



March 4, 2025

ATTENDANCE: LaShonda, Tawanda, Charles, Tim, Antjuan, Fane, Katherine, Rubi, Art, Harrison, Audrey

Charles motioned to rescind voting member rules of who can speak.

- Antjuan second and it passed unanimously

Agenda:

- Discuss the voting member model and whether we want to continue to have voting members in CFAC.
 - Tawanda; at first it was a good idea but as I see now, we have not done anything and we are arguing and it's about the community that is the one being affected. As for the voting member model I don't care for it.
 - Katherine: I agree, my understanding is that it stemmed from a concern from people swaying the vote and making decisions for the group that weren't involved. But there are other regulations we can have that don't just say this select group.
 - Fane: I agree with Katherine: at the beginning of CFAC, I talked to Sierra about how it felt exclusive and if we are to include the community this was not the best option, it felt like we were cherry picking, and I think we should do away with the membership body.
 - Antjuan: I think that voting is in the bylaws and it says it should follow democratic rules of order and it's not clear about the voting members. And trying to cultivate a consistent body can be hard if there are no expectations. Some ideas that members should have are...
 - Should have to be a marion county resident to vote
 - "Obligated" members that come with greater expectations. For example: If a stipend is released it should come with the expectation that you're keeping up your commitments and staying engaged
 - Tim: Right now no, there are not too many people who were voting members and are now not here, maybe in the future but right now it's just the people who are here. It was happening because of a problem that wasn't happening. And now I think without it we can get things done now.
 - Fane: There are lots of notes that can backup where votes were "vetoed", when the majority has made a decision, the minority halts the actions, so it also counteracted itself.
 - Art: Everyone voted for this, nobody made us do it, it was to prevent something from happening in the future. And I think we got away from the purpose by trying to protect ourselves and then got lost in the sauce. That lack of structure stopped us from moving forward. And after the commission orientation today it is similar to the proposals from Charles. It's all conscious voting and not one towering power. It was all supposed to be democratic.
 - Antjuan: if we dissolve all executive power, who is going to be the representative to speak for us in commission and outside spaces?

- Art: Having co-chair structure in committees. And grouping ourselves in teams and working together is what we need to do so we can mainline the ideas is a good structure.
- Fane: lack of communication without structure on the executive team and committee level also hurt the space.
- Art: There was a fall out of the executive team and then it all fell out.
- Katherine: Committee structure: in my role I have been able to think about the structure. This is what I suggest.
 - What I saw was that the bulk of the work done was committees, and it was more organization and not food related.
 - My suggestion is to have committees like Urban farming, food relief so people would gravitate towards the type of work they do. So those people would choose the steering committee who would then meet regularly and then amongst themselves there would be an executive team and then one staff member who is paid to keep the administrative work going of the coalition. The past committees are more administrative.
- Proposals 1,2,3 were introduced in the conversation.
 - Tim: Motion to vote on what proposal they want to see in CFAC.
 - No one seconded
 - Audrey: Can you please read the proposal first?
 - Katherine: Proposal 1 brought forth by Audry and Fane: proposal 2 brought forth by Charles. Proposal 3 is to not change the structure. [See proposal documented attached here](#)
 - Tim: Motion to vote on what proposal they want to see in CFAC? Fane seconded.
 - Vote for proposal 1: 9
 - Vote for proposal 2: 1
 - Vote for proposal 3: 0
- Proposal 1 won and we are now flushing out concerns and whether we like option A or B.
 - Option A - remove the current Executive Team and replace it with a larger, more representative leadership body of committee chairs who rotate every few months
 - Option B – completely flatten leadership into a horizontal structure in which working committees (for example, membership, grants, education, advocacy) will coordinate actions closely to make operations, programmatic, and internal governance decisions.
 - Antjuan: I would add an option to use the community as a way to surface topics and functionally this isn't changing much. Do we still need for legal purposes the president
 - Fane: I appreciate the concerns, the first proposal is still up for a lot of change. There is still room to improve on the details. But for admin purposes, I don't know if that is true.
 - Audrey: There is a lot of room for what can be added and I like Katherine's points about the committees. And who would be the contact would be committee leaderships and we have examples of this structure working in indy.

- Antjuan: It doesn't address if there is going to be a secretary, who chairs the meeting?
- Art: I agree with him, when we decide to go for a 501c3 we need a board and that has to be talked about.
- Charles: When we see that approaching we can take it on, but we aren't ready for that now.
- Fane: We also voted for a fiscal sponsorship a while back and still haven't done it because we weren't ready.
- Katherine: It's a good starting point and needs to have more structure like who has decision making power (which was causing conflict) but this is a good baseline.
- Ruby: Are we going to have a general meeting and voting meetings?
- Art: No, no more voting members.
- Antjuan: How are we going to propose policy to the city?
- Katherine: The commission is more policy and coalition is more getting stuff done, and yes we would have policy recommendations but that's not our main goal.
- Fane: What is the purpose of Indy FAC? Where is Indy getting their info to influence policy? This should be from the community. And I am excited to see where it goes.
- Katherine: Guidance and oversight is not legally binding and is independent to the commission. The coalition guides the commission not the other way around.
- Luna: I think it's a good foundation.
- Rubi: What I would like us to walk away with is the voting mechanisms and how we define who is making these decisions.
- Fane: in proposal 1 we would not have the 21 voting body.
- Rubi: I think we have all had issues where people have brought in others and they were not acknowledged because people did not know how to plug into the work.
- Art: It's a good place to start. I think we got lost there, on who does what, and how do we keep people accountable? If the word president triggers us, then let's do chair and co-chair. But it's a good foundation
- Lashonda: I agree, except for the Chair and Co-Chair roles, I support rotating individuals within committees and working groups to facilitate discussions and serve as notetakers. This approach ensures shared responsibility, encourages diverse participation, and strengthens leadership development. And we also need to get a .org email for CFAC to contact the members.
- Twawanda: I believe in the community and I like #1 and lets get the committees and I would like to be out in the community like the outreach committee. We can't keep dwelling in power and we are losing.
- Charles: I want to emphasize the meeting notes, and there are people here who can take notes. The problem is we don't get the notes distributed out, so we need to get them out as a priority for the community to know what we are talking about.
- Tim: Down for #1 and I like that it's being flushed out and I do not know about 501c3 but we have folks who can support that in the future so we shouldn't dwell on that now. If there is a culture of equality amongst members then it can bring new members.

- Antjuan: How do we hold people accountable? The committees? Reviews? These are important questions.
- Fane: to address what rubi said about new people coming in, I want to create an onboarding process, and take those new people on a one on one setting and get them up to speed on history, decision making and understanding the why. Code of conduct was also in the works and there is a list of responsibilities for roles.
- Audrey: I agree, I believe that the word is standard operating procedure, and I do not think punitive things are not needed. We need to ask ourselves what would we ask of ourselves and others?
- Harrison: I like the conversation and it's about doing the work and moving forward. As a group we are committed to the work, the community and the shared responsibilities. Can it be rotating? It keeps it fair and balanced and the horizontal leadership allows us to learn and then lead. We shine at working together.
- Katherine: I like option a over option b; and we can rotate leadership every few months.
- Tim: So option B would not have committees?
- Fane: The committees can be structured as the committee needs it
- Luna: Option A
- Charles: There is a lot of energy here, and before we leave should we talk about voting or are there other items? How would voting work in option 1.
- Conversation has now moved to talking about how voting works in the new proposal.
 - Art: What makes you a CFA member? You should be in a nonprofit space? That is one of the stipulations and then make yourself a member and then agreeing to the # of meetings to maintain it.
 - Fane: The membership requirements on the code does stipulate a list of representatives that we should have in CFAC and that should be a good starting point.
 - Harison: in one of our meetings we discussed "buy in" for members, like a function for the members to have a stake in the space if they cannot attend meetings. Share the work load or contribute to the process remotely.
 - Katherine: Art's suggestion for people to be nonprofit leaves out 70% of the population. Defining membership around involvement rather than an org is key to finding out what engagement is.
 - Antjuan: The most practical is to see who is being engaged. And the membership committee is monitoring.
 - LaShonda: Life happens - if we continue with 'voting members', members may lose their voting rights due to disengagement, but how can they continue to be involved or regain those rights.
 - Harrison: we can propose a hiatus period for members who world personal matters to take care of.
 - Charles: How do we get more members from the community?
 - Rubi: Having an outreach model.
 - Fane: When Katherine said when the main body would meet there would be a community outreach like the potluck and the purpose park events can bring in a lot of engagement.

- Katherine: I had no idea how I would be engaged because there was not an obvious way to get involved.
 - Art: What encourages people to be a member?
 - Katherine: Resource and connection is the main reason. As a community member how can we beef up the membership.
 - Harrison: I like outreach and would reach out to folks people would direct me to, such as Mrs Karmara wirh the Hope Parade. Fatima spoke highly of our Potluck event and Purpose Park event. There were a lot of food system actors who participated liken Arnold Farms and Food not Fences. Showing up and showing out.
 - Charles: Decisions made through voting mechanisms, first there is a call for submission of ideas. Do we want to make a working group to answer Rubi's questions? We can draw on the past experience and we can try to combine all our experiences.
 - Time: Next meeting action steps: flush out the proposal for the new co-operative governance framework, member eligibility, and then outreach (marketing/social media)?
 - Fane: A suggestion is to also do a priorities convection: a combo of this style of conversation blended with Luna's retreat. 2 days back to back where we bring in ideas and talk about it.
 - Antjuan: Also think about the accountability for the task that needs to be done.
 - Fane: next membership committee is to write a code of conduct. Please join our next meeting. Meeting time TBD.
 - Antjuan: Record the meeting next time?
 - Charles: Yes. Does anyone object to recording the meetings?
- Action steps:
 - Post in the brainstorming chat about details finalizing the voting.
 - Rubi will lead this.
 - Sharing our availability for when we can meet next?
 - Charles will lead this?
 - Please review notes in 2 days and then Luna will post on Band.
 - Luna is leading this
 - Next meeting?
 - Put a poll in the band to post about meeting in the next week
 - Charles will lead this?