

Governance and Policy Work Group, June 17, 2025, Minutes

Nate, Zale, Emma, Jill

Approved by the committee September 17, 2025

1. Check-in/[meeting guidelines](#)/agenda approval/announcements

- Nate sprained his ankle over a week ago and is feeling better.
 - His kids are heading to PA for a month but he can't drop them off without RealID or a passport.
 - Discussion about BS security theater
- Zale went to England! And was allowed back in the country!
 - Spent time in beautiful Wales, too.

2. Public comment

- No Public, No Comment

3. Minutes

- officially approve [Governance and Policy Committee March 18, 2025, draft minutes](#)
 - Approved!
- review [Governance and Policy Work Group May 15, 2025, draft notes](#)
 - May minutes look good
 - Nate feels inadequate about how much he's including since Zale is adding stuff on actual documents.

4. Report from the board: any proposed revisions for our new policy

- [Governance and Policy Committee | draft Public Participation policy revision 04152025](#)
- Jill presented to board
 - Board has comments for us to look at at the next meeting.

5. [Conflict Resolution Policy](#) revisions

- don't want to forget this info: [Copy of Conflict Procedure Questions for GaP committee](#)
- In Azia's mind (from notes in an old document), "suspend means temporary. "remove/terminate means you might be able to re-engage through the re-engagement process. Banned means for life."
- Nate asks if the way we define these terms is based on how people return to KBOO.
 - Remove can be viewed as separate from "suspend, terminate, or ban" as there is a world where someone could be removed but not face discipline.
 - You get removed, then an assessment would be made if you should be suspended, terminated, or banned, if any of these.
- Committee's definitions:
 - remove: remove from the premises, whether for their protection or for KBOO's protection

- suspend: there's a set time frame for re-engagement
 - terminate:: no set time frame, but re-engagement process is required
 - ban: banned for life; no re-engagement is possible
- Discussion of the results of Moderated discussion
 - Does #4 imply that "suspension" isn't disciplinary?
 - Nate thinks no.
- Where do glossary terms live? Do we need to define in place?
 - Trust the reader. Most will be largely evident by context and understood as far as most readers would need. Can live in a separate glossary.
- Add a table of contents to the top of the policy
- Is 30 days enough time for conflict team to issue a response?
 - Maybe?
- Why is it the chair of the Board the one appointing the Resolution Team?
 - Jill and Nate agree that it seems odd
 - Conflict is usually going to be an operations matter and won't concern the Board
- Section VI is written reflecting a KBOO that doesn't necessarily exist anymore
- Nate wonders if we need volunteer participation in the Conflict Resolution process.
 - Volunteers have said they want a peer on the team.
 - Could we have those involved in the conflict select their volunteer peers on the committee?
 - Could be fraught and wind up with spokespersons instead of unbiased parties
- Conflict team used to be a set team that was always the same team
 - Were going to get training
 - But things took time then their term would be up
- Nate believes he could be overthinking things and it's not a huge deal for him to just ask people he knows to be decent and thoughtful humans.
 - Just worries about taking advantage of good will.
- Will ask staff and board who they think should be on the Conflict Resolution Team and who appoints it and followup.

Jill will send us questions regarding SWOT Analysis for Governance to weigh in on the Strategic Plan with the revisions to the policy mentioned above.