy Tillman:

Kathy reported that she and many attendees had a great meeting about covenant on island this summer. Dana Powsner has been a wonderful mentor. Ideas put into a framework of categories which has been sent out to the committee members who volunteered to work on this process. Kathy is now getting feedback. She expects to have materials for the AS I community by January. She further hopes to have something to put out for ratification by the Chairs in the spring. On the committee are: Sally Easter Jr, Steve Parr, Dana Powsner, Ellen Clegg, Katherine Williams Cassidy. All these people volunteered enthusiastically to serve.

Conference Issues:

A. Governance (Paul Jennings and Jim Prochaska):

Paul said, “We have discussed governance issues for at least two years. The Exec requests that you approve a governance task force, which is described in Attachment N. We have grown in complexity; the issues we have to deal with have changed. People have dealt with these with the best of intentions but because we have lack of clarity the authority about how we deal with these has led to some strains and tensions in our group. We need to get back to establishing the kind of trusting community we have always been. The lack of clarity has led to a lack of trust. If we put some good minds to the question of how we appropriately govern this conference, the trust that is in this room will, we hope, resurface.”

Jim reviewed the proposal. He encouraged Chairs to “ask people who they feel would be good members to serve on the governance study committee...chairs and non-chairs. The Exec will then serve as a nominating committee, discuss those recommendations and come back and say to the Chairs group, ‘This is the slate that we have deliberated and discussed and that we recommend to you.’ And we will ask you to vote that slate up or down as the governance committee. We are looking for a committee that will generate the same kind of trust. What needs changing will be definite, the further process will be to go out and talk to people who have served on the committee, to others to gather information, to make recommendations back to this larger group for changes in the governance structure, if any.”

The motion was M (D Weiner Soule) and S.

Discussion:

Connie Lentz: Is this governance for the Chairs or the conference? Paul: The conference. But the entire question of how we govern ourselves as a conference, the committees we generate, all of this, should be on the table with no preconceived notions. Everything should be on the table. I personally think this committee should be constituted as quickly as good process allows, so that this committee can generate draft proposals at the on island meeting in July with recommendations going out in advance. The committee can then take feedback at the on island meeting, and then this group could act on the proposals a year from now. Jim: this would be ideal. We don’t want to scare people away, but that is what we’re hoping for.

Ben: When are you hoping to make a decision about who will be on the committee? Jim: In a month. Dennis: Without knowing exactly what is driving this, I take it that there is a perception from conferees in past years about lack of transparency? Paul: No, I think it is more within this group: where does the authority of the chairs begin and end, the Exec begin and end? By proposing this we are not saying that everything is broken. The Financial Aid Committee has information that they cannot share with us. They make recommendations to us and we either vote them up or down. They make recommendations that we personally might not accept, but they recommend them thoughtfully and we decide to endorse those recommendations or not. We have lost some of that in other parts of the governance structure. Dennis: Will you publicize this

study to other parts of the conference? Paul: Yes, because we are opening up the study process. And the larger community has to have confidence in the recommendations and the work of the group.

Connie: I think Bart and I were the last chairs before the Exec was formed. I think it's essential that the Exec function well. Before this we were governed by a group of 40 or 50 people and it was very dysfunctional. Governance has to be clear. If I entrust the Exec and I am not willing to do the work, I don't have the right to challenge other decisions people make. Paul: And in order for you to have that kind of trust, there has to be understanding about what decisions the Exec is empowered to do, what is remanded to the chairs, and so on. There has been confusion about this.

Tom Walton: Paul and the Executive Committee, some are making an assumption that something is broken. You are privy to information that might not suggest this. We have gotten very large, and at one time, some of us remember the whole body sitting in chairs at Little Compton [Rhode Island]. There are more people in the mix. We are as vulnerable as we are as people. And no matter what we make – an Executive Committee or whatever – we will always be vulnerable as human beings are. And if this is not where we are putting our energy and passion, we need to trust that those who are putting their energy and passion into this, are doing a great job.

Jim: Our governance structure and process is not just about the Executive Committee. We have bylaws, written policies, committees, and clarifying some of those inherent processes that come with governance... is about balance of responsibilities, and about recognizing the role of the Chairs. We are talking about the larger governance structure. The more we can clarify and have the kind of structure and process that will serve us well, the better off we will be.

Jane Trudeau: I worked on the original bylaws and at that time we were a large group of chairs and the discussions would go on and on. The Executive Committee has been invaluable in terms of coming together and pulling things together. When I developed those bylaws they were written and adopted – and Elizabeth worked with me – with the idea that the Exec would be facilitators. Spotting issues, identifying alternatives for us to vote on. We saw them as identifying issues but the final decision would lay with the former chairs. Jan: I'm glad that Jane reminded us of this, so that people could go back and review those original documents or change them. The three parts of [U.S.] government could be viewed as the H/R Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Chairs. If we have clarity about these issues and use them effectively that would be good.

Paula: I don't know that I have heard that many of the Chairs are questioning the work of the Executive Committee. The way I have heard it is that there were differences of opinion, not unanimity. For financial aid, you want unanimity. For the Exec, if there are differences of opinion, you get that sense that things aren't as functional. I don't know that this will ever be solved. Is it a simple majority that we are looking for, or something else? Paul: I don't think we need to look for a smoking gun as to why we are doing this. Organizations change, the bylaws were written a while ago. Any healthy organization takes a step back, periodically, and looks at whether the governance structure is serving us well, and whether people have confidence in the decision making process.

Carla Osgood: You said the group would look at structure and process. Paul: Correct.

Larry Yermack: With no more than two nominees being current or past members of the EC, I

would like to suggest that no current members of the Exec Committee be on the committee. That those people might be of closed mind. And having served on the Exec, I know how demanding the meetings are. An individual with both roles might be asked to do a bit much. Jim: I would accept this as a friendly amendment. I would hope that we take care that we don't have more than one person in a role of greater influence.

Larry: Moved (and S): That no current members of the Exec be on this committee. (Larry clarified his intent that up to two *former* members of the Exec may serve). Jim: We would expect that the study group would interact with current members. Tricia: I have concern about polarization. Paul clarified that the committee would be five to seven people. Lisa Jennings: The rationale for not serving on both is that it is a tremendous amount of work. I am concerned about people being overloaded.

Deb WS: I want to note that there are, by my count, 21 former chairs now living who have served on the Exec. Does that leave enough of a pool if all who have served on the Exec are excluded? Paul: Good point. The intent was to make sure that the information we have doesn't get lost but that the Chairs don't overload the committee. The other possibility is asking you to suggest to us that you identify people who will do a good job. And then we constitute the committee. So it may be better that we look for the people who will be willing to serve and commit, and who you have confidence in, to constitute the committee.

Ben: I will vote against this amendment and I trust that the people formulating the Committee will hear this discussion. Tom Griffiths: We are voting on an amendment that will bar current Exec members from serving on the governance task force (as of the end of the meeting today). The amendment was defeated.

Paul asked Jim how he felt about removing restrictions of roles in the proposed motion. Jim indicated that he felt the restriction should be lifted, which would amend the proposal. M (Lentz) and S: to so amend. The amendment passed unanimously.

M (Phil Pierce) and S: to change the number of the group to 5 OR 7. Rationale: to make sure there is an odd number on the committee. This was accepted as friendly amendment. Paul reiterated that the Exec will nominate the committee and the chairs will elect the committee. Paula asked what the process was for nominating people. Paul: I hope that there is enough of a nominating process that there is also a culling out process. Don't nominate people unless you know they would be willing to serve.

The vote went to the main motion. The amended proposal was unanimously voted.

Election of Executive committee members, Council of Conferences representatives, Financial Aid Committee Members:

- Treasurer – one to be elected for a three-year term.

Bill Gimpel is a candidate for re-election. Nominations were closed. We voted unanimously to re-elect Bill Gimpel

- Executive Committee - four to be elected:

1 to fill a 1 year unexpired term

3 to fill 3-year terms

The Executive Committee wishes to place Charlie Close's name in nomination for filling the

one-year unexpired term, and Tricia Coleman's name in nomination for filling a second three-year term.

Two additional nominees (at least) were needed.

Paul emphasized that these elections are contingent upon the governance review. Paul emphasized the importance of staffing all of our committees. Pam Pierce nominated Ben Soule, who accepted nomination. Cheryl-Anne Sturken accepted nomination as well. It was moved (Phil Pierce) and S: to close nominations. The Secretary was directed to cast a ballot to elect those nominated. So voted.

- Council of Conferences Representatives: 1 member of the Executive Committee, 1 at-large representative, each to serve a 1-year term.

Jim Prochaska and Roy Cook are candidates for re-election. It was moved (L. Yermack) and S to vote the incumbents, Roy Cook and Jim Prochaska, to these positions. So voted.

- Financial Aid Committee members: 2 to serve three year terms

Holly Hunnicutt and Shelley Powsner are both candidates for re-election. It was moved by acclamation to elect these two individuals, Holly Hunnicutt and Shelley Powsner. So voted.

Kathy Tillman asked the group to join in thanking those leaving the Executive Committee: Deb Walton, Deb Weiner Soule, and Larry Yermack.

Other business

Jan introduced discussion, at the request of Angela Matthews, SIC Development Director, to contemplate, as a group, what would be helpful next year, when there may be giving to both the Annual Fund and the Capital Campaign.

Ned clarified that gifts can be made as bequests, or outright to the Permanent Trust, or to the Star Island Corporation Annual Fund. Jim suggested that All Star One has been a leader in financial support in many different ways. One of the things we want to do is recognize that our leadership is important for the annual fund and the capital campaign. Each year we set a goal for the annual fund, and we may want to set one for the capital campaign. We should recognize that we are a leader for the annual fund, filling the conference, financial aid, and we are well behind in terms of capital campaign giving. One of the potentials is to look at what are the priorities for the capital campaign. We could say that we, as All Star One, want to help fund that particular need for the island.

Jim suggested that one of the few ways that we can build confidence in the financial stability for the island is for each of us, as much as possible, to give from our estate after we don't need it. If we could each do 5 to 10 percent, we would be able to ensure the kind of process that we need. More is needed in current dollars, but in many senses our families will benefit from this kind of giving. One of the goals we should have is to be among the leaders of the capital campaign. An example: the Religious Education conference has committed more to this campaign than All Star One. As has the Arts Conference. They have nowhere near the capability that we have in other areas...but they are really stepping up.

The capital campaign is for long term sustainability, Jim said. If we can frame this that way and challenge ourselves more, it gives us a couple of years to catch up. Paul: I think doing this as a dual ask is the right way to do this. It's also an opportunity to educate people as to where money

goes and how we do this. If the list is very clear about where the money will be spent, and how, that will be very helpful. Another way of being a leader is to commit to 100% participation. We have the capacity, but the percentage of participation is another way of demonstrating leadership.

Lisa: If a campaign becomes known through the public phase, are all other fundraising avenues moving into the capital campaign or do the other funding options still get offered as a way to donate? Jan: We are offering people the opportunity to designate part of their estate to the campaign. We gave part of our estate to the capital campaign. Jim: The McGill Society campaign can be designated as a percent of estate. The capital campaign asks for an amount. Pam: I think that we should identify a percentage. If we can ask people to have one to one meetings and make a commitment and help to approach others who have not yet been approached, that would be good.

Tom Walton: I want to support the idea of a percentage of giving. We have talked about supporting people who can't afford the conference, and we have also talked about the importance of the young adult community to our conference. I think that approaching one another and pairing donations is a very good idea.

Comments and Questions:

Paul: we did vote to become a 501©3 which we have not followed through on. Jane Trudeau noted that Ann Etter, a CPA, has reviewed Jane's application and made suggestions as to how to improve the application. Jane said, "We are running under the radar because our treasurers have used their own SSN's. We have no tax ID. I have to make us a New Hampshire Corporation with a tax ID, file an income report to the State of New Hampshire. The IRS filing is fairly simple, but we will exist after doing this. I would take the deduction at this time if you are making a donation to the conference, because all the money we give, even for financial aid, goes to Star Island." Paul: It's important to get our money out of personal accounts. And without tax ID's no bank will open an organization's account.

Jane will work on the 501©3.

Deb Walton: "I wanted to say more about **Dug Miller and Barb Denno** and their enormous contribution to the children's program. They have served well and they have volunteered and funded us. We called Larry Yermack and asked Larry to take a photo of the Miller family this year and this photo, plus the card that is circulating around you, will go home with Christine and Bill to Dug and Barb." All expressed gratitude for the generosity of time and finances offered by Dug and his family.

Date for Off-Island Meeting 2012 – Deb Walton:

Deb noted, October 26-28, 2012 are the dates for our meeting for next year, at The Guest House in Chester, CT. "I would like to turn over the planning of this weekend to someone else. Please volunteer." Judy O'Keefe mentioned that All Star 2 rotates the responsibility of planning. Deb noted that last year there were 28 couples and some additional attendees. "This year there are 20 people not with us, and I was a little concerned. Because rates were reduced on the basis of numbers, we didn't meet those minimums." It was suggested that attendance is lower because this meeting occurred earlier in the season.

Henry Powsner: How many are we this year? Estelle: 41. David Osgood: Could you talk about the negotiations with the conference center? One of my concerns is that people who are coming for lunch, dinner, and the meeting cost us \$70 each. Paul: I think they need to be a little

more flexible on their commuter price scale. Phil: The literature in our room advertises personal retreats at \$50 for a room and \$45 for meals. Deb Walton: The commuter rate caught me by surprise. We could get away with something at Whispering Pines. I felt they would do a head count. As long as we are establishing a relationship [with this new venue] I played it straight and then we were charged \$70/person. I asked my liaison about this. To use this facility and have two meals, they charge \$70 each. I am happy to try and renegotiate this with our sales contact.

Barb Hallows: When we signed in they said that we could have lunch today and lunch tomorrow. Tricia Coleman offered to take over as retreat coordinator. We accepted her offer with thanks.

Closing Words – Charlie Close:

Charlie noted that it has been a while since he has attended this meeting. He has attended many meetings, he said, and there is a lot of juxtaposition of those meetings. Anticipating those mailings, he wondered if we had gotten more streamlined, and he saw Paul's mailing with attachments A through O. "I thought, 'we are making progress.'" Yesterday Charlie got a note from Deb Weiner Soule, with 27 pages of minutes. "I thought about how we do our business and parse words and think about policy and what we need to do. Yet, with all that we do, and as much time as we spend here, doing this, there is another piece of paper, and another thing that happens. It is this: the card you sent me last year.

"It arrived in the deepest, darkest time in my life. And you reached into my darkness and you held me and you loved me. Now, I am not sure where those papers are going to end up in my life. [But] this card has a special place by my computer, where it lives, and it will stay there for a very long time.

"There is a strange quirkiness about organizations like this. We can get so caught up in governance. But in doing that, we can do this other thing...the love, the covenant, the nurturing, that makes All Star One as special as it is. So whenever I worry about what attachment K is going to look like, or what I am going to do with 27 pages of minutes, I think about what you sent me, and what you are sending to Dug Miller. And it is all worth it."

Charlie then shared the words of David White which, he said, "Spoke to me." White wrote: "Enough. These few words are enough. If not these words, this breath. If not this breath, this sitting here. This opening to the life we have refused again and again until now... until now."

"My word," Charlie said, "is, 'enough.'"

The meeting was **adjourned at 5:00 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Weiner Soule,
Secretary