

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WASHINGTON CONVENTION
MINUTES
(Virtual meeting)
June 24-29, 2021

[See Convention Workbook for reference.](#)

PLENARY SESSION I. Thursday, June 24, 2021, 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

Call to Order and Opening Remarks.

Lunell Haught, LWVWA President, called the Convention to order at 5:35 p.m.

Lunell Haught welcomed all delegates and other League members to the virtual 2021 LWVWA Convention, “The Next 100 Years, Defending Democracy.” She compared the League with the US Congress as being a representative democracy with the heart of the organization being the participation of members from the grass roots level in the decision making of the League. Even though the democratic structure is not efficient but messy, it is an inclusive model. She noted that the use of Robert’s Rules of Order provides structure to ensure that the assembly or body considers things it agrees are important and still allows for comments and input from the assembly. Robert’s Rules of Order allows the will of the majority to be expressed while protecting the rights of the minority. In addition, there are Standing Rules for the Convention approved in advance by the delegates. They are the rules of order for this specific convention and built to accommodate the online environment. New convention rules will be proposed at the next convention.

Lunell reviewed what the League means when it states that it says it is “defending democracy.” It wants to ensure the following in its meetings and in its communities:

1. effective participation. Members know what is on the agenda and can suggest changes.
2. equality in voting.
3. an informed electorate. There is time during meetings to read and discuss the issues and alternatives.
4. there is citizen or member control of the agenda. The members decide what the program of work to be conducted will be.
5. that democracy includes fundamental rights. The members have a right to communicate with each other, gather information and ask questions, and express themselves in a variety of ways.
6. free, fair, and frequent elections. The League elects new Board members and officers every two years, although there is a Bylaw amendment that would provide for annual elections.
7. freedom of association. Members have the right to form and to participate in independent political organizations, including parties and interest groups. The League itself and leaders are nonpartisan, however.

Appointment of Convention Secretary and Parliamentarian. Lunell Haught appointed Jean Snider (Snohomish County) as Convention Secretary and Julie Anne Kempf (Seattle/King County) as the Parliamentarian. Jean is a voting delegate, and Julie Anne Kempf is a member in good standing, but not a delegate and will not vote.

Presentation of Convention Rules as Previously Adopted by the Delegates June 15, 2021 (see p. 16 of workbook)

Credentials Report and Statement of Quorum (Delores Irwin). Delores Irwin (Kittitas County), Chair of the Credentials Committee, reported that the number of local leagues represented was 17, that there were 84 voting delegates from local leagues and members at large, that 11 state Board members were present, and that gave a total of 95 voting delegates present. Under the Bylaws, a quorum of local leagues was present and a quorum of 30 delegates, other than state Board members, was met.

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion #21-02. Jean Snider (LWVWA Board Member): **I move to adopt the Convention Agenda found on pp. 6-9 of the workbook. Linda Benson (Clallum County) seconded the motion.** Lunell called three times for any objection to adoption of the Agenda. No questions or discussion were raised. **Motion passed by unanimous consent.**

Presentation of Convention Standing Rules. The Parliamentarian announced that the Standing Rules for the 2021 Convention had been amended and formally adopted by an affirmative vote of over two-thirds of the delegates. **Jean Snider (Board member) had moved to accept these Standing Rules for the 2021 Convention and Linda Benson (Board member) had seconded this motion.** The Parliamentarian noted that these rules accommodate working in a virtual environment. Otherwise, they are the same as the rules adopted in the 2017 and 2019 conventions. They address credentials, speaking and debating the business of the convention, the program of work, resolutions, and recording of Directions to the Board and announcements.

Appointment of Reading Committee to Approve 2021 Minutes. Lunell appointed the Reading Committee: Beth Pellicciotti (Spokane Area), Michele Murnane (Snohomish County), Julie Sarkissian (Seattle/King County) and Jean Snider, chair (LWVWA Board, Secretary).

Introduction of Resolutions Committee and Explanation of Process. Lunell introduced the Resolutions Committee: Judy Davis, chair (Member at Large); Amanda Clark (LWVWA Board member, Seattle/King County), and Cindy Madigan (Bellingham-Whatcom County). Under the adopted Standing Rules, the process for submitting resolutions was the following:

- Any registered delegate to LWVWA Convention was eligible to offer a resolution;
 - Delegates must have used the form available, Resolution Submission form, and to have submitted the Resolution online prior to Convention. Resolutions were required to have been submitted no later than 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, June 17, 2021.
 - Amendments to any submitted resolution were to be taken between June 17–23.
 - The Resolutions Committee met on Wednesday, June 23rd at 7 p.m. This meeting was open to delegates.
 - No resolutions were submitted for the 2021 Convention.

Presentation of Recommended Program: by Linda Benson, LWVWA Board (see pp. 21-22 of the workbook). Linda Benson presented the Recommended Program of Work to the convention body, including Re-adoption of Current Positions. Three programs were recommended: Washington State, Local and Regional News Study; Washington’s Public Hospital Districts (PHDs) and Their Role in Your Local Community’s Health Care System; and Adopting by Concurrence the Criminal Justice Positions of the LWV of California. Three programs were not recommended: Counteracting Disinformation/Finding Reliable Information, DEI Strategy, and Natural Resources/Tree Campaign. The Program of Work

Planning Committee was Kristi Adams (Whidbey Island), Marilyn Littlejohn (Snohomish County), Lauren Pixley (Seattle/King County), Adele Reynolds (Seattle/King County), and Linda Benson, (Clallum County and Board chair). Linda stated the reasons that the committee did not recommend these three studies: the proposed study on counteracting disinformation was not recommended because there were no membership resources identified. The second non-recommended study, creating a DEI strategy, was not recommended because the committee felt that it was duplicating what the state DEI committee was doing. The third non-recommended study, the natural resources/tree campaign, was not recommended because it was specific to a region and would need to take different forms, depending on the geographical region of the state. Linda stated that an amendment had been submitted to amend the first recommended program and that another amendment was suggested to strike a bullet point in the concurrence study. She noted that the Parliamentarian has stated that the concurrence procedure does not allow us to make changes to a proposed concurrence. This proposed change to the concurrence and the League procedure will be discussed further in the following days.

Nominating Committee Report. Lynn Carpenter, Chair (see pp. 22-26 of the workbook). Lynn Carpenter introduced the Nominating Committee: Shelley Anne Jones (Pullman), Joanna Cullen (Board member), Ann Murphy (Spokane Area), and Jean Snider (Board member), and Lynn Carpenter, (Snohomish County, chair). Nominees for the state Board: Lunell Haught (President, Spokane region), Mary Coltrane (1st VP, Seattle/King County), Beth Pellicciotti (2nd VP, Spokane Area), Jean Snider (Secretary, Snohomish County), Dee Ann Kline (Mason County), Lea Galanter (Seattle/King County), Joan Lawson (Seattle/King County), Susan Fleming (Clark County), Linda Benson (Clallum County), Julie Sarkissian (Seattle/King County), Jayne Freitag (Seattle/King County), Roslyn Duffy (Seattle/King County).. The new nominating committee will be: Shelley Anne Jones (Pullman, chair), Kathy Sakahara (Seattle/King County) and Amanda Clark (Seattle/King County). Lunell stated that there were no additional nominations submitted in advance. She then asked three times whether there were any nominations from the floor. There were none, closing nominations.

Bylaws Committee Report with Proposed Bylaws Amendments: by Judy Davis, chair (see pp. 27-29 of the workbook). Judy Davis presented five proposed bylaws amendments. These were previously proposed by her and seconded by Paula Barnes, another member of the committee, so they were put on the floor for consideration. In addition, there were three secondary amendments proposed to correct minor drafting and technical errors. A caucus was announced to be held on Friday at 4 p.m. to discuss these bylaws amendments with the vote to be taken on Sunday at the plenary. Judy asked if there were any clarifying questions.

Shelley Anne Jones (Pullman) asked when will the bylaw changes take effect? Will they affect the new Board slate that was just presented? Judy stated that the bylaw changes, if passed, will take effect immediately. Joanna Cullen (Seattle/King County) expressed concern that the Nominating Committee had recruited people based on their serving a two-year term. The Parliamentarian is researching the effect on the new Board slate and the transition and will report tomorrow during the caucus.

Treasurer's Report: Joanna Cullen, State C4 Treasurer (see pp. 30-31 of the workbook). Joanna presented the C4 budget noting that even with additional payroll and convention expenses that aren't yet reflected in the budget in the workbook, the 2019-2021 budgetary cycle will end with revenue exceeding expenses. This was due to a substantial net income and growth in membership dues. League events were well attended and less expensive than expected, due to meetings being conducted virtually and travel being cancelled. There were no questions or comments.

Budget Report: Cindy Piennett, Budget Committee chair (see pp. 30-31 of the workbook). Cindy presented the budget for 2021-2123, noting that it is a break-even budget. Per Member Payment (PMP) rates will not increase, although revenues will increase due to increased membership. Revenues will come from PMPs, contributions from the C3 Ed Fund, registration fees and donations from the action programs, and money from Council and Convention. Expenses are due to payment to the LWVUS, costs of the action program, Board support, costs for state council and convention, and operating costs. Operating costs will include a new hire of a half time person to assist the Administrative Director in the state office. The Budget Committee members were Joanna Cullen, C4 Treasurer; Myra Howrey, C3 Treasurer; Sharon Brown (Clark County), Shelly Ann Jones (Pullman), Lunell Haught (state President) and Cindy Piennett, chair. A caucus on the budget was scheduled for Saturday at 11:00 a.m.

Lunell called the session to recess at 6:30 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION II. Friday, June 25, 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

Lunell Haught, LWVWA President, called the Convention back to order at 5:35 p.m.

Credentials Report and Statement of Quorum (Delores Irwin). Delores Irwin (Kittitas County), Chair of the Credential Committee, reported that the number of local leagues represented was 16, that there were 89 voting delegates from local leagues and members at large, that 8 state Board members were present, and that gave a total of 97 voting delegates present. Under the Bylaws, a quorum of local leagues was present, and a quorum of 30 delegates, other than state Board members, was met.

Program of Work (Linda Benson, LWVWA Board)

Motion to Re-Adopt Current Positions

Motion # 21-03: Linda Benson (LWVWA): **I move to re-adopt the current LWVWA positions in the areas of Government, Transportation, Natural Resources and Social Policy as written in the 2019-2021 Program in Action®.** The LWVWA Board recommends continued effort in the campaign for Making Democracy Work. This motion has been seconded by Jean Snider (LWVWA Board). There were no clarifying questions. The vote on this item will take place during Sunday's plenary session.

Motions to Adopt Recommended Program of Work:

Motion #21-04A: Linda Benson (LWVWA Board): **I move to adopt the Recommended Program of Work, Item #1, addressing the Decline of Local Newspapers on Our Democracy as outlined on p. 20 of the workbook.** This motion comes to us seconded by Dee Anne Finken (Clark County). There were no clarifying questions. The vote on this item will take place during Sunday's plenary session.

Motion #21-04B: Linda Benson (LWVWA Board): **I move to adopt the Recommended Program of Work Item #2, Washington's Public Hospital Districts and Their Role in Addressing Unmet Healthcare Needs, which is a civic education project, as outlined on p. 20 of the workbook.** The motion comes to us seconded by Lauren Pixley (Seattle/King County). There were no clarifying questions. The vote on this item will take place during Sunday's plenary session.

Motion #21-04C: Linda Benson (LWVWA Board): **I move to adopt the Recommended Program of Work Item #3—Adoption by Concurrence the Criminal Justice Positions from the League of Women Voters**

of California, as outlined on pp. 20-21 of the workbook. The motion comes to us seconded by R. Peggy Smith (Thurston County).

Linda stated that there were two amendments to the above Program of Work that were submitted timely. The first is moved by Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) and would amend the scope of work for the Washington State, Local and Regional News Study.

Motion #21-04D: Ann Murphy: I move to add to the description of item #1, Washington State, Local and Regional News Study “to include the effects of the increase of Dark Money and other forms of media that may or may not contribute to increased mis/dis-information”.

The project description would thus read:

1. Washington State, Local and Regional News Study.

This study will address the impact of the decline of local and regional news operations on our democracy. It will look at effects on community engagement, political participation, financial cost to public agencies and entities, partisan politics, public health and other concerns, to include the effects of the increase of Dark Money and other forms of media that may or may not contribute to increased mis/dis-information”.

More than a dozen Affinity Discussion Group members from throughout the state are part of the committee dedicated to completing the tasks.

Ann was asked to take clarifying amendments. Charlotte Persons (Thurston County) noted that her impression was that most dark money came from outside the state, making it difficult to study. She felt that this would be beyond the scope of the study group’s intent. Ann felt that her amendment would point out the importance of dark money. Deloris Irwin (Kittitas County) asked what was the definition of “dark money”. Ann stated that it was the definition that the League has used in the past. Shelley Kneip (Thurston County) expressed concern about broadening the scope of the project, suggesting adding the words “if feasible.” Ann stated that the issue of mis-information had come up in caucus about this project. Diane Ramsey (Seattle/King County) asked Ann if she would accept “if feasible.” Ann stated that she would not. The Parliamentarian pointed out that the rules would have to be suspended to accept an amendment.

Linda stated that there was another amendment submitted in time to be considered by the convention by Grace Popoff (Seattle/King County). Her amendment is

Motion #21-04E: Move to amend the Concurrence with the California League of Women Voters on Criminal Justice by striking the second bullet point, which reads: “the elimination of systemic bias, including the disproportionate policing and incarceration of marginalized communities.” The Parliamentarian addressed this motion and ruled that this amendment is out of order, since the League has a policy, which has the same effect as a Standing Rule, that we do not amend concurrences. The rationale behind this policy is that concurrences include the study, the debate and consensus, and the adoption of positions, and we would be changing a portion of the work without having participated in the deliberative process. So, we adopt concurrences as “all or nothing.” To consider this amendment would require suspending the rules, which requires a ⅔ vote. Is there a motion to suspend the rules? There was no motion to suspend the rules.

There were no pre-submitted motions to consider the non-recommended programs.

Motions to Amend Bylaws (Judy Davis, Chair of Bylaws Committee, Member-at-Large)

Motion #21-07: Judy Davis: I move to adopt the Recommended Bylaw Amendments for LWVWA as presented on pp. 27-29 addressing.

1. The elimination of per member payments to the LWVWA for life members and students (Article VII, Section 3).
2. The staggering of Board officer terms (Article V, Section 1).
3. The staggering of Board member terms (Article VI, Section 1).
4. Establishing rules for delegates for Council for the purpose of Board elections (Sections 2-5).
5. Establishing rules for the Nominating Committee to create and submit a report 40 days before Council (Article X, Section 3).
6. There are three secondary amendments, which have been proposed to these Bylaws amendments, which correct minor drafting and/or technical errors.
7. To consider these secondary amendments, the Standing Rules previously adopted must be suspended, as to the prohibition of amendments from the floor.
8. The amendments are on the convention portal, and are secondary amendments A, B, C. No second is required since this motion is coming from the committee.

Motion 21-08: Judy Davis: I would move to suspend the Standing Rules of the convention for consideration of only these three specific secondary amendments as printed in the workbook, and for no other reason. This motion was seconded by Linda Benson (LWVWA Board).

Motion 21-09: Judy Davis: I further move these three secondary amendments to the proposed Bylaws, as published on the convention portal, and the link placed in the chat. The motion was seconded by Linnea Hirst (Seattle/King County).

Lunell opened the floor for clarifying questions. Diane Ramsey (Seattle/King County) asked when do the affected terms begin? Judy responded that they will begin immediately if the amendments pass. Linda Benson (LWVWA Board) stated that nothing changes until Council in 2022. Judy Davis concurred with this assessment. Julie Sarkissian (Seattle/King County) asked what prompted the suggested change in the Bylaws. Judy stated that recently the Board has been made up of mostly new people. The intent of the change is to ensure that Boards have a continuing pool of experienced people. R. Peggy Smith (Tacoma County) asked if a key person, like the Treasurer or President, were to leave before their term expires, could someone from a Council election fulfill that incomplete term, even if that position is not listed as being up for election. Judy said yes that could occur. Linnea Hirst (Seattle/King County) asked how the decision was made as to which officers would step down together. Judy stated that the decision was made during discussions of the proposal. Criss Bardill (Yakima) asked if this could be amended. The Parliamentarian stated that it could not because it requires notice for changing the Standing Rules. Only editorial changes can be made now. Katherine Murphy (Kittitas County) stated that a person could be appointed to fill an unfilled slot. Judy Davis stated that a person could be appointed by the Board, but not ratified for the next term. Maureen Cervinsky (Kitsap County) stated that it seems like a process is in place to fill vacancies and these amendments are just adjustments to the terms. The transition is just one year to the new structure. Judy agreed. Diane Ramsey (Seattle/King County) asked how the choice of directors will be made after one year. The Parliamentarian stated that it would be a random process, after asking for volunteers. Joanna Cullen (LWVWA Board) stated that at the last Convention, the Bylaws were changed for the Nominating Committee to fill the vacancies that arise on the Board during the two-year term. Judy Davis agreed. The discussion ended.

Lunell stated that the chair would entertain a motion to amend the Agenda to include discussion and debate on the Program of Work and the Bylaws Amendments during the next day's plenary after the

scheduled agenda items have been completed. **Jean Snider (LWVWA Board) so moved.** Linda Benson seconded. Lunell asked three times for objections to the motion. There were no objections. The motion passed by unanimous consent. The revised agenda will be posted.

Lunell called the session to recess at 6:30 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION III. Saturday, June 26, 2021, 2:00 - 3:30 p.m.

Call to Order and Opening Remarks.

Lunell Haight, LWVWA President, called the convention to order at 2:09 p.m. She noted the change in the agenda, approved during the Plenary II session, to include time for a debate on the Program of Work and on the Bylaws amendments.

Credentials Report and Statement of Quorum (Delores Irwin). Delores Irwin (Kittitas County), Chair of the Credentials Committee, reported that the number of local leagues represented was 16, that there were 69 voting delegates from local leagues and members at large, that 8 state Board members were present, and that gave a total of 77 voting delegates present. Under the Bylaws, a quorum of local leagues was present and a quorum of 30 delegates, other than state Board members, was met.

Budget Discussion

Motion 21-010. Cindy Piennett, Budget Committee chair: **I move to adopt the LWVWA 2021-23 Per Member Payment as follows: \$19 for individuals, \$9.50 for each additional member in a household.** The motion was seconded by Joanna Cullen (C4 Treasurer). This budget appears on pp. 30-31 of the workbook.

Motion 21-011. Cindy Piennett, Budget Committee chair: **I move to adopt the LWVWA 2021-23 Budget as presented on pp. 30-31 of the workbook.** This motion was seconded by Joanna Cullen (C4 Treasurer). There were no clarifying questions.

Resolutions Discussion.

Lunell announced that there have been no resolutions submitted. She also expressed appreciation to the committee members: Amanda Clark (Seattle/King County), Cindy Madigan (Bellingham-Whatcom) and Judy Davis, (Chair).

Candidate Forum.

Lunell announced that there had been no contested races and that the delegates had voted to spend the additional time on discussion of the Program of Work and the Bylaws Amendments.

Program of Work. Linda Benson, chair, Program of Work Committee

Motion 21-04D. Ann Murphy. **I move to add to the description of item #1, Washington State, Local and Regional News Study “to include the effects of the increase of Dark Money and other forms of media that may or may not contribute to increased mis/dis-information”.**

Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) addressed the objective of her amendment: to have the recommended study on the impact of the decline of local and al news operations in our democracy to include the effects of dark money and the increase of other forms of media that may or may not contribute to

increased mis/dis-information. She stated that she felt that this should be included in the study, but it had not been in the description. She wanted the description of the project to specify that it will be looking at the effects of dark money.

Debate on the amendment Motion #21-04D:

(Con) Delores Irwin (Kittitas County) stated that including this topic was too far afield from the central theme of the project although the project will address social media where dis-information is a significant topic.

(Pro) Grace Popoff (Seattle/King County) supported the addition since dark money is so important, but stated that she would support the project regardless.

(Pro) Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) reiterated her support for the amendment to include dark money.

(Con) Susan Fleming (Clark County) agreed that dark money is a problem but felt that it was important to confine the study to local and regional media since the study could be completed sooner.

Debate on Program of Work

Motion #21-04 A:

(Pro) Delores Irwin (Kittitas County) stated that she feels strongly that news dissemination, and especially local news, is absolutely crucial to maintaining democracy, and there has been a huge erosion in the past few years in the number of local news outlets. That impact is evident by the decisions that local government officials are making. When there are no local reporters who are involved and watching what government is doing, it is a bad thing. This study is going to really show that trend and the effects.

(Con) Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) stated that she is not against the issue but wants to ensure clarity in the study: that it will cover more than newspapers. She just wants to add more definition to what the committee is doing.

Motion #21-04-B:

(Pro) Jody Disney (Thurston County) speaking for Barbara Sharp (San Juan) who was having technical problems, talked about the difficulties of living in a small isolated community and trying to get health care. She had worked for many years in rural areas, and this issue is particularly critical for these communities which are underserved.

Motion #21-04C:

(Pro) Deb Carstens (Seattle/King County) supports the adoption of the California criminal justice position by concurrence. She is currently serving as the criminal justices issue chair for the LWVWA. She is keenly aware of the need to develop the League positions in this area. For example, there is no statewide position on the issue of police accountability. If it hadn't been for the urgent resolution on racial justice that was passed at last year's national convention, she couldn't have advocated for any of the numerous bills on this issue in the legislature that they considered and passed last year. Another area in which League positions are lacking involved re-entry into society of people who've been incarcerated. Last year there were several good bills introduced on this issue, and the League's ability to advocate in favor of these bills was severely limited because of the lack of positions. She said that she believes that this California position sets some common sense principles that she hopes will be the subject of consensus among members. It sets a framework to govern the entire criminal justice process from policing practices, through re-entry, and provides a strong and necessary foundation to advocate in this area.

(Con) Grace Popoff (Seattle/King County) offered support for most of the CA position, but was concerned about the second bullet, that starts out with a reference to systemic bias in policing. She believes that the assumption of systemic bias is in conflict with the last bullet, referring to action being related to available data. There are more arrests and more detentions of black youth than their numbers

would suggest, but not necessarily more than their involvement in crime would justify. She stated that she is sad that homicide is the number one cause of death for young black men, but does not support this study because of the assumption of systemic bias.

(Pro) Heather Kelly (Seattle/King County) supports this study and does not feel that the CA study was based on the assumption of systemic bias. She stated that the data are sound and show that systemic bias is real—a product of the criminal justice system.

(Con) Toyoko Tsukuda (Clallum County) stated that she is against the study and its assumption of bias.

Debate on Bylaws

Explanation. Julie Anne Kempf, the Parliamentarian, gave an overview of the amendments. She pointed out that the secondary amendments were tweaks to the language that were missed in the earlier drafting. On Sunday, there will be a motion to suspend the rules to consider secondary amendments to the Bylaws. The Convention Standing Rules do allow for the suspension and require a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote to suspend. She then proceeded to give a summary of the main motion, five bylaw amendments, to institute staggered terms. Cindy Piennett (Seattle/King County) asked if the Bylaws limited the Board to seven members. Julie Anne stated that it did not and that the intent is to have seven Directors and five officers for a total of twelve. Julie Anne noted that the question had come up as to how the directors would be staggered and that the Bylaws proposal is silent on that issue. Julie Anne said that customarily, volunteers would be solicited because all directors have equivalent positions. If there aren't enough volunteers, Roberts Rules state that you draw names out of a hat—a game of chance. This approach is also in Washington State law for public elections. After election at the next council, all newly elected directors will have two-year terms. The procedure will be to have a motion to suspend the rules, which if passed, would allow consideration of the secondary amendments, items A, B, and C, and vote on these. If they pass, they become part of the main motion that will then be voted upon. Joanna Cullen (Seattle/King County) noted that the main motion requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote to pass.

Motion #21-07:

(Pro) Beth Pellicciotti (Spokane Area) spoke in favor of staggered terms, noting that the Spokane League has been using it for some time. She also felt that having staggered terms would elevate the role and importance of the Nominating Committee.

(Con) Katherine Murphy (Kittitas County) spoke against the proposal stating that this proposal of staggered terms would not solve the problem of preserving institutional memory for incoming new Board members or for Board member burnout. She cited the LWVUS study, "Assessment and Transformation Roadmap", that stated that the working Board model was no longer a viable model and that we should move forward towards a policy Board model. She felt that having staggered terms doesn't address the need for change in that way. She recommended that a statewide affinity group be formed to look at what it would take to move from the unsustainable working Board model to a policy Board model.

(Pro) Tony Wilson (Thurston County) stated that he supports these amendments since he has sat on other boards and realizes the importance of institutional memory in any endeavor. He also supports suspending the rules to address the technical amendments. Long-term members of the Thurston County Board have been very supportive of him and have mentored him as a new member of the local league board. This support has reinforced his view that staggered terms are good, especially for the Board officers.

(Con) Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) stated that she did not support these amendments, and like Katherine Murphy (Kittitas County), would like to have a more deliberative process, including looking at alternatives to solve what seems to be the perceived problems. She also expressed concern for the unintended consequences of staggered terms and questioned why the separation of the president and

first vice president offices. She also expressed surprise that none of the present Board members had expressed support for this proposal. She noted that everything else done by the Board follows a biennial timeline. She would support a more deliberative process, along with the transitional details.

(Pro) Karen Verrill (Thurston County) stated that her local league had instituted staggered terms about six years ago, and it has made everything easier. She has served on the state nominating committee for four years and found it very difficult to find a large number of people every two years to fill the Board vacancies. Having so many new people at one time has made it too hard to move forward and to catch up with what was going on before coming on the Board. The transition will be difficult, but she stated that she thinks in the long run, it will make everything move more smoothly and the institutional memory will move with you.

(Con) Kathy Sakahara (Seattle/King County) opposes these amendments primarily because she feels that there has not been a deliberative democratic process preceding this proposal. She agrees with Katherine Murphy's suggestion that there needs to be a more careful discussion including the examination of options, before moving forward with a proposal.

Lunell called the session to recess at 3:29 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION IV. Sunday, June 27, 2021, 2:00 - 4:30 p.m.

Lunell Haight, LWVWA President, called the Convention back to order at 2:10 p.m.

Credentials Report and Statement of Quorum (Delores Irwin). Delores Irwin (Kittitas County), Chair of the Credentials Committee, reported that the number of local leagues represented was 17, that there were 96 voting delegates from local leagues and members at large, that 11 state Board members were present, and that gave a total of 107 voting delegates present. Under the Bylaws, a quorum of local leagues was present and a quorum of 30 delegates, other than state Board members, was met.

Voting on the Bylaws

Lunell reviewed the motions that would be coming up for a vote.

Motion #21-07: Judy Davis moved to adopt the Recommended Bylaws Amendments for LWVWA as presented on pp. 27-29 addressing:

- 1. The elimination of per member payments to the LWVWA for life members and students (Article VII, Section 3).**
- 2. The staggering of Board officer terms (Article V, Section 1).**
- 3. The staggering of Board member terms (Article VI, Section 1)**
- 4. Establishing rules for delegates for Council for the purpose of Board elections (Sections 2-6).**
- 5. Establishing rules for the Nominating Committee to create and submit a report 40 days before Council (Article X, Section 3).**

Motion #21-08. Judy Davis moved to suspend the standing rules of the Convention for consideration of only these three specific secondary amendments as printed in the workbook, and for no other reason.

Motion #21-09. Judy Davis further moved these three secondary amendments to the proposed Bylaws, as published in the Convention portal and the link placed in chat.

Lunell stated the order of voting: Motion #21-08 will proceed first; if that passes, Motion #21-09 will be considered; and if that passes, Motion #21-07 will be considered.

Lunell then moved to **Motion #21-08** to suspend the standing rules. This motion is not debatable, and so she proceeded with the vote. She called for any objections to suspending the rules three times. None were offered. **Motion #21-08 passed unanimously.**

Lunell reviewed the next motion (**Motion # 21-09**) to restore the definition of “student” in the bylaws, to strike the word “feasible” and restore the word “elected” to a sentence where it was inadvertently stricken, and to correct the number of elected directors from five to seven to simply be consistent with other portions of the bylaws. **Motion #21-09 passed**, with over $\frac{2}{3}$ supporting it. (Note from Parliamentarian: only on close votes will the number of votes be given; otherwise, it will announced by percentage for or against.)

Motion #21-13. Judy Zeider (Clark County) **moved to separate the Bylaws amendment #1, addressing the elimination of per member payments for life members and students, from the Bylaws amendments #2-5, addressing staggered terms for Board members.** It was moved and seconded by Joanna Cullen (Seattle/King County).

Lunell asked three times if there were any objections and hearing none, concluded the vote. **Motion #21-13 passed by unanimous consent.**

Lunell then moved on to **Motion #21-07**, the adoption of staggered terms for the state Board. She proceeded to clarify points of disinformation or confusion that she had heard in the preceding days about the proposal:

- This proposal will result in higher costs for Council—Both Council and Convention are planned to break even. Scholarships are available to assist in paying membership dues, and there is no reason that a fund to help with Council expenses could not also be set up. The reason Council has become better attended is in part due to the low barrier to attendance, the publicity for it and stressing that it’s for everyone, not just local league officials.
- This proposal would make Council something altogether different—The nominating process takes about 15 minutes maximum, as you’ve seen in the meeting today. So, it would take about that amount of time to present the nominations, entertain nominations from the floor and take the vote. Council is normally smaller than Convention. There is a provision that Council and Convention both require 30 voting delegates other than state Board members to conduct business.
- The other concern voiced was that we need more creative solutions for addressing Board retention. There are a variety of reasons Board members leave either midterm or do not run again. We do an exit interview with every Board member who leaves. This proposal is not intended to address all those situations. There is no reason to believe that people are not working on retention and moving the Board from a working Board to a policy Board. You’ve seen indications of this through the hiring of staff and outside help.
- The application process is cumbersome, especially for those who want to serve another term. Both returning Board members and new Board members presently have the same process. However, that process can be changed. It is solely the responsibility of the Nominating Committee to design the application process. At present, the Nominating Committee fills 12 slots every two years. If this proposal passes, it will fill six slots every year.

- What is the effect on the biennial budget? None. Currently the budget is adopted by the membership and given to the new Board members who have not participated in its development.

So the reason that you have the slate that has been presented at this Convention, is that some Board members, not me, convinced about half the Board to run for another term. Otherwise, you would be voting on an entirely new Board of Directors.

- Lunell then moved on to calling for a vote to adopt **Motion #21-07** addressing staggered terms for the Board. The vote requires 2/ 3 to pass. **Motion #21-07, items #2-5 passed, with 79% voting for and 19% voting against.**

Voting on the Program of Work

Motion #21-03. Lunell reviewed the actions on the Program of Work. Linda Benson (chair of Program of Work committee) has moved and Jean Snider (LWVWA Board) has seconded a motion to re-adopt the current LWVWA positions in the areas of Government, Transportation, Natural Resources and Social Policy as written in the 2019-2021 Program in Action®. She stated that the LWVWA Board recommends continued efforts in the campaign for Making Democracy Work®.

Lunell asked for objections three times and heard none. **Motion #21-03 passed by unanimous consent.**

Motion #21-04A. Item #1 in Program of Work regarding WA Local and Regional News Study. Lunell reviewed the actions on this motion. Linda Benson (LWVWA Board) has moved, and Dee Anne Finken (Clark County) seconded, to adopt the Recommended Program of Work, Item #1. Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) moved to add to the description of item #1, Motion #21-04D.

Motion #21-04D to amend Item #1 in Program of Work.

Lunell asked for any objections. Objection was heard.

Motion #21-04D failed with yes-53%; no-48%. This amendment requires 3/5 to pass.

Lunell called for a vote on **Motion #21-04A.** She asked if there were any objections and heard one.

Motion #21-04A passed: yes-93%; no-6%. The vote needed 50% to pass.

Motion #21-04B. Item #2 in Program of Work regarding WA Public Hospital Districts and Their Role in Your Local Community's Health Care System. Lunell reviewed the actions on this motion. Linda Benson moved and Lauren Pixley (Seattle/King County) seconded to adopt the Recommended Program of Work, Item #2.

Lunell called for a vote on **Motion #21-04B.** She called for objections three times and heard none.

Motion #21-04B passed by unanimous consent.

Motion #21-04C. Item #3 in Program of Work regarding Adopting by Concurrence the Criminal Justice Positions of the LWV of California. Lunell reviewed the actions on this motion. Linda Benson moved and R. Peggy Smith (Thurston County) seconded to adopt the Recommended Program of Work, Item #3.

Lunell called for a vote on **Motion #21-04C.** She asked if there were any objections and one was raised.

Motion #21-04C passed: yes-87%; no-10%; 3% abstention. The vote needed 3/5 to pass.

Lunell stated that there were no non-recommended programs brought forward. The Program of Work has been adopted.

Voting on the Budget

Lunell reviewed the actions on the 2021-23 Budget.

Motion #21-10. Cindy Piennett (Budget Committee chair) has moved, and Joanna Cullen (C4 Treasurer) seconded, to adopt the LWVWA 2021-2021 Per Member Payment as follows: \$19 for individuals, \$9.50 for each additional member in a household for 2021-23.

Lunell asked if there were any amendments to this motion and saw none. She then asked three times if there were any objections to calling for a vote and heard none. She then called for a vote on this motion.

Motion #21-10 passed by unanimous consent.

Motion #21-11. Cindy Piennett has moved and Joanna Cullen seconded, to adopt the LWVWA 2021-23 Budget as presented on pp. 30-33 of the Convention workbook.

Lunell asked three times if there were any objections to adopting the budget and heard none. She then called for the vote. **Motion #21-10 passed by unanimous consent.**

Resolutions

Lunell announced that there had been no resolutions submitted.

Election of Officers, Directors and Nominating Committee Members

Lunell reviewed the past actions on the slate of officers. She noted that this is the slate recommended by the Nominating Committee, chaired by Lynn Carpenter (Snohomish County). No nominations were brought forward from the floor. Although a voice vote is allowed by the Bylaws since there is only one nominee per position, Lunell stated voting would be done electronically since this meeting is being held virtually.

Nominees for Officers of LWVWA 2021-23 Board:

President Lunell Haught (Spokane Area)

1st VP, Mary Coltrane (Seattle/King County) (Note: Term will be 2021-2022)

2nd VP, Beth Pellicciotti (Spokane Area)

Secretary Jean Snider (Snohomish County)

Treasurer Dee Anne Kline (Mason County) (Note: Term will be 2021-2022)

This slate was accepted: 99% Yes; < 1 % No; (1 abstention)

Nominees for Directors for the LWVWA 2021-23 Board:

(Note: Four Directors' terms [to be determined] will be from 2021-2022); three Directors' terms (to be determined) will be from 2021-2023.)

Lea Galanter (Seattle/King County)

Susan Fleming (Clark County)

Linda Benson (Clallum County)
Joan Lawson (Seattle/King County)
Roslyn Duffy (Seattle/King County)
Julie Sarkissian (Seattle/King County)
M. Jayne Freitag (Seattle/King County)

This slate was accepted unanimously.

Nominees for Nominating Committee:
Shelley Ann Jones, Chair (Pullman)
Amanda Clark (Seattle/King County)
Kathy Sakahara (Seattle/King County)

This slate was accepted: 99% Yes; < 1% No (1 abstention)

Lynn Carpenter, chair of the Nominating Committee, effusively thanked the Nominating Committee for their hard work and welcomed the new Board and its directors and the new Nominating Committee.

Lunell similarly thanked the outgoing Board members and Nominating Committee members, and welcomed the new Board members.

Awards: Amanda Clark (Seattle/King County, Chair of the Award Committee)

Amanda recognized and praised the Award Committee. The members were: Bonnie Bless Boenish (Clallum County), Maren Halvorsen (Clallum County), and Lauren Pixley (Seattle/King County).

She noted that the nominated projects and programs and their leagues are found on p. 34 of the workbook, although some of the entries are miscategorized. However, all of the entries were judged according to the categories that the entrants selected.

Strengthening Democracy Award: This category is to showcase the work of leagues that activate their grassroots network to empower voters and advocate change around key issues such as protecting voting rights or increasing voter registration and turnout. **The choice for this category was Clark County, Speak Up Schools; submitted by President Nancy Halvorsen and Alan Unell. Honorable mention was given to Snohomish County for Voter Services, submitted by Vicki-Roberts-Gassler and Kate Lunceford.**

Community Connections Award: This category aims to highlight how leagues have leveraged issues affecting their local community in order to engage new voters and/or protect voters' rights, especially among underrepresented communities. **The choice for this category was Kitsap County, "DEI Engagement and Education," submitted by Ann Strosnider. Honorable mention was given to the Skagit League for their drive-through method for registering voters safely at local food bank distribution sites in Skagit County.**

Effective Member Engagement and Recruitment Award: This category is for democracy-building and voter empowering programs and activities that are innovative and have been successful in gaining visibility and recruiting new members. This category had two selections: **Clark County's communication program that effectively used social media in engaging and recruiting members** and **Kitsap County League for their program, Building Democracy and Reaching Out to Youth.**

Descriptions of these projects can be found on the local league websites.

Good Citizen Awards

Ann Murphy (Spokane Area). Ann gave some background on the Good Citizen Award. It was established to highlight someone in the Convention host community who represents what a good citizen is. Ann said that the Spokane League, as host city for this Convention, **selected Susie Gerard to receive the League Good Citizen Award**. She is a secondary school social studies coordinator for Spokane public schools. Over the past three years, in a partnership with the Spokane League, Susie has invited Spokane League members into 41 different high school civics classes to present the importance of voting and then register eligible students to vote. League members visited over 130 classes, presented to over 3000 students and registered 1200 first time voters. She also developed an “American Perspectives program” that presented stories, based upon original materials, about oppressed groups who had spoken up to make a difference in society. Her audiences were communities of color, the native tribes, and LGBTQ communities. Her goal was to encourage young voters to become active citizens by showing them role models who had overcome great obstacles.

Dorothy Roberts Award.

Lunell presented the criteria for the Dorothy Roberts Award. It is presented every two years at the League of Women Voters of Washington Convention to a person who shows a commitment, dedication and passion for the mission of the League. Lunell announced the winner(s) of the award: **Ann Murphy (Spokane Area) and Catherine Ahl (Thurston County)**.

Evergreen Award

Lunell Haught gave the background to the Evergreen Award. It was established in 2016 to acknowledge an extraordinary action that benefits the League. In the past, these awards have been given for an extremely generous financial donation. The symbolism of the name of the award is to convey the vibrancy and lifelong connections that evergreens have in this state. Although there is a series of these awards named for different trees, the Evergreen award represents a particular extraordinary action that sustains the League and keeps it vibrant and growing. Lunell announced the **winner of this year’s Evergreen Award, Karen Verrill (Thurston County), for her long-term effort as project manager for the League’s civics education textbooks.**

Directions to the Board

(appended to these minutes)

Invitation to Future Council

Lunell announced that Snohomish and Skagit Leagues offered to co-host 2022 Council in Everett.

She also went through the long list of people who had helped to make this Convention a success and expressed her gratitude to them for their long hours of work, endless patience, and perseverance in holding the first ever, virtual Convention.

She adjourned the 2021 Convention at 4:30 p.m.

Appendix A: List of Delegates

Adams, Kristi (LWV of Whidbey Island)
Alley, Lee (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Ambrosio, Candice (LWV of Bellingham/Whatcom County)
Austin, Beverly (State Board)
Bardill, Criss (LWV of Yakima County)
Bayman, Dawn (LWV of Spokane Area)
Bell, Michael (LWV of Spokane Area)
Benson, Linda (State Board)
Black, Cindy (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Bonaparte, Eunice (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Brewer, Coralee (LWV of Clark County)
Brinck-Lund, Maureen (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Buono, Shirley (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Burke, Martha (LWV of Kitsap County)
Busacca, Lynn (LWV of Mason County)
Carpenter, Lynn (LWV of Kittitas County)
Carstens, Deborah (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Clark, Amanda (State Board)
Coltrane, Mary (State Board)
Connors, Diana (LWV of Whidbey Island)
Crevier, Jeanne (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Cullen, Joanna (State Board)
Dickerhoof, Becky (LWV of Spokane Area)
Disney, Jody (LWV of Thurston County)
Duffy, Roslyn (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Dysart, Sherri (LWV of Mason County)
Elson-Schwab, Lev (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Fairgrieve, Rhonda (LWV of Kitsap County)
Fiksdal, Susan (LWV of Thurston County)
Finken, Dee Anne (LWV of Clark County)
Fleming, Susan (State Board)
Frick, Julie (LWV of Thurston County)
Galanter, Lea (State Board)
Gibbins, Martin (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Gold, Raelene (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Grantham, Christine (LWV of Benton-Franklin Counties)
Grau-Egerton, Carla (LWV of Whidbey Island)
Griggs, Susan (LWV of Kitsap County)
Hagens, Noel (LWV of Tacoma-Pierce County)
Halvorson, Nancy (LWV of Clark County)
Harger, Elaine (LWV of Spokane Area)
Hatchett, Ruth Ann (LWV of Tacoma-Pierce County)
Haught, Lunell (State Board)
Herbst, Bev (LWV of Skagit County)
HIRST, Linnea (LWV of Seattle-King County)

Howrey, Myra (State Board)
Hubner, Julie (LWV of Bellingham/Whatcom County)
Hucka, Judy (LWV of Whidbey Island)
Hutton, Ellie (LWV of Clark County)
Irwin, Delores (LWV of Kittitas County)
Johnson-Torelli, Beverly (LWV of Benton-Franklin Counties)
Jones, Shelley (LWV of Pullman)
Kelly, Heather (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Kelm, Clare (LWV of the San Juans)
Kentner, Tressa (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Kilty, Cheri (LWV of Yakima County)
Kneip, Shelley (LWV of Thurston County)
Knox, Elizabeth (LWV of Tacoma-Pierce County)
Larsen, Carol (LWV of Kitsap County)
Lawson, Joan (State Board)
Liberman, Gail (LWV of Clark County)
Links, Lynda (LWV of Mason County)
Louis, Maurie (LWV of Kitsap County)
Lunceford, Kate (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Madigan, Cindy (LWV of Bellingham/Whatcom County)
May, April (LWV of Spokane Area)
Mcclure, Michelle (LWV of Kitsap County)
Mcmahon, Carol (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Miller, Rebekah (LWV of Clallam County)
Molleson, Diane (LWV of Benton-Franklin Counties)
Monjure, Joy (LWV of Bellingham/Whatcom County)
Monoian, Anita (LWV of Yakima County)
Muir, Robin (LWV of Kitsap County)
Murdock, Marla (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Murnane, Michele (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Murphy, Katherine (LWV of Kittitas County)
Murphy, Ann (LWV of Spokane Area)
Nelson, Lisa (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Olson, Deborah (LWV of Pullman)
Parton, Polly (LWV of Benton-Franklin Counties)
Paul, Barbara (LWV of Kitsap County)
Pellicciotti, Beth (LWV of Spokane Area)
Persons, Charlotte (LWV of Thurston County)
Petersen, Rosanne (LWV of Clark County)
Piennett, Cindy (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Pixley, Lauren (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Popoff, Grace (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Power-Drutis, Theresa (LWV of Tacoma-Pierce County)
Powers, Rosemary (LWV of Tacoma-Pierce County)
Quast, Necia (LWV of the San Juans)
Ramsey, Dianne (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Raymond, Karen (LWV of Kittitas County)
Renhard, Susan (LWV of Snohomish Co)

Reynolds, Adele (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Roberts-Gassler, Vicki (LWV of Snohomish Co)
Roomes, Joann (LWV of Whidbey Island)
Ryder, Bobbie (LWV of Pullman)
Sakahara, Kathy (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Sanderson, Wende (LWV of Skagit County)
Sarkissian, Julia (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Sharp, Barbara (LWV of the San Juans)
Smith, R. Peggy (LWV of Thurston County)
Snider, Jean (State Board)
Stegemeyer, Janet (LWV of Kitsap County)
Stewart, Cynthia (LWV of Tacoma-Pierce County)
Sullivan, Carol (LWV of Skagit County)
Taylor, Mary Kay (LWV of Seattle-King County)
Tsukuda, Toyoko (LWV of Clallam County)
Tvedt, Karen (LWV of Thurston County)
Verrill, Karen (LWV of Thurston County)
Walker, Libby (LWV of Pullman)
Whitmore, Marjorie (LWV of Clallam County)
Wilson, Stephen A. (Tony) (LWV of Thurston County)
Zeider, Judy (LWV of Clark County)

Appendix B: Standing Rules of the 2021 LWVWA Convention

As adopted by the delegates June 15, 2021

Technical notes: These rules were moved by Jean Snider and seconded by Linda Benson, who are automatic delegates to the 2021 convention. These rules were adopted via written ballot disseminated electronically 21 days prior to the convention. Proposed amendments were submitted by June 8, 2021, via email to Jean Snider, the secretary of the convention. Voting on these rules and proposed amendments occurred electronically June 10-14, 2021, and results were announced on June 15, 2021.

Preamble

These rules contain accommodations for the 2021 convention only to adapt to the technology and communication limitations of the virtual online environment during the pandemic.

These rules were developed in coordination with the convention parliamentarian and the virtual meeting technology team for the convention.

The rules, as proposed or amended, required a two-thirds affirmative vote of the entire delegation for adoption. To suspend a rule at a later time during the convention requires a two-thirds vote.

A. Credentials

1. Admission to the convention online meetings and caucuses shall be limited to persons who are properly registered as delegates, observers (members who are not delegates), or guests.
2. Business sessions (e.g., plenary sessions) will be restricted to delegates, the parliamentarian, and meeting staff as designated by the chair.
3. Guests and observers will be able to observe the business sessions via livestream.
4. As an equivalent of a convention badge, each participant's status as a voting delegate or meeting staff, and local League if applicable, shall be shown on their screen name using designated abbreviations or symbols, as assigned by the Credentials Committee.
5. The Credentials Committee, directly after the opening ceremonies of the first business meeting, shall report the number of delegates with proper credentials and whether the distribution of delegates meets the Bylaw requirements. The committee shall make a supplementary report before each business session.

B. Speaking and Debating

1. Privilege of the Floor is reserved to delegates in attendance via active presence in a convention Zoom meeting.
 - a. Only delegates shall be permitted to vote and initiate motions. All members can contact their delegates to propose motions.
 - b. Nondelegates may be recognized by the chair to provide clarification on motions and information on topics before the assembly. The chair is the sole determinator of such need to recognize nondelegates to speak.
2. Recognition: Delegates wishing to speak shall gain the attention of the chair, using the designated indicator for that specific meeting provided in the online meeting environment. When recognized, they shall unmute their microphone and give their name and the name of their League, Unit-at-Large, or the State Board position they represent.
3. Debate: During debate, no person may speak more than once on a given question until all who desire to speak have been heard. No one may speak more than two minutes without permission of the meeting. The chair may set or alter the rules for debate, including, but not limited to, the

time allowed to speak, or the number of speakers pro and con to be recognized, if the agenda is behind schedule.

C. Business of the Convention

1. Motions: All motions, except simple motions such as to close debate, shall be submitted through the designated process as defined on the Convention website.
 - a. The chair may make use of the entertainment of unanimous consent motions on noncontroversial items of business and meeting actions to keep the meeting moving efficiently in the virtual environment.
 - b. The LWVWA shall establish a process for the submission of motions and resolutions, with any advance notice as required for consideration in the sections below.
2. Votes of the convention shall be taken with entry from the online waiting room suspended for the duration of the vote, and no one may enter until the vote has concluded. Absentee or proxy voting shall not be permitted. The vote count shall be taken of those present in the Zoom room and voting, counting only “yeas” and “nays.” Abstention will also be an option on every ballot.
3. Bylaws: Proposed Bylaw changes may be considered, provided notification had been given as prescribed in the Bylaws. Bylaws changes may not be amended from the floor but may simply be voted up or down.
4. Budget amendments for line-item changes need to be presented in writing to the budget committee, using the online process at least seven days prior to the convention, and may be debated during the budget discussion period.
5. Amendments to items that are part of the permanent business (e.g., budget, program of work, bylaws) of the convention may be offered in writing up to seven days prior to the convention using the online process provided. Additional candidates for any positions, other than those already on the Report of the Nominating Committee, may also be nominated online, using the web form on the convention website, or from the floor of the convention.
6. Each amendment to items that are part of the permanent business of the convention shall be taken in the order the amendment would appear within the customary business of the convention.
7. Due to the limitations of an electronic meeting of the size of the convention, written amendments may not be further amended from the floor, nor may amendments to substantive meeting business documents be offered that were not submitted through the portal at least seven days in advance of the convention to ensure ability to review by voting delegates.

D. Program of Work

1. The Recommended Program of Work shall be presented and moved for adoption by members designated by the Board of Directors. Only questions for clarification shall be allowed at this time. The recommended program will be taken up for debate, and a vote taken when the order of business calls for it. Recommended items require a simple majority vote.
 - a. Amendments to the Recommended Program of Work must be submitted via email to Linda Benson at lbenson@lwwa.org, at least seven days (11:59 p.m. on June 17, 2021) prior to the beginning of the convention.
 - b. Amendments from the floor shall be out of order.
2. Not-Recommended Program of Work items require notice of intent to consider no later than 14 days (11:59 p.m. on June 10, 2021) in advance of the first day of the convention to consider at

the first plenary. Amendments to Not-Recommended items with a notice of intent filed must be submitted no later than seven days (11:59 p.m. on June 17, 2021) in advance of the first day of the convention. Items eligible for consideration are those that have been submitted to the Board as required in the LWVWA Bylaws but were not included in the Board Recommended Program of Work.

- a. Not Recommended items shall be presented immediately following the presentation of the recommended program. Amendments submitted 11:59 pm on June 17, 2021, will be considered as a part of the discussion of the same item, and will be either forwarded or not, based on the same requirements for consideration of a Not-Recommended item.
 - b. Move for consideration: The member who moved consideration of either the not-recommended item or an amendment to one may give a two-minute explanation.
 - i. Questions for clarification are allowed, and only debate on the merits of consideration is permitted at this time.
 - ii. The vote for consideration requires a simple majority and is taken immediately. If an online vote is required, speeches for and against may continue while votes are tallied on the previous motion.
 - c. As each item eligible for consideration is considered, amendments from the floor shall be out of order.
 - d. Consideration for Adoption: Those not-recommended items, and any amendments to those not-recommended items voted for consideration, will be taken up for debate and vote when the order of business calls for it at a subsequent plenary session. Not-recommended items require a three-fifths vote for adoption.
3. Concurrence: In the event an item to be considered by concurrence has been proposed according to the Policies and Procedures, voting shall require a three-fifths vote for adoption. As each item eligible for concurrence is considered, amendments from the floor shall be out of order.

E. Resolutions

1. At least three weeks before the convention, the president shall have appointed a Resolutions Committee consisting of a current board member other than the President and at least two other League members. One of the two non-Board members shall be appointed as the Chair of the Resolutions Committee.
2. Any registered delegate to the LWVWA Convention may offer a resolution by 11:59 p.m. on June 17, 2021.
3. Delegates must use the [Resolution Submittal Form](#) available online and must submit the resolution at least one week (11:59 p.m. on June 17, 2021) prior to convention online. This is a hard deadline, and members offering resolutions should make themselves aware of it.
4. Submitted resolutions shall be posted for review by delegates, and amendments may be submitted to the resolutions committee for consideration and disposition prior to the scheduled meeting of the resolutions committee on June 23, 2021.
5. The Resolutions Committee shall meet via an online meeting platform at a time announced. This meeting will be open to delegates who wish to explain their resolutions or proposed amendments to the committee.
 - a. To hear each delegate who wishes to explain their resolution to the Resolutions Committee.

- b. To consider whether each resolution meets the requirements as to form, notice, or exception to notices and the following criteria:
 - i. Consistent with Bylaws and Principles
 - ii. Consistent with League program positions and the position is identified on the Resolutions Submission Form
 - iii. Addresses a single, topical issue
 - iv. Requires time-sensitive governmental action
 - v. Likely to have an impact on the single topical issue as described
 - vi. Consistent with the current stated legislative priorities
 - vii. Can be implemented using existing League resources
6. The Resolutions Committee shall report its findings on all submitted resolutions and proposed amendments to submitted resolutions.
 - a. Proposed Resolutions are either reported affirmatively or determined to not meet the stated criteria.
 - b. The chair of the Resolutions Committee will announce those findings to the convention on the LWVWA website at the beginning of the plenary session on Sunday morning.
7. Any resolution or amendment to a resolution reported affirmatively by the Resolutions Committee will be automatically considered by the convention following adoption of the program. Any motion to appeal a ruling of the president regarding the presentation of resolutions shall require a two-thirds vote.
8. Debate and action on resolutions shall take place after action on the Proposed Program, Concurrences, and Not-Recommended Program items. Adoption requires a majority vote.
9. Amendments moved from the floor shall be ruled out of order and not considered.
10. Those who desire to make resolutions may consult with the Resolutions Committee prior to deadlines to be sure that the resolution meets form and content requirements.

F. Direction to the Board

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. Direction to the Board may be made by any member of the LWVWA and shall be submitted to the Convention in writing using the [web form](#) posted on the Convention website. Those members who wish to read their Direction to the Board at the closing Plenary session may do so but are not required to do so. The board will respond through a report to the entire membership on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

G. Announcements

Announcements must be submitted to the secretary of the convention using the designated [announcements submission portal](#). Submitted announcements approved by the chair and secretary as timely and appropriate will be read at the next announcements opportunity appropriate to the nature of each announcement in a plenary session.

Appendix C: Directions to the Board



Sunday, June 27, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. **Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.**

Be kind and considerate of one another. It is so very necessary to make the many League volunteers, issue chairs, as well as paid staff, feel appreciated.



Tuesday, June 29, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

Catherine Ahl

Email (optional)

cahl@lwvwa.org

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

I agree with Kathryn Murphy's comments on increasing outreach. Members are told they can attend Board meetings on Zoom but not what topics will be discussed. How would they know if they wanted to attend if they can't see what's on the agenda? So I hope that in the future, Board agendas will be published/posted so members can determine if they want to attend.

Thanks.



Sunday, June 27, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

Heather Kelly

Email (optional)

hejokelly@gmail.com

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

I request that every new board member be required to take the Leaderosity course on DEI or an equivalent course in the first year of their term. I also request that there be a standing DEI committee that provides regular updates to the members, works to recruit speakers for statewide events (virtual) or for local Leagues to use, and creates toolkits for Leagues to implement the DEI policy effectively in all that we do.



Monday, June 28, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

Jody Disney

Email (optional)

jodyannette1@gmail.com

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

Hello Board,

Thanks for the excellent conference and the opportunity to share during caucuses. The importance of Universal Healthcare and whether or not people have it or have enough of it is front & center. Though the leagues have positions, I believe it is time to look at healthcare as a serious DEI issue, and mobilizing our membership. Perhaps a resolution regarding the lack of equity in healthcare could be a place to start.



Sunday, June 27, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

Katherine Murphy

Email (optional)

kbmurphy@lwvwa.org

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

Advice to the Board—Increasing Member Access Board Deliberations

Katherine Murphy, LWV of Kittitas County

Example—Research Project: Communicating the Plan to the Membership

I really appreciate the intention, the training in Appreciative Inquiry, the in-depth interviews, and the objective of being sure that we are accomplishing our strategic plan. My concern is that the LWVWA Ed Fund board did not communicate the scope and cost of this project with the membership until many resources and people were committed. Attached are all the mentions of the Research project that a member could find over the past two years.

Even with the detail that Lunell Haught offered in yesterday's presentation, I can still not find where the LWVWA/EF Board debated the merits of spending nearly \$100,000 on this project vs. other possible uses of these funds. This investment represents nearly 10% of our investment account. At convention we make decisions about the c4 budget but have no input on the c3 budget or projects. As a good government organization, we often encourage and advocate that public bodies operate in a transparent fashion, including deliberations. We also encourage the public to attend meetings and we encourage public bodies to announce when they will be deliberating on topics and offer opportunities for community members to comment.

So my hope is that we can find a better way to preannounce the topics the c3 and c4 boards will be discussing and explain to members how they can get the board reports on these issues and really encourage member comment on large projects that will use League capacity—including volunteer time, money, staff time, and board time. I know that you are creating a member survey. I encourage you to include questions on how the LWVWA and LWVWA/EF can create ways for members to access board reports and agendas in advance and to create a time period where members can come and ask questions.

The extra efforts you might need to make to increase the visibility of your work, your tradeoff discussions, and opportunities for members to comment and question before decisions are taken will also serve as an introduction to board work for members. So I hope you take up this advice as an exercise in educating our members about how League works and demystifying board work. I think we will all benefit.

ALL MENTIONS I COULD FIND THAT MEMBERS HAD EASY ACCESS TO

TWIL June 19, 2019

June 19, 2020

Looking for a Few Good Snoops!

Curious? Want to know what impact the League has? Wonder if we are organized in a way that makes us rewarding to be involved in? Interested in knowing if we are engaged with the groups and people who can help us make democracy work?

The LWV of Washington is putting together a small group to create an assessment to help us evaluate how we are doing in a number of priority areas in our “transformational journey” and strategic plan. The group may be working with researchers from Washington State University. The goal is to create a “benchmark,” or status report, of our work, based on our goals and strategies. This assessment will be ongoing so that we can see the results of our work and determine if we need to modify our strategies. It will be interesting and potentially quite fun. Want to join in? Contact president@lwvwa.org.

I did this research and read all of the board minutes during the second week of May 2021--FROM BOARD MINUTES

First mention that I can find--September 16, 2019--Facilitate Local Work Agenda Item

First bullet: Research: In the Action/Assignment column it says this:

LH will send out what she has put together on measurable outcomes and WSU research group to look at outcomes and research.

Second mention that I can find--June 15, 2020--Good of the Order

WSU is helping to do an evaluation on how well the Board in addressing the goals and objectives defined in the strategic plan. This assessment provides a good opportunity for Board members to re-evaluate their portfolios and raise any questions about their portfolios. This study will also provide the groundwork for future assessments. Bobbie Ryder, Pullman LL, and Susan volunteered to help with this effort.

Third Mention--September 21, 202--Research--Jean Snider

Jean reported on the progress of the Research Committee. It has met twice. It has 6 members, but could use a few more volunteers. She reviewed the document submitted to the Board, “Research Plan for Evaluating Progress in Meeting Goals of LWVWA Strategic Plan”. The project is intended to be both qualitative and quantitative and provide information about how well the League is meeting its goals. The information will be collected through interviews with league members initially, and then through interviews or surveys with partners and others outside the League who we are trying to affect. The questions will primarily be focused around the portfolio topics (3 goals of the strategic plan). The timeline presented is optimistic but as the project becomes better defined, it will be updated. It is hoped that the costs for training interviewers, defining a survey and collecting quantitative data, and data analysis can be kept minimal through partnership with WSU faculty, retirees, and students. However, the committee may still be asking for some ed fund money for parts of the project. Jean asked that information about the project be mentioned in the upcoming MELD calls, since some participants may be asked to participate in the project, either as interviewers or interviewees.

Fourth Mention--October 19, 2020--Research Committee

Jean said that the focus of the Research Committee right now has been on the training of interviewers 2 and developing the interview questions. This project uses resources from WSU and Gonzaga University. The first training session will be for committee members to be held Nov. 6th to test the

protocols and questions. Interviewers will begin interviewing the Portfolio Directors, hopefully before the end of the year. Questions will be sent to interviewees before their interview. Board members should be aware that some of their LL network contacts may be asked to be interviewees.

Fifth Mention—January 18, 2020—Research Committee Report pulled from concept agenda

Research Progress Report (Jean and Lunell):

Joanna requested that the report be pulled from the Consent Agreement so that questions that she had could be addressed. Her concern was that the ongoing interviewing was not well organized since she had heard of a problem in duplicate interviews. She was assured that the committee was well aware of the misstep, had spoken with the person who was affected by the problem, and that that person was not negatively concerned and wanted to continue to participate in the project.

Sixth Mention—Research Project—February 16, 2021—Budget approved

A budget was proposed for the research project for Evaluating the Progress in Meeting the Goals of LWVWA Strategic Plan. Two budgets were proposed: one for the remainder of the fiscal year and one for supporting a research assistant.

The funds are going to support students, among other items, from Washington State University (undergraduate students) and Gonzaga University (graduate student). Estimates were also provided for costs for part of the next biennial budget.

Move (Snider)/S/P to approve the estimated research expenditures for 2021 as submitted.

Move (Snider)/S/P to approve the Service Agreement between LWVWA/Ed Fund and Stephanie Elie Martin.

May 2021 TMIL

By Beth Pellicciotti, Member, Research Plan Committee, and Jean Snider, Chair, Research Plan Committee

The LWV of Washington created the 2017 Strategic Plan for LWVWA Sustainability to guide LWVWA activities into the future. As the LWVWA Strategic Plan approaches the five-year mark, the LWVWA is committing time and funding to a comprehensive Research Plan to Assess LWVWA Effectiveness to see if the LWVWA is accomplishing what it said it would.

Strategic Plan Goals

The LWVWA's Strategic Plan has three main goals: (1) increase LWVWA impact in public policies and civic involvement, (2) facilitate local League work, and (3) strengthen organizational capacity. The Research Plan assesses how the LWVWA is meeting all three goals. The LWVWA impacts public policies at the state level, and as local Leagues advocate for issues important to their communities, the LWVWA offers ways for all members to become involved at the state level as well.

Members may work with teachers to increase the distribution and use of LWVWA textbooks across the state, they may host candidate forums for both state and local candidates, or support state-led efforts to change legislative or state policies. In all these activities, the LWVWA provides a framework whereby all members can jointly mobilize to push the League's mission, goals, and positions. But is the state League having a significant effect? Is it being successful? What else should the LWVWA do to increase its impact on public policy and civic engagement? Are there things the League should stop doing?

Another goal of the League plan is to facilitate local League work by creating opportunities for members to share ideas and concerns with other League members. The 2020 Council, the newly formed Affinity Groups, greater participation by membership in statewide committees, and the Membership Engagement and Leadership Development (MELD) network are examples of these opportunities. What else should the LWVWA be doing to facilitate local League work?

As local Leagues have increased their organizational capacity to meet their growing mission, so the LWVWA has increased its capacity-building. Local Leagues may have also received LWVWA grants for civics education, redistricting programs, or special projects. Local Leagues may have seen their

technical capacity increase through the purchase of equipment, software, and training on new technology. What other ways should the LWVWA work to support the local League organizational capacity?

Research Plan Ins and Outs

The Research Plan has both an internal and an external part. In the internal part (2020-2021), the LWVWA asked members to assess its effectiveness in impacting public policies and civic engagement, in facilitating the work of local Leagues, and in strengthening capacity-building among local Leagues. We want to know things like: what impacts local Leagues think the state should be making, whether or not it is making them, and what impacts the state is having on members through their membership and engagement.

The internal part consists of interviews and a survey. Interviewers from the League asked 100 members how they perceive their League work and the impact of the League's activities. Members reflected on the best future for the League and what it will take to get there.

The interview results will be shared through a future article in the TMIL and during the upcoming LWVWA Convention; there will also be a survey for all members this summer. Look for results of the survey in fall 2021.

In the external part of the Research Plan (2021-2022), the LWVWA will evaluate how well it impacts public policies and civic engagement as viewed by those outside of the League. Through interviewing and surveying external stakeholders, voters, and nonvoters, the LWVWA seeks to understand how the League is perceived and what contributes to or detracts from the League's trustworthiness. Results from the external part will also be shared with members. These results will provide guidance to the LWVWA and local Leagues on maintaining and strengthening the League's reach and credibility.

A broad cross-section of League members and outside collaborators have partnered with the LWVWA Research Plan to date. Over 120 League members have been involved with the interview phase of the project. Outside collaborators include Washington State University faculty members, a Gonzaga University doctoral student, and several university interns. Faculty members provide technical guidance and assistance in the project design, data collection, and analysis.

What We Know So Far

What are some preliminary benefits of the Research Plan? The work has created a strong basis for a continued partnership between the LWVWA and academia. The internal interviews have created new networks among local League members and stronger ties to state board members and state goals. It is clear that League members like to talk with each other about League work!

Want to learn more about this work? Visit the Overview page for this project (restricted to League members); read the detailed Research Plan, including the internal interview method and interview questions; and watch for monthly board updates. Look for continued information on the Research Plan in the TMIL, at the convention, and through the League's other communication channels. Questions? Contact Jean Snider.

Overview Page

<https://lwvwa.org/project-overview/>



Sunday, June 27, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

Nancy Halvorson

Email (optional)

lwvclarkcounty@gmail.com

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

I had made a "direction" 2 years ago about giving attendees clearer direction about how the convention works - you scored! Thank you so much for a fabulous convention and making it happen virtually,



Sunday, June 27, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

Nancy Halvorson

Email (optional)

lwvclarkcounty@gmail.com

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

In the future, please do the awards during a general session and not during a plenary session. It was unfortunate that all attendees did not have an opportunity to see the awards presentations. Understand this may have been a byproduct of having to do this virtually.



Sunday, June 27, 2021

2021 Convention: Directions to the Board

Name (optional)

R Peggy Smith

Email (optional)

rpps4u@comcast.net

Direction to the Board are ideas, suggestions, and requests for consideration and board action. Resolutions that are not adopted may be the basis for a direction to the board. The board will respond through a report on actions taken or with explanations of why no action was taken.

Please provide information and directions for how to REMOVE some adopted positions.

I am wanting to do this, but I need to know who will be the responsible board member (s) for consultation.