

February 3, 2005

Memo to: ICPJ Steering Committee, and possibly to ICPJ members

From: ICPJ Process ad hoc working group

Re: Report (entitled "Final Report, version of 2/03/05" – hereafter, "Report") on our efforts, and our recommendations to the ICPJ Steering Committee.

We wish to let you know of the work we have done, during our fifteen meetings together, between September 2, 2004, and February 2, 2005.

1. Our work grew out of the August 8-9, 2004 ICPJ retreat, where clarification and some possible revisions of ICPJ structure and/or processes were given high priority as a goal which we as an organization wished to accomplish. The retreat recommended the creation of an ad hoc working group, to be open to interested ICPJ members.

2. The first meeting of interested members took place at Memorial Christian Church on Sept. 2, with 9 members present. At first, we met on an every-third-week schedule; we have finished with five meetings in the last week. The leadership and minute-taking has been on a rotating basis. We've called ourselves the ICPJ Process ad hoc working group (hereafter, "the working group")

3. During the course of our meetings, people of widely differing viewpoints have created a Report which we now submit to the Steering Committee for your consideration. We would be open to meeting with members of the Steering Committee in advance of the Annual Meeting, to enable the Steering Committee to discuss this Report at greater depth, or to pursue any questions which you would wish to address to us. The purpose of this meeting would be for the Steering Committee to reach agreement on as many points as possible, thereby enabling the Steering Committee to submit to the general ICPJ membership (hopefully in advance of the Annual Meeting) a series of recommendations from the Steering Committee as to proposed changes in ICPJ procedures and By-laws, for consideration at the Annual Meeting.

4. We have tried, throughout, to hold in our minds and hearts the needs and welfare, and the role and importance in our community of the entire ICPJ. We have tried to create a document which is not too much influenced by current issues, but which hopefully clarifies some areas, and is designed to recommend a structure and process (consistent with the State of Michigan laws under which we are chartered) which will serve ICPJ well into the future.

5. We encourage the Steering Committee and the membership at large to consider this Report as an integrated whole. We are eager to share our "drafting experience". You would realize that, in considering the multitude of issues we have addressed, there are some where there are strong and differing viewpoints. We have clearly identified where we have been unable to reach full agreement, and have included in an appendix our individual thoughts on these issues. We are also attaching (as "the original Status Report, version of 10/28/04"), a document which contains the basic initial information which we collected – thanks to the particular efforts of Chuck Warpehoski and Roger Pohl -- on the structure and processes of ICPJ existing at that time.

6. A listing of people who have participated on our committee from its inception includes: David Bassett, Gretchen Bingea, Henry Herskovitz, Louie Leedle, Roger Pohl, Grace Potts, Anne Remley, Farouq Shafie, Bill Thomson, Paul Versluis, and Chuck Warpehoski. For a variety of reasons, several participants had to drop out along the way, leaving at the endpoint, David, Gretchen, Henry, Louie, Anne, Farouq, Bill, and Chuck.

7. We have ourselves learned and benefited much from this process, and we appreciate ICPJ's confidence in allowing us to do this work.

# FINAL REPORT

February 3, 2005

## CONTENTS:

**Section I: ICPJ Mission Statement, Vision, Membership, Fiscal Year**

**Section II: Steering Committee: Membership, Nomination, Selection, Term of Membership, Consecutive Terms, Responsibilities, Decision-Making Process, Officers, Executive Committee, Other Committees**

**Section III: Task Forces: Duties, Members, Officers, and Decision-Making, Deliniation**

**Section IV: Staff: Responsibilities, Remuneration, Support, Selection**

**Section V: By-Laws: Proxy Voting, Amendments, Precedence**

=====

## SECTION I: ICPJ

### A. ICPJ Mission Statement

(As adopted by the Steering Committee of Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice, June 1995)

The Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice is a non-profit education/social action organization which brings together people of various faiths who believe the world is one family. We believe that love, commitment to future generations, wise stewardship of the environment and promotion of social, political and economic justice are religious responsibilities.

**Decision:** In light of the 10 years since adoption of the mission statement, and since the review of the mission and vision is beyond the scope of this committee, we recommend to the Steering Committee to launch a review of the mission and vision in 2005-2006.

### B. ICPJ Vision

The Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice strives:

To help members of the local religious community put their faith into action on issues of peace and justice for all people

To be a resource to local congregations in their work on peace and justice issues

To encourage dialogue among members of the various faiths on peace and justice issues of our time

To promote the creative use of nonviolence to solve conflicts and resolve injustices

To raise awareness in the wider community of our vision of peace and justice and the ways in which all of us can bring it about

**Decision:** See IA above. Fur further discussion, see Appendix II, Item 1.

### C. ICPJ MEMBERSHIP:

**1. ICPJ GENERAL MEMBERSHIP:** Members are persons who are committed to the mission and vision of ICPJ, as well as meeting one of the following three criteria:

**a).** Payment of annual ICPJ dues, as set by the Steering Committee\*

**b).** Contributing volunteer service to ICPJ for 10 hours or more of office work, Art Fair assistance, fundraising, Task Force participation, or other ICPJ projects.

**c).** Membership on the Steering Committee or a Task Force.

\*(Process Cmte Proposal: \$10 for student/low income; \$30-\$50, general)

**2. ICPJ MEMBERS WITH DECISION-MAKING STATUS:**

ICPJ Members who meet two of the criteria stated above may participate in decision making at the annual meeting.

%%%%**Flagged Item/Reminder:** Check back with “decision making status” to ensure it is consistent with the final decision making process.

**3. ICPJ ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP:**

We recommend that Steering Committee consider organizational membership as part of the membership structure. There was not agreement on the responsibilities and privileges of organizational membership, such as payment of dues or decision-making rights. We did agree that organizational members are those congregations or other groups committed to the mission and vision of ICPJ.

**4. MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS**

- a) Volunteer opportunities: All members have the opportunity to work for peace and social justice in ICPJ Task Forces and projects.
- b) Input: All members are invited to attend and share their perspectives on matters before the Steering Committee, the Annual Meeting, the task forces, and other meetings of the ICPJ membership.
- c) Information: All members receive information by mail and email (as requested) about ICPJ projects and related events.
- d) Resources: ICPJ provides members with speakers, videos, and informational materials.

**D. FISCAL YEAR**

This body recommends that the fiscal year be changed to April 1 -- March 31.

=====  
**SECTION II: Steering Committee**

- A. STEERING COMMITTEE (SC) MEMBERSHIP:** The SC shall consist of 12-16 elected members, the number to be set for the following year by the SC and approved by the membership at the Annual Meeting. In addition, any founding member of ICPJ is invited to participate on the SC in perpetuity, with all the rights and responsibilities pertaining thereto.
- B. STEERING COMMITTEE NOMINATION:** The SC shall select a Nominating Committee of representative SC members, staff, and an invitation for at least one member from each Task Force to present a slate of nominees for the SC and a nominee for President to the Annual Meeting. Nominations by ICPJ members for the SC and ICPJ Presidency may also be submitted at least one month prior to the Annual Meeting and in time for publication in the ICPJ Newsletter. Candidates are to be briefed on the job of SC and/or presidential service and declare themselves ready to serve before their names are placed in nomination. Members are sought who have expertise and interest in varied ICPJ activities, from the work of Task Forces, to staff support, to congregational involvement, fundraising, and the like.
- C. STEERING COMMITTEE SELECTION:** Members of the SC shall be elected at the Annual Meeting. Voters will be provided with a paper ballot containing the name of each nominee. Each voter may place one X per candidate, up to the number of SC vacancies. The candidates with the highest number of votes are elected, up to the number of SC vacancies. Voting is by ICPJ members with decision-making status who are in attendance at the Annual Meeting.
- D. STEERING COMMITTEE TERM OF MEMBERSHIP:** The term of membership on the SC is three years, with approximately 1/3 of the members elected each year.

%%%%**Flagged Item/Reminder:** Check to see that this item is consistent with current SC term status.

- E. CONSECUTIVE TERMS:** Service on the SC, except for founding members, is limited to two consecutive terms or partial terms of two years or more. After a break of one year, former members of the SC are eligible for election to the SC as new members.
- F. STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS' RESPONSIBILITIES\***
  - 1. With consideration for the recommendations of the Nominating Committee, elect ICPJ officers (other than President) at the first SC meeting following the Annual Meeting. The SC may select persons other than SC members to serve as secretary or treasurer, in which case they would serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the SC.

2. Attend at least seven SC meetings per year.
3. Participate in setting policy, making decisions for the organization, directing staff, and providing a liaison with one's home congregation or community.
4. Members other than officers serve on a Task Force (attending three or more meetings a year).
5. Officers are encouraged to join a task force, if possible, or to attend occasional Task Force meetings.
6. Participate in at least one SC committee (Executive, Personnel Support, Task Force Liaison, Finance-and-Fundraising, Congregational Participation, Nominating, Annual Meeting Program Planning, and, as needed, Hiring).

**\*NOTE 1:** SC members unable to fulfill these responsibilities will be replaced by vote at the next Annual Meeting to complete the original SC member's term. If the Annual Meeting is more than three months from the time when the member's inability to serve is noted, a replacement will be selected by the remaining members of the Steering Committee, to serve until the next Annual Meeting.

**NOTE 2:** Upon final reflection, there arose some disagreement regarding 2-F-4 and 2-F-6. Please see Appendix II, item 2 for details.

## G. STEERING COMMITTEE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

1. A quorum of the SC is defined as at least 50% of the members of the SC.
2. SC decisions are usually made by consensus, through discussion. Where discussion has reached an impasse, voting will occur if **X%** of SC members present decide to vote. Discussion can be proposed to have reached an impasse by the chair, or by 3 SC members. **{We could not agree on the appropriate size of "X%". Three members felt that "X" should be a simple majority; two members felt that "X" should be a 2/3 majority. Arguments for both positions may be found in Appendix II, Item 3}**
3. In order to facilitate discussion, any 3 SC members may postpone any vote until the next SC meeting, unless **Y%** of the SC members present decides that the matter requires immediate attention. Any vote so postponed shall be decided at the next SC meeting. **{We could not agree on the appropriate size of "Y%". Five members felt that "Y" should be a simple majority; one member felt that "Y" should be a 2/3 majority. Arguments for both positions may be found in Appendix II.}**
4. Voting shall be carried out by recorded hand vote. Proxy voting is not allowed.
5. A motion shall pass with the agreement of **X%** of SC members present and voting.
6. SC decisions are made by SC members. As ex-officio members of the SC, staff are expected to inform and advise the SC but are non-voting participants in decision-making.

## H. OFFICERS

1. The President of ICPJ shall be elected at the Annual Meeting. To insure discussion and familiarity with the candidates, proxy voting is not allowed.
2. **{We could not agree on the type of voting process for President. Four members favored Option a, with three members favoring Option b (below). Arguments for both positions may be found in Appendix II, item 4.}**
  - Option a. The voting shall be in the form of "Instant-runoff Voting", in which each candidate is ranked in order of preference by each voter. First choices are tallied. If no candidate has the support of a majority of voters, the candidate with the least support is eliminated. A second round of counting takes place, with the votes of supporters of the eliminated candidate now counting for their second choice candidate. After a candidate is eliminated, he or she may not receive any more votes. This process of counting and eliminating is repeated until there is only one candidate left.
  - Option b. Voters at the Annual Meeting will be provided with a paper ballot containing the names of Presidential nominees. Each voter places a single X on the ballot next to the candidate of choice. The candidate with the highest number of votes is elected.
3. The term of the President shall be one year. A President may be elected to serve three consecutive terms. After a break of one year, a former President is once again eligible for election.
4. If the President becomes unable to serve, the Vice-President becomes President, and a new Vice-President is selected by the SC. This new President may be elected to serve an additional three consecutive terms, as described in 3 above.
5. All other officers of ICPJ are elected by the SC as described in Section IIF1.

6. The terms of all other officers of ICPJ shall be one year, and they may be re-elected by the SC to serve additional terms. If any officer becomes unable to serve, a replacement shall be selected by the SC.

**I. STEERING COMMITTEE OFFICERS (EXECUTIVE CMTE): DEFINITIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

1. The Executive Committee shall consist of the following:

**President of ICPJ:** Chair the monthly SC meeting and represent ICPJ in public. Set agenda with staff

**Vice President:** Chair the SC meeting when the president is absent

**Secretary:** Take minutes of SC meetings, Executive Committee meetings, Annual Meetings, and other meetings of the full membership.

**Treasurer:** Monitor finances, advise the SC on financial matters, serve on the Finance and Fundraising committee, and present the ICPJ financial report to the SC and Annual Meeting.

**J. COMMITTEES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

1. Except for the Nominating and Executive Committees, all Standing and Short-Term Committees are to be selected by the Executive Committee, in consultation with the SC.
2. Decision-making in all Standing and Short-Term Committees shall be as described in section II-G, with the substitution of "committee membership" for "SC", where applicable.

**a) STANDING COMMITTEES:**

**(1) EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** With staff and Task Forces, execute the policies of the SC. Make recommendations for policy and action to the Steering Committee. Between SC meetings, the Executive Committee may take actions consistent with SC policy. Such actions will be reported to the SC at the next SC meeting.

**(2) FINANCE AND FUNDRAISING COMMITTEE:** Work with staff to plan and implement ICPJ fundraising activities. Prepare annual budget within a reasonable time prior to the annual meeting. Conduct appropriate monitoring of organizational finances.

**(3) PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:** Staff supervision and support. Assign staff to task forces and organizational duties, including fundraising, coordination of volunteers, congregational outreach, and assistance to the SC to facilitate decision-making, communication, and preparation for meetings. Personnel Committee members also serve on a Hiring Committee when new staff are needed.

**(4) CONGREGATIONAL AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH COMMITTEE:** Contact congregational representatives and representatives of other community groups in order to meet mutual aims and needs.

**b) SHORT-TERM COMMITTEES:**

**(1) NOMINATING COMMITTEE:** (see section II-B)

**(2) ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM COMMITTEE:** Set a date (January, February, or March), location, and plan for speakers, program, and publicity. Monitor staff implementation of plans.

**(3) HIRING COMMITTEE:** Hiring committee members seek and select staff candidates to recommend to the SC for final hiring decisions. Representatives of task forces are consulted and participate in Hiring Committee work.

**c) AD-HOC COMMITTEES:** The Steering Committee may, as needed, form additional ad-hoc committees to address issues and concerns of the organization. Ad-hoc committees report to the Steering Committee.

=====  
**SECTION III: Task Forces**

**A. DUTIES OF TASK FORCES:**

- 1) Enable ICPJ members to work on peace and justice issues.

- 2) Report to the Steering Committee on discussions, progress and activities.
- 3) Cooperate with other task forces on joint projects, as appropriate.
- 4) If desired, choose a representative to serve on the SC nominating committee.
- 5) Provide input to advise or assist the Hiring and Personnel Committees, as desired.
- 6) Select one or more representatives to:
  - (a) brief the SC on actions the task force requests the SC to take.
  - (b) brief the SC on potentially controversial actions the task force proposes to take.
- 7) Be guided by decisions of the SC relative to proposed actions.
- 8) A task force may select a member to serve as the task force's liaison to monthly SC meetings.
- 9) Raise funds to cover the task force's program expenses plus 25% for ICPJ overhead.

**B. ICPJ TASK FORCE MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND DECISION MAKING:**

- 1. MEMBERS:** Persons who attend at least three meetings of a task force within any given year are considered members and are invited to participate in decision making. A membership roster is to be kept by each task force.
- 2. OFFICERS:** Task forces may select chairpersons in a variety of ways: rotating chair, fixed chair, co-chairs, reliance on staff as chair, or the group acts as chair. Secretaries to take minutes are similarly chosen. The task force informs the SC of the method it uses, and the officers so chosen.
- 3. DECISION-MAKING:** The custom in ICPJ task forces is to make decisions about courses of action by informal consensus. Task forces are encouraged to adopt the decision-making process described in Section II-G, but may make modifications as desired. The task force informs the SC of the method it uses to make decisions.

**C. DELINIATION:**

1. The following Task Forces currently exist: Disarmament Working Group, Racial and Economic Justice Task Force, Middle East Task Force, Latin America Task Force, CROP Walk & Hunger Coalition and Globalization Task Force.
2. Task Forces may be created or modified on a provisional basis by the SC, subject to approval by the general membership at the next Annual Meeting.
3. Task Forces may be discontinued by the general membership. Notice to discontinue must be submitted at least one month prior to the Annual Meeting and in time for publication in the ICPJ Newsletter.

=====  
**SECTION IV: Staff**

**A. STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- As directed by the SC:
1. Ensure effective implementation of ICPJ programs
  2. Work with the Steering Committee in an ex officio capacity to facilitate decision-making and communication and to offer advice on organizational and policy matters.

**B. REMUNERATION:** Set by the SC, as advised by the Finance and Fundraising Committee.

**C. SUPPORT:** Staff support includes monitoring, review, and counsel from the SC Personnel Support Committee and feedback from task forces.

**D. SELECTION:** See II-J-2-b) (3) HIRING COMMITTEE

=====  
**SECTION V: By-Laws**

**A. PROXY VOTING:** To insure discussion and communication, proxy voting is not recommended within any part of ICPJ, and is not allowed in general membership meetings.

**B. AMENDMENTS:** {We could not agree on whether By-Law amendments could be considered only at the Annual Meeting (three members—Option 1) or at both the Annual Meeting and at other general membership

**meetings called for that purpose (two members—Option 2). Arguments for both positions may be found in Appendix II, item 5.}**

Option 1: By-Laws may be amended by a 60% vote of those present and voting at the Annual Meeting. Proposed amendments may be made by the SC or by individual ICPJ members and must be submitted at least one month prior to the Annual Meeting and in time for publication in the ICPJ Newsletter.

Option 2: Amendments to the By-Laws may be made at the Annual Meeting or at a meeting of the general membership specifically called for that purpose. Amendments may be made by the SC or any ICPJ member, and must be submitted at least one month prior to the Annual Meeting and in time for publication in the ICPJ Newsletter. A 60% majority of those present and voting shall be required to approve or change the By-Laws.

- C. PRECEDENCE: {We could not agree on the layers of “precedence” that various documents would play in governing our actions. We agreed that the By-Laws (consistent with state law) were the first authority, and that the appropriate state law ruled where the By-Laws were silent. Three members felt that the governing documents should end at that point (with the phrase “...of 1982”, and one member felt that Roberts Rules should be a final backup authority (adding the material within the “[ ]” ). Louie Leedle provided alternative “boilerplate,” language, but there was insufficient time to incorporate it into this document. Additional information may be found in Appendix 2, Item 6}**

When allowed, these By-Laws take precedence over Michigan State Law known as "non-Profit Corporation Act, Act 162 of 1982"[, which in turn takes precedence over "Roberts Rules of Order", which will be used in situations not covered by these other documents].

## APPENDIX I: ORIGINAL REPORT 10/28/04

Below is our Original Report about the present structure and process of ICPJ. We gathered this information during September 3-October 22, 2004 and compiled it as shown below on October 25-28.

### CONTENTS:

**Section I: ICPJ mission, vision, membership, communication, annual budget**

**Section II: pg.3 Steering Committee: members, affiliation, how selected, how long have they served, term length, term limits, duties, officers, executive committee, decision-making process, SC Standing & Interim Subcommittees.**

**Section III: pg.5. Task Forces: A.duties and missions; B.officers, decision-making, members**

**Section IV: pg.9 Staff: .by-laws re: staff, practical selection process, personnel committee, job description, titles, remuneration, review & support, list of responsibilities.**

**Section V: By-laws**

=====

## SECTION I: ICPJ

### ICPJ Mission Statement

(As adopted by the Steering Committee of Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice, June 1995)  
The Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice is a non-profit education/social action organization which brings together people of various faiths who believe the world is one family. We believe that love, commitment to future generations, wise stewardship of the environment and promotion of social, political and economic justice are religious responsibilities.

### ICPJ Vision

The Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice strives:

To help members of the local religious community put their faith into action on issues of peace and justice for all people

To be a resource to local congregations in their work on peace and justice issues

To encourage dialogue among members of the various faiths on peace and justice issues of our time

To promote the creative use of nonviolence to solve conflicts and resolve injustices

To raise awareness in the wider community of our vision of peace and justice and the ways in which all of us can bring it about

### ICPJ Membership:

The by-laws define a member as anyone who is on the ICPJ mailing list. There are several possible variations on this definition:

Newsletter recipients: There are 1930 who receive ICPJ's bimonthly print newsletter (this includes congregations, partner organizations, and others)

Solicitation Recipients: There are 2213 who receive ICPJ fundraising letters (some of which will shortly be culled from the list)

Email recipients: There are 475 people who receive ICPJ's weekly email update. (This list is not cross-referenced with the main database)



Donors: There are 396 who have made financial donations to ICPJ since fall of 2002 (beginning of our records in the database, some of which have since moved away or deceased)

**ICPJ COMMUNICATION:**

**HOW DO WE GET THE WORD OUT? HOW DO WE GET NAMES ONTO ICPJ MAILING LIST. HOW DO WE MAKE SURE EVERYONE IS INCLUDED? ADDRESS FACT THAT TASK FORCES ARE PART OF LARGER BODY? FAROUQ**

**HOW DO WE GET THE WORD OUT?**

**1) A weekly E-mail announcement** is sent to a 475 addresses list. This list includes most task forces and Steering committee members.

**2) A monthly newsletter** with articles of interest and info about upcoming events. This letter is mailed out to over two thousand addresses locally, state wide and nationally.

**HOW DO WE GET NAMES ONTO ICPJ MAILING LIST?**

**1) Clipboards** are made available at all events. E-mails and addresses are solicited of those interested.

**2) Interested persons** can have their name added to the mailing list via ICPJ's web site, by word of mouth or by simply calling ICPJ offices at 734 668-1870

**HOW DO WE MAKE SURE EVERYONE IS INCLUDED?**

**1) We do the best we can! The monthly newsletter** is sent to all local zip code addresses that start with 481, regardless of expressed interest unless removal from mailing list in requested.

**2) Stacks of monthly newsletter** are placed or offered at public places and events.

**ICPJ ANNUAL BUDGET 2004 CHUCK**

**REVENUE**

Congregational donations	15,000
Individual Donations	34,000
Sales	2,700
Task Force Income	13,000
Events	5,000
Fiduciary	150
Misc.	250
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70,600</b>

**EXPENSES**

Office Supplies	1,100
Equipment	1,500
Postage	4,800
Printing	2,000
Phone/Internet	1,700
Sales	1,300
Task Forces	8,000
Events	2,500
Rent	3,600
Staff	44,000
Travel and Training	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70,600</b>

=====

## SECTION II: STEERING COMMITTEE

**WHO'S ON STEERING COMMITTEE? MEMBERS' TASK FORCE AFFILIATIONS. HOW ARE SC MEMBERS AND OFFICERS CHOSEN. HOW LONG HAVE PEOPLE BEEN ON? HOW LONG ARE TERMS? LIMITS TO SERVICE? SC MEMBERS JOBS. JOB DESCRIPTIONS OF OFFICERS (EXECUTIVE CMTE?), DECISION-MAKING PROCESS**

### STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND AFFILIATIONS 2004-2005--GRETCHEN

<b>Member</b>	<b>Task force and/or sub-committee</b>
Bill Ingraham	Executive committee (President); Personnel committee
Gretchen Bingea	Executive committee (VP); Clear Process & Structure
Roger Pohl	Executive comm. (Co-Secretary); Globalization chair
Bob McMurray	Executive committee (Treasurer)
Jan Wright	Executive committee (Co-Secretary)
Art Publitz	Disarmament task force
Rebecca Kanner	Personnel committee; Latin America task force
Barbara Fuller	Globalization task force
Russ Fuller	Globalization task force
Farouq Shafie	Middle East task force
Amy Rosenberg	Congregational participation sub-committee
Paul Versluis	Fundraising committee, METF, Clear process and structure
Ruth Kraut	Fundraising committee
Joe Summers	None
Nazih Hassan	Unknown
Shirley Brown	Unknown
Helen Criglar	Unknown
Tom Firestone	Unknown
Hazel Turner	None

### HOW ARE SC MEMBERS & OFFICERS CHOSEN?

**This is an invitation process carried out by the Nomination Committee.** The Nomination Subcommittee is comprised of whomever volunteers for the effort. Usually an individual from the SC convenes the subcommittee. There is a review of which SC positions will be left vacant and then individuals are recruited to fill vacant slots. The process is generally the same for officers as well as the larger SC. The main difference is that officers are usually recruited from existing SC members.

The effort is generally geared to finding those willing to commit the time and energy required, additionally, there is a significant effort to recruit individuals from a variety of faith traditions. Lastly, the slate of nominees are IS voted on (more or less by acclamation) at the annual meeting.

### STEERING COMMITTEE: HOW LONG HAVE PEOPLE BEEN ON? [SERVED] HOW LONG ARE TERMS? LIMITS TO SERVICE? FAROUQ (DELE)

----Currently we have a nineteen-SC-members list. BY LAWS CALL FOR 12 OR MORE.

----SC Members are nominated and officially appointed/confirmed for a three years term at the annual membership meetings, by vote of those attending

----How long have people been on? Members can stay on the SC as long as they wish. There are no term limits.

A good number of the SC members, I count seven, have been on for 3 terms or more. One long time member was approved, at her request, for an additional one-year term, because of job situation.

SC meetings attendance is not mandatory. I count three members that I have not seen at SC meetings for more than a year.

### **STEERING COMMITTEE [MEMBERS] JOB DESCRIPTIONS (An attempt)**

1. Once nominated and elected to serve on the Steering Committee [ICPJ] the primary expectation of SC member is to show up for the monthly SC meeting scheduled on the second Tuesday from 11AM to 1PM. At these meetings the SC members listen and provide shared wisdom for decisions and policies of ICPJ.
2. A second expectation is that each SC member would choose to become involved and attend one of the six or seven task forces of ICPJ.
3. A third expectation of SC is that they might provide ICPJ a connection with area congregations. [These three expectations of SC members are polity but not policy.]
4. A fourth responsibility of SC members is to be willing to serve as officers of ICPJ.

### **STEERING COMMITTEE OFFICERS (EXECUTIVE CMTE??) JOB DESCRIPTION**

President: to chair the monthly SC meeting and provide a public face for ICPJ. [May help to set meeting agenda, serve and/or be consulted by executive committee]

Vice President: to chair the SC meeting when the president is absent

Secretary: to take minutes of SC meetings, revise and check minutes.

Treasurer: to keep the books, track expenses, make deposits, bring budget and wisdom to SC meetings..

(These four officers serve as the Executive Committee??)

### **STEERING COMMITTEE: DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES** Gretchen to Bill Ingraham

There is no official policy on how decisions are made by the ICPJ Steering Committee at meetings and for the organization. Currently it has been the practice to use a hybrid method. At times a formal process is followed with motions made and votes taken. This tends to happen when we need to be absolutely clear on issues such as finance, policy, and hiring. At other times, decisions are made more by consensus, when it appears that through our discussion together as a group, there is general agreement in the room. Rarely however, even when a vote is taken, is a decision made if there is not a "super majority" for taking action one way or the other. For instance if the committee is split 60% to 40%, there usually is continued discussion and deliberation rather than majority rules. When this happens, the need to preserve solidarity within the group takes precedence over decisive action.

### **SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

**SELECTION OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS:** The Executive Committee considers who on the current Steering Committee would be a good member of a standing committee (Personnel/Staff Support, Executive, Task Force Liaison and Support, Congregational Participation) and on short term committees (Budget, Nominating, Annual Meeting Program Planning, and Hiring).. They may invite such persons to serve or ask for volunteers. All subcommittee members are not members of the Steering Committee.

### **STANDING COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES:**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** See above.

**PERSONNEL AND STAFF SUPPORT COMMITTEE:** Manage staffing issues, including oversight, troubleshooting, and annual review sessions. Assign staff to task forces and organizational duties, including fund raising, coordination of volunteers, congregational outreach and assisting the Steering Committee to facilitate decision-making, communication, and preparation for SC meetings, such as agendas (after consultation with the president) and packets, as requested. Personnel Committee members also serve on a Hiring Committee when new staff are needed. (See Section IV: Staff, for hiring details).

**TASK FORCE LIAISON AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE:** Communicate monthly with the chair of each task force, with SC members who serve on task forces, and with staff who serve task forces to assure that each task force is receiving all the support they need. Troubleshoot with taskforce members and staff as problems arise.

**CONGREGATIONAL PARTICIPATION COMMITTEE:** Contact congregational representatives to assure participation meets the needs of each congregation.

**SHORT-TERM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES.**

**BUDGET COMMITTEE** (established at October Steering Committee meeting).  
Oversee staff preparation of proposed budget for Dec.meeting

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE** (established at November Steering Committee meeting).  
See above.

**ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM COMMITTEE** (established at November Steering Committee meeting). Set a date (January, February. or March), location, and plan for speakers and publicity, etc. Oversee staff's implementation of plans.

**HIRING COMMITTEE:** Hiring committee members seek and select a candidate to recommend to the Steering Committee for final decision.

**SUBCOMMITTEE DECISION-MAKING:** Committee members discuss decisions until they reach full agreement. Committees will not take a course of action that one member of the group cannot accept except in the case of controversial decisions when 3/4 carries.

=====  
**SECTION III-- TASK FORCES**

**A. DUTIES AND MISSIONS**

**B. OFFICERS, DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, MEMBERS**

**A. DUTIES AND MISSIONS OF TASK FORCES:**

**Duties:**

- Raise funds to cover program expenses plus 25% for overhead
- Report to Steering Committee
- Seek Steering Committee approval for major initiatives or potentially controversial or divisive initiatives

**Missions:**

**Disarmament Working Group**

This group addresses the threats of nuclear weapons, land mines, and biochemical weapons, as well as the alternative of economic conversion. It organizes speakers and programs to area congregations, schools, and community groups. Each August, the Disarmament Working Group organizes Come Together for Peace, a commemoration of the bombing of Hiroshima and

Nagasaki and a celebration of the many courageous efforts stop the use of violence and to build a worldwide culture of peace.

### **Racial and Economic Justice**

This group works to actively challenge racism and economic injustice locally and nationally. Programs include an annual forum on racial and economic justice, nonviolence trainings by Michigan Peace Team, and Welfare Simulations offered for congregations, university departments, and community groups. This task force "midwived" the Ann Arbor Peace Team and Religious Action for Affordable Housing, and it remains active with both groups and with several other coalitions, including Jubilee USA Network, Universal Health Care Network, the Living Wage Campaign, and others.

### **Middle East Task Force**

The Middle East Task Force plans educational events about peace and justice in the Middle East, promotes dialogue and action within the interfaith religious community, and offers support to various peace groups working on Middle East issues. The task force also sponsors religious delegations to the areas of the Middle East where tensions are high, where conflicts place a special burden on the poor and disenfranchised, and where people cry out for justice.

### **Latin America Task Force**

This group devotes itself to education and action on Latin America concerns, especially US. policy in that region. It stands in solidarity with the movement to close the US. Army's Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (formerly School of Americas), as its graduates have committed atrocities across Latin America, leading many to consider it to be a "School of Assassins." The task force also organizes educational programs about the US. military presence in Colombia and how corporate globalization affects the poor in Latin America.

### **CROP Walk & Hunger**

Since 1975 we have organized and the annual Washtenaw County CROP Hunger Walk as an interfaith response to local and world hunger. Over the last 28 years walkers from some 50 area congregations and schools have raised more than one million dollars to assist both local and international agencies in relieving hunger and addressing its root causes. ICPJ works closely with Bread for the World in education, action and advocacy efforts; provides resources for congregations and groups doing programs about world hunger; and cooperates with area agencies in raising community awareness and soliciting funds.

### **Globalization Task Force**

As ICPJ's newest task force, "our purpose is to explore the implications of globalization in an interfaith context so that we might be empowered to work together for a more just and humane global community." We organize panel discussions to educate ourselves and the broader community, explore the implications of economic structures that subjugate the needs of the human family, and seek to act in solidarity with those who work for justice in the global marketplace.

**B. OFFICERS, LEADERS OF TASK FORCES: WHAT EXISTS, HOW IS THAT DONE, DECISION MAKING PROCESS. WHO ARE MEMBERS? OF ICPJ, OF TASK FORCES? WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF MEMBERSHIP OF TASK FORCES AND OF ICPJ?** Bill T: METF; Chuck: LATF, REJ, DWG; Grace: Crop, Globalization

**METF TASK FORCE: OFFICERS, LEADERS--WHAT EXISTS, HOW IS THAT DONE, DECISION MAKING PROCESS...BILL THOMSON**

Bill's Notes:

At the last ICPJ "Clear Structure and Process Sub-Committee", I was asked to collect preliminary information from METF on two questions:

**1) Officers, leaders of METF Task Force-what exists, how is that done, decision making process...**

Several years ago, we had an individual (Jim Sweeton) who was the designated "moderator" of our meetings. I'm not sure if his position was the result of an election, or simply the result of volunteering (or being coerced). When Barbara came on board we switched to an informal "rotation system." When Chuck was assigned by the Steering Committee to be staff liaison for METF, he asked at each meeting for members to volunteer as chair. In the face of member reluctance, Chuck offered to take that role, one meeting at a time. One meeting was chaired by Betsy Barlow when Chuck was away. And one other meeting or parts of it were chaired by Odile Hugonot Haber. Recently METF passed (18-3) the following resolution: "We are resolved to select our own chair and appoint our own representatives to the SC as needed." We are currently rotating the chair until we decide on a more permanent arrangement.

Historically, our decisions have been virtually unanimous and we did not feel a need to formalize our decision-making process. In fact, I can recall only the vote on the first vigil resolution as having any significant opposition. Because we had decided to operate under "Roberts Rules" for that meeting, the majority vote prevailed and the resolution (along with the virtually unanimous second resolution) was submitted to the SC.

At this point we have not settled on a formal method for making decisions.

**2) Who are members of METF Task Force? What is the definition of membership of METF?**

In general, we have historically defined membership in METF as including anyone who said that they were a member of METF. We have attempted to put together a list of current active members as follows:

**Members** (taken from attendance at last two meetings). THIS IS NOT MEANT TO BE A DEFINITIVE LIST: Betsy Barlow, David Bassett, Lee Booth, Phil Booth, Harry Clark, Diane Cooper, Larry Cooper, Karen Deslierres, Avery Demond, Marcia Federbush, Alan Haber, Henry Herskovitz, Marian Horowitz, Odile Hugonot Haber, Michelle Kinnucan, Louis Leedle, Elizabeth Lindsey, Sol Metz, Linda Najjar, Phyllis Ponvert, Anne Remley, Elaine Rumman, Thom Saffold, Karem Sakallah, Farouk Shafie, Barbara Stahler-Sholk, Jim Sweeton, Ellen Teller, Bill Thomson, Paul Versluis, Chuck Warpehoski, Charlotte Whitney, Shirley A. Zempel

**LATF (LATIN AMERICA TASK FORCE):**

**Officers & Leadership:** No current officers, although Mary Anne Perrone has served as task force chair in the past. There have also been experiments with rotating facilitators.

**Decision Making Process: LATF rarely votes**, most decisions are made by sense of the group. I think the process could be described as informal consensus: we are not going to take a course of action that a task force member strongly opposes or cannot live with. In choosing between two options that everyone is comfortable with, we may take a vote or straw poll to see which has more favor.

**Membership:** Core members (people I expect to see at each meeting or to hear from saying they can't attend) : Chuck, Rebecca K., Jim Kalafus, Mary Kalafus, Richard Stahler-Sholk, Lynn Meadows, Arlene Huff.

**Regular participants** (people who I see regularly at LATF meetings, who are very involved in the work of the task force, but who may not show up every two weeks): Mary Anne Perrone, Phil Booth, Lee Booth, Chuck Booker-Hirsch

**Occasional participants** (people who show up now and then, are willing to help with LATF projects, but are currently not regular participants in the task force): Abby Schlaff, Sheri Wander, Deb Regal

We also have a group of folks that come aboard in October/November for the SOA Watch trip who help plan and attend that event. They remain on the listserv but are not regular attendees of the task force.

**Email:** There are 43 members of the LATF email list.

**How membership is determined:** If you show up and are committed to the work of the task force, you are considered a member.

### **DWG (DISARMAMENT WORKING GROUP)**

**Officers & Leadership:** DWG currently has no officers. Chuck usually serves as both chair and scribe.

**Decision Making Process:** DWG rarely votes, we talk our issues until we reach a decision we can all get behind. In choosing between two options that everyone is comfortable with, we may take a vote or straw poll to see which has more favor.

**Membership:** Core members: Chuck, Dick Brown, Carolyn Diem, Jim Varani, Kathi Tobey, Art Bublitz (less active now due to health issues), Sr. Dori Gapczynski (less active now due to family issues)

**Occasional participants:** Alan Haber

Email: There are 10 members of the DWG email list.

How membership is determined: If you show up and are committed to the work of the task force, you are considered a member.

### **REJ (RACIAL AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE):**

**Officers & Leadership:** REJ has no officers.

**Decision Making Process:** REJ usually talks things out until there is agreement. A key component of this discussion is finding out what projects the group has energy for.

**Membership:** Core members: Jim Mogenson, Mary Browning, Barbara Wykes

**Occasional participants:** Paul Lambert, Rev. Tracey Huffman, Susan McGarey. There is also a strong groups of people who volunteer for the REJ welfare simulations, but they are not otherwise involved in the programming decisions of the group

**Email:** REJ has no email list.

**How membership is determined:** If you show up and are committed to the work of the task force, you are considered a member.

### **CROP HUNGER WALK COORDINATING COMMITTEE:**

**Decision Making Process** - Informal Consensus (suggestions made, and the group talks about it until there is general agreement)

**Membership**

--Grace Potts,

--Thank yous, Pat Schock,

**Officers & Leadership**

Recruitment, Donald McGregor

- Safety, Pat & Chuck Yonka
- Treasurer, Cindy McBride
- Co-treasurer, Christopher Mollo
- Host, Scott Wright
- Education ICPJ Task Forces
- Business Kathleen Peabody
- Publicity Jenny Day

**Becoming a member:** Invitation or Inquiry (usually invitation, folks have been inquiring via our member interest survey)

**GLOBALIZATION:**

**Officers & Leadership** ^ Roger Pohl is the chair; Barbara Wykes is the secretary

**Decision making process** ^ Informal Consensus (suggestions made, and the group talks about it until there is general agreement)

**Membership**

- Robert Baillie, --David Bower, C.W.S.,--Art Bublitz, --Jean Converse, --Carolyn Diem,
- Barbara and Russell Fuller,--Gerry Johnson, Church Women United, --Jim Mogensen, --Arthur Parris, --Roger Pohl, --Jim Russo,--Roland Schaedig, --John Schwarz, --Malinda Waltz, Church Women United, --Barbara Wykes,--Jean Dietrick Rooney, --Charles Rooney

**Becoming a member** ^ Invitation or Inquiry (usually inquiry, folks have been invited recently in response to conference organizing)

=====  
**SECTION IV: ICPJ STAFF:**

**BY-LAWS RE: STAFF, PRACTICAL SELECTION PROCESS, PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, JOB DESCRIPTION (POSTING), HOW ASSIGNMENTS ARE DETERMINED, TITLES, REMUNERATION, REVIEW & SUPPORT, LIST OF RESPONSIBILITIES. Anne, 9/20/04**

**ICPJ STAFF:**

Jason Crosby, jason@icpj.net, ICPJ, 730 Tappan, Ann Arbor, 48104, 734-663-1870  
 Chuck Warpehoski, ICPJ, 730 Tappan, Ann Arbor 48104, chuck@icpj.net 734-663-1870

**BY-LAWS THAT MAY PERTAIN TO STAFF**

Staff role: [The Board/Steering Committee will be] "Employing consultants or program staff as deemed necessary to effect the purposes of the organization." (6/85)

"Policies shall be approved by the members of ICPJ in meetings...." ('87)

Board, staff role: "Conducting the business of the organization between meetings of the members and in keeping with any consensus established by the consultant staff." (By-laws 6/85, '87)

Board & members re: policy: "Calling a meeting of the membership, as appropriate, when questions of policy are to be decided."

Task forces' work & relationship to Steering Committee: "The Board of Directors [Steering Committee] shall have the authority to appoint small working committees to plan and effect programs. These committees will be responsible to the Board of Directors " (6/85 Bylaws)

Pay: "...no officer or employee of the organization shall receive any pecuniary benefit of any kind except reasonable compensation for material for services in effecting the purposes of the organization as provided by these By-Laws." (6/87)



Legal protection: ICPJ can indemnify staff vs. suit or other proceeding occurring by reason of fact that the person is an employee. (Bylaw amendment. 1989.)

## **HOW STAFF ARE SELECTED IN PRACTICE**

### **Posting:**

Staff openings are posted in the following: ICPJ newsletter; Ann Arbor News ad; email lists; and three non-profit sources: idealist.org; (nonprofit posting directory); Comnet.org (United Way & UM, with a SE Michigan focus); and The New Center in Ann Arbor; as well as to the School of Social Work; UM Ginsberg Center for Community Service & Learning; & to congregations (omitted in 9/04 due to urgent need for Grace Potts' replacement).

### **Who looks at resumes:**

Members of the Personnel Committee meet as a Hiring Committee when new staff are sought. They receive and review the applications (resume and cover letter).

They choose whom to meet..

They make a tentative selection and make a tentative offer to a candidate.

Their proposal goes to the Steering Committee for final acceptance.

### **Personnel Committee members:**

Personnel Committee members must be current (preferred) or former Steering Committee members and, when hiring occurs, current staff. (Example: Tobi Hanna-Davies helped select Sheri Wander.) In 9/04, members of the Personnel committee were Bill Ingraham, Mary Anne Perrone (principal at a Detroit School), Rebecca Kanner and Ruth Kraut. Ruth joined the Personnel Committee in 9/04. Until recently, Derrick Yip Hoi also served. One or two new members will probably be added soon.

**The 9/04 Hiring Committee** members were Mary Anne Perrone, Bob McMurray (from the Steering Committee), and Chuck Warpehoski. (Bill Ingraham, Rebecca Kanner, and Ruth Kraut were unable to participate.)

### **Personnel Committee members: How selected?**

The Personnel Committee considers who on the current Steering Committee would be a good member. They may invite such a person to apply for membership. Also, the Steering Committee may ask: who will volunteer for this job?

### **Who decides on new staff?**

The Personnel Hiring Committee recommends a finalist. The candidate is tentatively approved by the Hiring Committee and presented to the Steering Committee for final approval.

### **How does the Personnel Committee make decisions?**

Generally, the committee discusses decisions until they reach full agreement. The committee will not take a course of action that one member of the group cannot live with.

## **STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES LISTED IN POSTING**

These responsibilities are stated in the half-time job posting (9/04)

1. Ensure effective implementation of ICPJ programs, including direct responsibility for three volunteer task forces and some ICPJ events. (Full time staff works with two task forces.)
2. Represent ICPJ, speaking to religious congregations, university classes, ICPJ events and working in coalition with other groups.
3. Work as a team with other coordinator. Share office tasks, phone coverage, helping when and where needed.
4. Support fundraising efforts.
5. Work with Steering Committee (Board of Directors) to facilitate decision-making and communication.

**FULL-TIME JOB ADDITIONAL DUTIES:**

1. Budgeting and financial management.
2. Oversee fundraising

**ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS SOUGHT IN STAFF SELECTION:**

[Note: Idealist.org recommends that ICPJ add desired qualifications to its postings in future.] Here are four qualities that are currently looked for:

1. Personnel Committee will seek a staff member who is part of a faith community as a regular participant. This is preferred, but not absolutely necessary.
2. The candidate needs to relate well to people.
3. Their strengths should complement other staff (Chuck excels with the computer and the web, though he is a little shy. So they could use an outgoing person, as was Grace.) The chemistry for joint work is important.
4. Staff must commit to keeping careful records of the hours they devote to various duties.

**JOB TITLES:**

Director/Co-coordinator (full time);  
Coordinator (half time)

**REMUNERATION:**

Half time: \$10,000-\$12,500. Basic health care available. Vacation: 3-4 weeks. Paid holidays: 10. Hours: flexible.

Full time: \$20-25,000. (Currently \$21,500.) With benefits as above.

Note: adjustments may be made because ICPJ was \$20,000 in debt in 2003.

**REVIEW & SUPPORT OF ONGOING STAFF:**

Staffing issues are the charge of the Personnel Committee. Annual review sessions are held with each staff member. They include feedback forms gathered from task force and Steering Committee members

**WORK ASSIGNMENTS: WHAT THEY ARE AND HOW THEY ARE MADE**

Three major areas of work are assigned:

1. Task force assignments are made by the Personnel Committee in line with staff strengths and interests).
2. Organizational duties (such as fund raiser, volunteer coordinator, Steering Committee packet, and congregational outreach): These assignments are made by the Personnel Committee, though staff may negotiate with each other for changes with the Personnel Committee's o.k.
3. Event assignments: Event assignments are decided by staff themselves, with approval by the Personnel Committee. Events include Alternative Holiday Fair, Art Fair, Hiroshima Day, CROP, Fort Benning trip. Some of these are related to task force assignment.

**DETAILS OF WORK ASSIGNMENTS (LISTED BY SHARI WANDER, 6/00)****1. Fundraising**

Write at least one appeal a year and oversee two others .

Write grant proposals and requests to other organizations annually.

End-of-year letter to clergy: Update and individualize the form, as needed.

Congregation Contact Committee: update their material annually.

Art Fair: Order merchandise, recruit and coordinate volunteers, recruit volunteers to build booth, help out, as needed. Set up display each morning and take down each night.

Collect cash and deposit twice daily.

Alternative Holiday Fair: publicize to media and clergy, order merchandise, recruit & coordinate volunteers, set up displays.

Charlie King Concert: Keep records of tickets, payments, contracts. Help cmte, as needed.

## **2A. Steering Committee Liaison Staff Work: (Meets 2nd Tues., 11:00-1:00)**

Prepare agenda after consulting with president.

Proofread minutes from Steering Committee secretary and mail them out.

Make reminder calls, especially to those responsible for lunch, meditation, etc.

Set up tables and chairs, dishes, hot water.

Distribute copies of agenda, minutes, treasurer's report.

Attend monthly meetings and give reports as needed on task forces.

## **2B. Steering Committee Subcommittee Staff Work:**

Budget Committee. (established at Oct. Steering Committee meeting).

Serve on the committee, prepare proposed budget for Dec. meeting.

Nominating Committee (established at Nov. Steering Committee meeting).

Serve on the committee, Invite nominees, write up bios.

Annual Meeting Program Committee (established at Nov. Steering Cmte mtg).

Make arrangements for date (Jan, Feb. or Mar.), for speakers, location, child care, etc.

Develop and coordinate publicity campaign for Annual Meeting (flyers, press releases, clergy mailing, newsletter cover).

Create program booklet for Annual Meeting.

Attend and assist with Annual Meeting set-up, logistics, clean-up.

Personnel Committee: Serve on the committee, especially when hiring is necessary. Set-up meeting dates, call applicants, etc.

## **3. Task Force Staff Liaison Work.** (Examples from Latin American and Racial/Economic Justice Task Force as reported by Shari Wander):

Make arrangements with First Baptist Church for use of their space - annual contract.

Plan meeting agendas with chairperson (one task force); prepare meeting agenda on computer for chair to use (other task force).

Attend meetings.

Give reports as needed.

Keep records of decisions & of members' volunteer tasks.

Develop & coordinate publicity campaigns for task force events (flyers, press releases, letters to clergy, Newsletter pages, etc.).

Assist at task force events - arrangements, volunteer coordination, set-up, clean-up, etc. \*Work on any tasks the group needs performed for which no one has volunteered.

Coordinate tasks for projects like Fort Benning trips (contact info, travel plans, payments, accommodations appointments).

Coordinate tasks for presentations, such as Welfare Simulations--contacting hosts, mailing floor plan and publicity info, coordinating with union, preparing family & staff packets, copying handouts, recruiting volunteers, serving on set-up & take-down crew, distributing honoraria (as signed for).

## **4. Congregation outreach (all staff).**

Speak at congregations when invited.

Set up meetings with new clergy or others as needed.

## **5. Clerical Tasks**

Open & process mail

Record checks received

Notify specific people about congregations' gifts & about IRS mail

Deliver mail to Memorial Christian Church, other ICPJ staff and Treasurer

Skim congregation newsletters  
File info for task forces and library  
Respond as needed  
Reception (all staff)  
Answer phone & doorbell  
Record messages on clipboard  
Answering machine: record complete messages on clipboard after each absence  
Change outgoing phone message to give information about upcoming events  
Post Office (all staff)  
Purchase 1st class postage as needed  
Take bulk mailings to Stadium P.O.  
Publicity calendar  
Compile next month's calendar by 10th of month  
Fax to media & congregations  
Wall calendar  
Record month's activities on erasable wall calendar - (1/2-time worker)  
Year-at-a-glance wall calendar (all staff)  
Record mailings  
Clergy mailings, postcards: send out, as needed  
Tax receipts  
Compile and mail by Jan. 31 to all donors of \$250 or more and tax-deductible receipt forms  
Copying  
Make copies in office, take care of copier, take large jobs to ISR or elsewhere  
Newsletter Assistance  
Last 2 weeks of each even-numbered month  
Collaborate with other staff on decisions about contents, cover, layout  
Oversee 2 pages for each of one's own task forces--text and layout  
Recruit & support volunteers to write, design, compose, if necessary  
Proofread newsletter for spelling, correct dates, etc.  
Office Management  
Order supplies, get machines serviced, make purchase recommendations to Steering Cmte.  
Training, Supervision, and Volunteer Support  
Train new staff as needed  
Train and supervise volunteers  
Recruit volunteers  
Support volunteers in charge of donor record keeping, treasury, taxes, ABM letter, congregational contact, thank yous to donors, office supply shopping, computer upgrades, mailings, web site, task force projects, etc.  
Housekeeping  
Take mugs upstairs to dishwasher  
Run and unload dishwasher, as necessary  
Water plants  
Take recycling across street to recycle dumpsters  
Take trash out to parking lot dumpster  
Dust, carpet sweep and vacuum as needed (bring vacuum cleaner from home, or get volunteers)

=====

## **SECTION V: BY-LAWS:**

Put together by-laws: Louie L.

**APPENDIX II**

February 3, 2005

This Appendix contains statements concerning items upon which we were unable to reach full agreement.

=====

**Item 1: Sections IA and IB: ICPJ MISSION AND VISION**

Here are suggestions for the Mission and Vision Statements, incorporating a few revisions. The SC may wish to consider adopting these versions before or in place of a major review. The original 1995 statements are below.

\*\*\*\*\*

A. David Bassett and Anne Remley suggest:

Mission:

"The Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice is a non-profit education and social action organization which brings together people of various faiths and humanistic traditions who believe the world is one family. We believe that love, nonviolence, commitment to future generations, wise stewardship of the environment and promotion of social, political, and economic justice and equity are principles which should guide our actions.

Vision:

The Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice strives:

- 1. To help members of the local religious and humanistic communities put their beliefs into action on issues of peace and justice for all people.
- 2. To be a resource to local congregations in their work on peace and justice issues.
- 3. To encourage dialogue among members of local communities of faith and belief on peace and justice issues of our time.
- 4. To promote the creative use of nonviolence to solve conflicts and resolve injustices.
- 5. To raise awareness in the wider community of our vision of peace and justice, and the ways in which all of us can bring it about.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Bill Thomson suggests:

Mission statement: "...of various faiths and spiritual/humanistic traditions who believe..."

Mission statement: "...justice are religious, spiritual and humanistic responsibilities."

While I think we all have a fair idea of the meaning of the term "humanistic", the same may not be true of "spiritual". "Spiritual" suggests inclusion of the many earth-based religious practices (e.g., Native American), where all objects (even those conceptualized in the Western mind as "inanimate") are imbued with life and spirit properties. This, of course, plays a special role when considering, in particular, environmental issues. This concept follows from most indigenous peoples' creation myths, which often include the melding of fire and water to create the universe. To exclude spiritual in our statement would exclude many of us, both native and non-native (including myself) who hold to those beliefs.

(To the best of my recollection, the inclusion of "spiritual/humanistic" was a view that was overwhelmingly supported at the August retreat.)

=====

**Item 2: Alternative text for Section II F 4-6, proposed by Chuck Warpehoski, supported by David Bassett:**

TEXT

4. "Serve in at least one of the following capacities:

- a) Serve as an officer (as defined in section II H)
- b) Serve on an ICPJ Task Force (As defined in Section III), including attending at least three Task Force meetings per year
- c) Participate in at least one SC committee, as defined in section II-J)"

RATIONAL

I offer this amendment because I believe that the requirement to serve on Steering Committee AND serve on a committee AND serve as an officer or a task force member is too restrictive. Very few people can make that extensive of a commitment. Furthermore, it would severely limit our ability to recruit a steering committee that is diverse in terms of economic position and life conditions. How could a single mother fulfill all these obligations? How could a low income worker manage to serve? These high requirements make the steering committee an exclusive club for the fortunate few who can commit to so many obligations. As such, it runs counter to the ideals of an inclusive, welcoming, and diverse organization.

=====

**Item 3: STEERING COMMITTEE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS** Sections II-G2 & II-G5-“The Value of ‘X’”

\*\*\*\*\*

The Value of “X”  
Bill Thomson

In all of the peace and justice work that I do I have tried to be guided by two “mantras”. The first is found in Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”:

“I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the past few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen's Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by a mythical concept of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait for a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.”

The second is a statement by Mohandas Gandhi: *“Recall the face of the poorest and most helpless person you have seen and ask yourself if the next step you contemplate is going to be of any use to that person.”*

I would hope that we could keep these two thoughts in mind as we work on the effective structure of ICPJ.

-----

With respect to our current discussion of the “Size of X” first, let me note some areas of agreement:

1. I agree that full discussion and consensus is the way to proceed on the overwhelming majority of issues.
2. I agree that the size of “X” is a critical factor in determining the future direction of ICPJ.
3. I agree that there must be a process by which the SC can reach a decision, even if that decision is to take no action.

The rubber hits the road, of course, upon the consideration of “controversial issues”. The first question to be addressed is whether or not ICPJ should be dealing with controversial issues at all. If we take seriously the statements at the top of the page, I believe that the answer has to be “yes” – neither “interfaith” nor “peace and justice” are concepts that carry universal support, and if we are to follow the concepts implicit in our name, then there are bound to be controversial issues from time to time.

If we agree that controversy is occasionally going to occur, how do we deal with it?

One model would be that if one person objects, the issue is tabled. I believe that we can readily see that such a restriction would put us in the position of being hopelessly ineffective and powerless to take any but the most saccharine actions.

A second model would be that if a majority objects, the issue is tabled. This is the model of most legislative bodies, and to me it is obvious that if a majority of the SC objects to something, the issue dies. This leaves us with a myriad of options, from 2 to one less than the majority, in which we could define the size of a minority opinion that would be sufficient to table/defeat a proposal.

Let's look at some numbers.

Suppose there is a "controversial issue" on the SC agenda, and because the issue is "controversial", a larger-than-normal number of SC members attend the meeting. By means of illustration, let's say 15 SC members are present.

Let's suppose that on the issue before the SC, 12 are in favor and 3 are opposed (80% in favor). Discussion has reached an impasse, so a vote is called to end discussion.

The vote breaks down as follows:

3 are opposed to the issue and thus favor continued discussion.

2 believe that near universal consensus should occur, so with 3 people opposed, they also vote to continue the discussion,

2 believe that the harmony of the SC is of extreme importance, and being upset with the process, abstain from voting.

The other 8 people vote to end the discussion and proceed with a vote. So here we have an issue favored by 80% of the SC, but only 53% vote to end the discussion.

So what should "X" be?

We could plug in other numbers (as I have), but the general result is the same. The rule of thumb is that with smaller numbers of the SC present, the size of the minority required to table an issue decreases, and vice versa.

In any practical case, I am convinced that 2-3 people could effectively derail **any** action of the SC, unless "X" were set to 50%. I believe that the frustration that would result from any higher value of "X" would so trouble the majority and seriously affect the harmony of the SC, that ultimately ICPJ would be affected in a negative way. (By the way, I originally favored X=60%, but convinced myself otherwise when I plugged in some numbers.)

Conversely, I believe that if there were an understanding that sooner or later a "majority prevails" vote would occur, that SC members would be motivated to reach compromises and iron out differences in a positive fashion. On the other hand, the reality that 2-3 people could prevent an action might cause those individuals to "dig in their heels" rather than actively work toward a compromise position that all could support. (As I have stated previously, I also think that a willingness on the part of ICPJ to deal with "controversial" issues would result in a significant net gain in size, interest, participation and financial support, but that is another argument for another day.)

I certainly don't object to safeguards that would insure complete and full discussion, and I believe that the procedures given in IIG3 will accomplish that. In short, I believe IIG2-3 will go a long way toward enforcing sufficient discussion, while at the same time allowing for a decision to ultimately be made. And I believe it would be to ICPJ's ultimate benefit to do so.

The Value of "Y" (Section 2-G-3): Following the same logic described above, I feel that the ability to postpone a decision that a clear majority has determined requires immediate attention is a major error—one which will inevitably lead to frustration amongst the majority and a total inability to respond to immediate situations (e.g., starting of a war, etc.). All but one member of our committee felt that 50% was the appropriate value for "Y".

With respect to decision making in Task Forces, I believe that differing needs and approaches in the various Task Forces mitigate against a "one size fits all" approach. Therefore, I feel that each Task Force, while guided by the decision-making process in the SC, should be able to choose their own method of decision-making. To have the imposition of a decision-making process from "beyond" with which a Task Force is in fundamental disagreement can only lead to impairment and frustration within the Task Force and a breakdown of communication and trust between the Task Force and other parts of ICPJ.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Value of "X"  
David Bassett

It goes without saying that ICPJ must be prepared to grapple with controversial issues. Some organizations, in doing so, create feelings of animosity within the group which are destructive to

the group. I hope that our recognition and support for the contributions which ICPJ as an organization has made and can make will be strongly upheld. I believe that we should work very hard to preserve unity and coherence within ICPJ. Striving for unity does not mean requiring unanimity. I believe that we will need always to uphold respect for each person, forbearance, and patience as we give vigorous and careful consideration to those urgent and critical problems which face us. We need to be able to work together with those who come from a principally religious background and viewpoint, and with those who come from a more secular but also a humanistic viewpoint.

I hope that all of us would agree that an issue would never be set aside if only one person objects; i.e., we are not an organization which is going to require unanimity on an issue.

Another point related to decision-making-- I read in a recent memo that, for a motion to be "tabled" means it is defeated. I've never been absolutely clear on the meaning of "tabled". The meaning of "tabled" needs to be clarified. I have not understood that "tabled" always means "defeated".

ICPJ will of course need to deal effectively with "controversial" issues. If they are relatively non-controversial, "discussion" will usually allow reaching a decision, by the process of consensus. I suggest that the SC could be grappling with at least 5 types of troubling issues: A very important; B difficult; C controversial; D dangerous; or E illegal (e.g., war tax resistance). Any one of these categories could lead to an impasse. I think our ad hoc group made progress in moving from "controversial and urgent" to "issues where an impasse has been reached."

Now, consider the generic situation, where the chair, or 3 SC members have declared an impasse, and a vote is now to take place.

It is incumbent on the chair to be sure that the question is worded in a clear way, so that a "yes" or "no" vote will be unambiguous (and I believe it is a responsibility of a good chair to recognize if a "motion" is ambiguous, and then to work with the group to fashion a clear motion, before a vote is taken.)

The generic form of a motion is: "Shall SC approve that we (the SC, or ICPJ, or an ICPJ Task Force) take this specific (controversial/difficult/dangerous, etc.) action?"

Two general situations could result regarding this issue.

	The vote =	"yes"	"no"
Situation I		51% (or more)	49% (or less)
Situation II		49%(or less)	51% (or more)

In situation I, if as many as 49% believe we should not act on an issue of type A – E, it does not seem to me wise to act, even though the majority (50.1, or 51%) voted yes. At some higher % (we'll still call that X), I would agree it is wise and necessary for the group to act.

In situation II, if 51% believe we should not act on issues of Type A – E, it does not seem to me to be wise to clearly not act, when 49% believe we should. But at some higher % of persons voting "no", I would agree that it is wise and necessary for the group not to act. Again the question arises, -- what is the reasonable level of X, for ICPJ, and for its Steering Committee?

In either of the above situations, I believe that there should be further discussions; pondering (and, for those who pray, praying). The next question is – for how long? Certainly not interminably. I believe that (in most circumstances) a reasonable time for discussions, pondering, or praying to take place would be one month. Then a new vote would be taken.



One hopes that all concerned persons would be present when a vote is taken. But one should not be forced to vote yes or no; i.e., it should be possible to abstain. I believe that the organization should consider the situation where some percentage of the group eligible to vote (I'll suggest 25%) abstain, for whatever reason. If some significant % abstain, the organization should ponder very carefully whether to proceed to act (or not to act) if there is a significant % who are unwilling to vote "yes" or "no". I believe that any organization should (under some circumstance) be willing to decide that, for this organization, on this issue, at this time, we must not force ourselves to act. (That does not mean that, with the passage of time; further discussions among members; consideration of new realities, that a decision might not change. And it certainly does mean that members of that organization should ponder very deeply the words of Martin Luther King, and Gandhi, as quoted by Bill Thomson).

I have, above, been arguing against making decisions by pure majority vote (i.e., 50.1, or 51% carries). I must now decide on some % for X. I will consider 60%, 66.6 (i.e., 2/3rds); and 75%. While I personally would prefer 75%, I feel a need to take an intermediate position (in the spirit of willingness to compromise), and therefore could agree to 66.6%.

I am not persuaded that 2/3rds, or 75% values for X are "arbitrary", and 50% is not "arbitrary". One could say that any specific percentage is "arbitrary". I feel the more important consideration is to hold both the unity of the organization, and the importance of a given issue as very important, and never to conclude that one supercedes the other. In other words, we should be prepared to live with "creative tension", and to do so in ways which involve nonviolence in thought, word, and deed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Value of "X"  
Anne Remley

As an interfaith group, ICPJ aims to involve members of varied faiths in ever more wide-ranging and productive social action. I believe the organization's cohesion, influence and future effectiveness depend on its members' respecting each other and working together to find meaningful and courageous actions which a large majority can endorse. I favor having the Steering Committee reach decisions by consensus whenever possible. In case of an impasse, when the matter has been discussed for at least two meetings and a good alternative cannot be found, a majority of 2/3 to 3/4 of SC members present should be required for approval of a proposal.

Occasionally SC members who favor an action may in fact choose to vote against it in the belief that 1) it will limit the future "reach" of ICPJ by driving some groups away or by arousing deep public animosity toward the organization, and 2) that it is more properly the province of another kind of organization not committed to interfaith action. I believe this can be a logical and valid position, particularly if the SC opts to continue seeking for an effective alternative action with which to address a particular injustice--an action supported by a 2/3-3/4 majority.

The Value of "Y"

The decision to stop the search for a proposal that can rally general agreement is a serious one. It should be reached by no less than a 2/3 majority.

"X" in Task Forces

I was intrigued to review the reports on how ICPJ task forces make decisions. (See Appendix I, "Original Report," Section III.) Every task force reports that its practice is to proceed with action only when its members reach general agreement. That has been the custom, too, in the Middle East task force where, however, one controversial issue has recently been decided by vote.

I believe "X" -- voting -- has little place in task forces. This is not a faith-related matter, but a sound organizational principle, recognizing that members of small, voluntary groups gain energy for concerted action by respecting each other and creating plans all can support. Task forces' action plans should routinely have general agreement or, at the very least, the support of a 3/4 majority.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Value of "X"  
Henry Herskovitz

I favor having Steering Committee support for taking action decided by consensus whenever possible. In case of an impasse, when the matter has been discussed for two meetings, a majority of 51% of SC members present should be required for approval of a proposal.

I would hope that the Steering Committee of Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice would comport themselves as they would in any other grouping of people endeavoring, as Margaret Mead said, to "Change the World". ICPJ is a "peace and justice" group foremost, and its title serves to reflect our composition of lay leaders, clergy and members of various faiths.

The possible uniqueness of this group is that it is "Interfaith"; however, I sense no distinction, sense of higher duty, or sense of obligation this uniqueness demands that requires a higher standard in decision-making than in any other group

Requirements of decision-making percentages other than 51% are arbitrary. In addition, we must recognize that since we have required that taking action must be supported by *X% of members present*, this in effect takes an abstention, and places this non-vote into the "No" vote column. This appears unfair, and a 51% majority requirement addresses this unfairness.

\*\*\*\*\*

Appendix II - GETTING TO "X" - Louie Leedle style

"SC decisions are usually made by consensus, through discussion."

This is history and does not belong in the bylaws.

---

"Where discussion has reached an impasse, voting will occur if X% of SC members present decide to vote."

"Impasse" is a negative term. The voting can equally be described as "mature." Or it can be said that the membership is ready for a vote.

---

"Discussion can be proposed to have reached an impasse by the chair, or by 3 SC members."

Robert's Rules provide that in "small boards . . . . where there are not more than about a dozen members present . . . . There is no limit to the number of times a member can speak to a question, and motions to close or limit debate generally should not be entertained."

---

**DECISION-MAKING:**

When a motion on the floor needs more than just simple development to make it viable, it may be promoted to "proposed project" status. Under the status of "proposed project motion," rules of "consensus decision-making" shall be put into operation. There are several books or publications available on "consensus" or "facilitating." The board could chose its own rules to follow under the general term "consensus."

**FORM:**

"I move that we promote this proposed action to a "proposed project," (thereby putting rules of "consensus decision-making" into operation.)"

A "second" would be required. Also, 2/3 majority vote would be required to pass this motion because it would be very difficult to reverse this action, once passed. However, this motion should be able to be reversed by a subsequent 2/3 majority vote.

=====

**Item 4: PRESIDENTIAL VOTING PROCESS (II-H-2)**

\*\*\*\*\*

Bill Thomson (see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instant\\_Runoff\\_Voting#How\\_IRV\\_works](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instant_Runoff_Voting#How_IRV_works) for further details)

I favor the "Instant-runoff System" (also known as "Hare" voting) because

1. By allowing support for "Third Party" candidates, it brings more people into and creates greater ownership of the overall voting process.
2. It allows the candidate with the greatest overall support to be elected.
3. It is currently widely used in Australia and within many US groups (my own UM/Dearborn, for example), and is supported by John McCain, Howard Dean and Dennis Kucinich. It is also being used to elect the current chairman of the Democratic National Committee.
4. With only one or two candidates, it is identical to the more familiar "Option b", which is the other alternative we are considering.

I see no real disadvantages to it, other than a bit more cumbersome counting process. In my experience, that is not really a problem at all, at least for the size of elections that we are having; e.g., UM/Dearborn elections typically had between 100 and 200 voters.

\*\*\*\*\*

Anne Remley

I favor the simple and familiar approach in which the presidential candidate who garners the most votes on the presidential section of the ballot for ICPJ President at the Annual Meeting is elected. In the unlikely event that more than two candidates come forward, instant runoff voting could be used.

The wording of II-H-2 is as follows:

2. Voters at the Annual Meeting will be provided with a paper ballot containing the names of Presidential nominees. Each voter places a single X on the ballot next to the candidate of choice. The candidate with the highest number of votes is elected.

I begin this process with placement earlier in the document, as follows:.

1. Under ICPJ- Section I, I would create a new Section D. ICPJ PRESIDENT. (This entails moving "D.FISCAL YEAR" to a new "E." )
2. Section I-D would read:  
D.President of ICPJ: The president represents ICPJ in public, as well as chairing the monthly Steering Committee meeting. See Section II-B for presidential nomination procedures and II-H-2 for presidential selection procedures.
3. Section II-B would be reheaded: STEERING COMMITTEE AND PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.

=====

**Item 5: BY-LAWS: Section V-B**

\*\*\*\*\*

Bill Thomson

I favor amendments only at the Annual Meeting for the following reasons

1. Amendments must be given careful thought and should not be made on relatively short notice.
2. This would emphasize the importance of the Annual Meeting.
3. It is difficult for me to conceive of a situation in which we would need to amend the by-laws on an "emergency" basis.
4. We have difficulty getting much of a crowd even at the Annual Meeting. A "called" membership meeting might be quite small, and I don't think it makes sense to amend the by-laws with a small number of people.

=====

**Item 6: BY-LAWS: Section V-C**

\*\*\*\*\*

Anne Remley

This point should read only "3. When allowed, these By-Laws take precedence over Michigan State Law known as 'non-Profit Corporation Act, Act 162 of 1982.' "

There should be no mention of "Roberts Rules of Order as a "fall-back position" in ICPJ's by-laws." "Roberts" is intrinsically divisive. It puts weight behind voting rather than reaching consensus. It fosters a win-lose mentality and undercuts the search for common approaches to commonly held goals. It can be harmful to groups, leading to action that a significant number of members oppose, thus, driving members away, and, in the long run, gutting a group's effectiveness.

When members of ICPJ find themselves in situations seemingly not covered by the organization's stated process and by-laws, they need to rely on working together to find a satisfactory way forward.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bill Thomson

I believe that we need a reference point for situations not covered under the by-laws or state law. Virtually every organization that I have belonged to that had by-laws had Roberts Rules as its most basic authority, with other layers taking precedence over it. However, situations will ultimately arise that are not covered by our by-laws or by Michigan law, and what do we do then? Without something as a comprehensive backup authority, we stand the possibility of being hung up and unable to move.

\*\*\*\*\*

Louie Leedle

This is the "boilerplate." This recognizes the following five levels of authority, from the top down being:

- (1) State of Michigan, Non-profit Corporation Act, Act 162 of 1982, as amended.
- (2) ICPJ articles of incorporation.
- (3) ICPJ bylaws
- (4) Any special rules of order that the ICPJ or any of its committees or other subsidiaries may adopt.
- (5) Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised

Section V, 3.

These amended articles of incorporation are "not inconsistent with law." [From Act 162, Sec. 231 (2). The law being, "State of Michigan, Non-profit Corporation Act, Act 162 of 1982, as amended."]

These amended bylaws are "not inconsistent with law or the articles of incorporation," [From Act 162, Sec. 231. (2).]

Parliamentary Authority

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the [ICPJ] in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with [State of Michigan, Non-profit Corporation Act, Act 162 of 1982, as amended, the ICPJ articles of incorporation, and] these bylaws and any special rules of order the [ICPJ] may adopt. [From Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, (10th ed.), p. 569.]

=====