



## **MEETING SYNOPSIS**

NARFE Strategic Planning Committee Meeting  
June 22, 2015

### **Conducted Electronically**

#### **Participants**

Jon Dowie, National Secretary/Treasurer  
Ted Jensen, Maryland  
Charles Stanphill, Oklahoma  
Charles Brodigan, Oregon  
Dave Southworth, California  
Ted Van Hintum, Colorado  
Gaston Gianni, Virginia

Bruce Coleman, Iowa  
Bill Leatham, Florida  
Evelyn Kirby, Region II VP (SP Team)  
Jim Crawford, Region I VP (SP Team)  
Lou Ann Sabatier, Facilitator  
Edward Fitzelle, Facilitator

Absent – Nancy Hunt, Ohio

**The opening discussion centered on the progress the SP Committee has made and which is reflected in the summary of the May 13, 2015 meeting.**

The summary noted that a consensus had been reached on:

- BOD and regionalization
- Size of the BOD
- Policymaking by the BOD and executive authority
- Non-Mandatory Chapter Membership

The SPC members discussed and clarified their respective perceptions of the role of the Strategic Planning Committee as a body that will make recommendations to the Strategic Plan Team on what will be included in the strategic plan.

Some SPC members expressed a sense of urgency for changes to be made to the organization through the strategic planning process and urged the committee to make decisive recommendations.

It was noted by several SPC members that the summary of the prior meeting was posted and circulated to the membership and there were few comments or objections voiced or received regarding the summary.

Others voiced caution on recommending significant organizational changes in short order. They do not disagree with the recommendations, but rather that it may be difficult to get the voting members to embrace and adopt several changes at one time.

A concern shared by many of the SPC members was how to get feedback and insight from the membership and the leadership into the strategic planning process.

It was noted that a full day of the Federation Presidents Meeting agenda is devoted to discussions and presentations on the strategic planning process and that this will be an opportunity for the SP Committee to hear feedback from the Federation Presidents and others in attendance on issues related to the future of the organization.

### **The next topic of discussion was federation and new state structures.**

- The need to ensure that money that goes to federation or state CDLs is accounted for and used to further the NARFE mission.
- Wholesale change (i.e., elimination of structure below HQ) vs. Allow the federations to change themselves, with fiscal oversight from HQ.
- How to manage change to achieve CDL effectiveness.

One SPC member recommended that this discussion be framed by the concept of transition that will take place over time and the hope that what emerges is a new more effective organization that is as inclusive as the original NARFE.

There is a perception held by several SPC members that the money shared with federations is being used to support an organizational structure that is out of date and losing its effectiveness. Some members believe that the funds transferred from HQ to federations (the 10%) are not being used effectively because not enough members will take on leadership roles or do the work to bring in new members and raise NARFE's profile with their Congressional representatives.

Whether or not it is practically feasible to audit federation spending to ensure that money is directed to membership and legislative activities is maximized and the amounts spent on travel and meeting attendance is minimized was discussed extensively, along with different approaches for how to achieve greater effectiveness.

One SPC member expressed the idea that more support from HQ on how to fulfill the role of a CDL would be helpful.

Some believe that the funds sent to federations could be better used at HQ for membership marketing.

Whether or not HQ retains the 10% in total or a lesser amount (i.e. 5% of dues) continues to be allocated to the federations was discussed.

Some SPC members believe that the best way to approach changing the federation and state structures should be a functional approach. That is to determine what functions are best handled in the state structures and which ones are best handled at HQ and use that information as a basis upon which any future changes would be made.

**The next discussion topic was BOD structure and executive management responsibilities.**

As a modification to what has been previously agreed on, it was put forward that in any final recommendations the concept of staggering board terms should be included. The goal being to avoid a complete changeover of personnel on the board and the loss of a "corporate" memory with every election. No one dissented from this idea being put forth.

### **Strategic Plan Outline**

A basic, draft outline for the Strategic Plan was discussed.

Much of the discussion focused on the Situation Analysis section and the importance that it convey actual current conditions being faced by NARFE. One SPC member expressed the belief that NARFE must change in order to survive as an organization and urged that be reflected in the plan.

Others discussed critical issues and topics that have been brought up in prior discussions and asked where in the plan these should be addressed.

Based on the discussion, modifications to the outline will be made and presented at the next meeting.

**The next meeting is Monday, July 27 from 1-4 p.m.**



**Strategic Planning Committee  
Preparatory Questions  
Go-To-Meeting Session  
July 27, 2015**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

- Q1. Should the BOD be elected regionally or nationally?
- Q2. How many Board members (how many regions)?
- Q3. What should be the composition of the Regions?
- Q4. Should there be appointed board members?
- Q5. Should Board members have staggered terms?
- Q6. Should Board members be term limited?
- Q6. Yes, two terms of four years.
- Q7. Should Board members set annual dues every year?
- Q8. Would NARFE hire an Executive Director?
- Q9. Should the BOD have policy making authority?

**CDL STRUCTURE**

- Q10. Should Federations be required to establish a CDL structure?
- Q11. Should NARFE HQ provide funding for the CDL structure directly or through 10% funds?
- Q12. Who should assess the performance of the CDLs?

Q13. Should 10 percent funds be reduced and redirected to legislative advocacy?

Q14. Should the CDL structure exist outside the Federation structure?

### **MANDATORY CHAPTER MEMBERSHIP**

Q15. Should NARFE eliminate the current requirement for mandatory Chapter membership?

Q16. If MCM is eliminated, should E-NARFE be closed?

Q17. Should voting rights be restored to National Only and National Live members?

Q18. Should NARFE transition to one member, one vote governance structure?

Q19. Should there be uniform NARFE dues?