

Community Wide Meeting

Thursday, December 12, 2013 from 8:45-9:45 pm at Railyard

Meeting commenced at 8:45

Attended by: Ana, M, Tim, Alec, Tom, John, Benjamin, Tia, Neal, Scott, Raphael, Alana, Patrick, and Lyric

Consensus statement shared with group

Dance Passes (Presented by Lyric)

- Lifetime Dance Pass—Option to buy a lifetime pass for \$5,000
 - That would be 500 dances at \$10 a dance
 - 104 dances a year = about dancing for 5 years “paid” and then longer of course as long as they are part of the community
 - Do we need the money? We have a reserve at the moment, but we dug into it this year. Our reserve can keep the dance going for 3.5 months. As a board member I’d like to see the reserve double, if not three times that amount.
 - I think we need a financial report before we discuss this.
 - A financial report has not be delivered for 4 years to the community; the board is now working on one and the goal is to present this at the Annual Meeting.
 - How much money do we have in the bank? Our overall budget per year is covered by our intake. Our reserves stand at a dedicated \$3,000 reserves. We have an additional \$6,000 at hand. That is down a \$1,000 from this time last year. Two years ago, the reserve was \$4,000 less.
 - So the general trend is up for general operating expenses with the exception of large purchases which doesn’t happen annually.
 - There is no general trend. This current down year is due to an increase of costs from facilitators, space, insurance, coordinators, etc.
 - We have a proposal that we could pass. Having one more person in the room for the rest of their lifetime would be great. We appreciate that time back in 2013 when you threw in a big chunk. I don’t think one or two people with this would affect us adversely. We could have a good reserve for safety and security. We could use 5 or 10 grand and seriously upgrade.
 - ***The proposal is to allow a \$5,000 lifetime pass. . . do we consensus or object. One objection. The rest of the group consensus. We now have a lifetime pass. It will be available on the website soon.***

New Dance Pass Price Decrease: Make the dance pass \$70 to really give people the full 8 dances for the price of 7. ***We have full consensus on this change of price.*** The new card price is now on the website. Print out your receipt and bring to the dance to get your card.

Community Council (Presented by Patrick)

- ***Community-Wide meetings: Have them every 2 months on a Thursday evening after dance. It will be a combination Community Council and Community-Wide meeting. We like this and this is now Consensed.***
- Nominations for CC are now open—process outlined to community. Present Member status
 - Present CC is Lyric, Ana, Tom, Alec, and Patrick (rep of the BOD)
 - Tom has served for 2 years and is leaving
 - Alec has served for 3 years and is leaving
 - Ana has served for 2 years and would like to stay
 - Lyric has served for 1 years and will be leaving mid 2014
 - What is the commitment?
 - We meet every 2 weeks—currently at 10 am on a Wednesday morning. We keep the meetings to about 90 minutes. With the new consensus above re: Community Wide meetings—all CC will be requested to attend those
 - Two Nominations thus far: Raphael, Neal
 - Nominations are now open and will close January 15
 - We can have 7 members on the CC. 6 members on the community and one member from the board
 - CC members are given to the dance without donation, because they are donating their time.
 - The CC has action items after meetings to “get the work done” for example, Special Saturdays or Facebook or Email message to the community
 - CC members spend about 5 hours a month of their time
 - Three more nominations: M, Ben, and Tim
 - Board reads minutes, officially approve them, and also there is a Board Rep at the CC meetings. Board members do not dance for free.
 - **Current Nominations include: Neal Egan, Raphael Weissman, Tim, M Scher Dow, and Benjamin Michaels-Fallon**
- Board Member invitations: We are also inviting members to the Board. It is about a commitment of 1 hour a month
- Potential Change from Elections to Consensus Processes: Move to Consensus Process for CC Nominations to become CC Members via the Community at annual meeting. ***Full Consensus was reached on this proposal***
 - Past years have been an online election and there was voting. Which really wasn't fully participated in
 - We propose that at the Annual Meeting we actually consense as a group on each nomination to the CC.
 - I think the reason, perhaps it is past, we went to elections, because there may have been people who wanted to be on the CC that people wouldn't publically want to object to. The

elections allowed the process to be anonymous. If we return to that older process, then we'd have to have 2 people block a person. And there could be hurt feelings.

- The way I see it, I've been involved for 2 years on the CC, and for awhile it seemed like a huge effort to get anyone involved and it seemed like a waste of time and money. So terms were elongated and staggered. So we are where we are and it is lovely to see more people participating. There seems to be a stability happening now in the sense of personalities.
- I like that idea, but what if we have more people coming than there are spaces available.
- I would like to see that one nominee would be gracious enough to step aside and come on in the next year.
- There is something about the consensus process that is more evolved than a voting process. As we evolve as a community I'd like to see consensus be more in the front and center
- I'd like to apologize for my earlier worry about consensus. Compliments on a well run meeting
- Personality conflicts exist no matter what. I have a problem facilitating processes that allow those things hidden in the background. And now introduce an environment where people are comfortable voicing objection.
- An introverted person may appreciate having a shield of anonymity. But I also admire the stand forth and be counted.
- If someone leaves mid-term is it brought to the community to replace that person or up to the community. I believe it would be done at a community meeting. I also don't think it would be an issue unless we fell below the quorum

- **Term Limits APF (John Cavanagh)**

APF

Name: John Cavanagh

Email: jcav@606design.com

Subject: Meeting Agenda Item

Comments: Since the CC terms are now held for 2 years, I would like to see the term limited to 2 years for any one individual, with any previous 2-year term member disallowed from holding another seat until 2 years has passed. I believe this should be made a Community-wide decision.

- John says that he felt that someone on the CC for 4 years doesn't allow for freshness and movement. I think that any one person in a decision making position for an entire community is not a good idea.
- Why isn't a good idea?
- I think 4 years for any one individual to serve in a decision-making position for any organization is too long. The CC makes many decisions that are not at the purview of the community. I understand that and I helped set that up. But if 2 or 3 members of the CC have an agenda then they can block anything—all the time.
- I would like to speak to this, when I begin, John you were there and so was Alec. Everyone else was new. There was a big issue in the community between a facilitator and some dancers. The CC at that time was so green that we couldn't handle it very well. Now that I have experience, I have a better sense on who to call on to handle it. It hurts my heart that it happened. So to ask people to step out because they've been there so long—that I think it will now happen by consensus and naturally. If someone starts to power play, consensus will take care of it.

- I'm not only thinking about power play, but fresh ideas, new people, so it isn't so easy to fall into "this is the way we do it." I think it is important to bring new ideas and new people in. Many of us have been here more than 4 years, but there are many people who step forward, and they're not even going to do 2 years even if they say will. I just don't think serving 4 years in a row is a good idea
- I like the idea in general. Staggered terms helps with this. As you speak it, but I find myself in 2 full terms is a reasonable commitment if someone is willing to do that. Though I would be surprised if anyone chose to do that.
- If you have a large talent pool of qualified people like in a 5,000 person mega-church that is one thing. But I don't know how many choices do we really have here? Are we strapped for people? Why would you say "you gotta go because of the rules"—when they're doing a fine job. If someone is the glue, but nope it says here you've got to go. I think that not doing it would be a better thing. If it just doesn't feel right then people talk about it. Maybe on a yearly basis, we all review about the president. Accountability yes, but consensus.
- The thing is exactly centered on what you just said, "so and so was the glue that held everything together, then it becomes their dance and not the community dance."
- As you know, I'm happy about having the election process removed. As far as this goes, when we began the EC and then the CC, I kind of looked at it as a work in progress and that things should morph and change, because we were learning. I kind of agree, but I would go with 2 terms instead of one. Which is why we moved it from 1 year to 2, because learning the journey of being on the CC takes time. If the community becomes more engaged then the sense of the president or chairman or someone "who is doing it" can become less and this can feel more of a community. I think what we've been trying to achieve in this new paradigm, which is what we're going towards, is changing and flexible. Is it flexible? Are we moving? Are we able to make it adapt to the community. I appreciate your APF, but I think 2 terms is more appropriate and I like the idea of having a review. I like the idea of having more frequent meetings and doing more. I don't like to think of it as "this is the way it is" we do have to adapt, because doing things on consensus is very different. I'm all for going forward, but wanting to see that we able to adapt.
- I'd like to point out that historically that no one has stayed on these things for 4 years. It is a lot of work and it has been hard to get people involved. What happens in Embodydance, anything we decide can be questioned. Everyone can participate. On the CC, we don't have a president or roles. We just participate as a community. This year has been the deepest of any CC year. . . and I've been here for 3 years. Sometimes we do business and sometimes we have discussions about the essence of the dance
- Anyone on the CC is here to guide this ship we call Embodydance. I see what John is saying, but modify it to a year break makes more sense to me than 2 years.
- My worry is that if we don't limit it, then someone can stay for 6 years. New people come in and they don't feel they can engage, because this person has been here for a long time
- I would like to address this, since historically no one has served 4 years. That we change the proposal to serve for 2 years with the option to serve 1 more. Then you take a 1 year break unless we can find no one willing to serve.
- Your proposal is interesting and the modification feels better, because if we had done this in the past, it would have been death. Last year, we needed to carry people over to reach the quorum. My proposal is that we put this back into discussion and brought forward to the next meeting.
- I'm picking up that there has been a very small pool, in the past, my question: we have a small medium, large amount of people wanting to fill these positions on a regular.
- Last year, we only had one person step forward. This year we've had 5 people step forward. Let's push this forward to the next meeting in modified form and discuss it again.

- We did have a problem with community meetings in the sense of coordination with the CC. I'm very interested in this Community CC meeting. There was a sense that the CC was doing this and come to the community meeting and the meeting was a flop. There seemed to be a distance. I am happy to see this movement. . . the CC is the community and the community is the CC. Our goal is to be more efficient and to facilitate more engagement and feelings of engagement.
- Consensus is to carry this to the Annual Meeting

Sunday Dance/Music Format: overall flow of the journey (Presented by Ana)

- There has been a constant objection, why do we have to hear the guidelines all of time. We changed it to the coordinator doing the guidelines so people would clearly know who the coordinator. Could we just start the dance and not break it after a 1/2 hour. Why do we have to hear the rules every single time. We experimented, John did a version of a longer wave, which was harder on the facilitator. So we were thinking of keeping the format, but minimize the talking.
- Still have a warm-up and then have a wave without talking. John pointed out that it is a very different thing to create one long wave. The history of Embodiment is that we have this format—the warm-up helps people get into the groove and the wave is what they can focus on. Especially if there is an expectation that there is a warm-up and then a wave. We especially think we need to tell people on a Thursday night, because there are a lot of new people, about the rules. They can read the board, but some people need to be told 10 times. I really don't think it is a good thing to legislate this.
- I'm thinking of this in a couple of different ways. I don't think people are just hearing the rules; I think they're objecting to have their dance "broken" in the middle. As a facilitator that the warm up is to bring them to a place where they can receive the ritual. When I do a wave, my intent is to bring people to a sacred place. It makes sense to have a prologue and then a ritual
- Tracy wanted me to bring this to the community, that if people are really have objections. That the guidelines are spoken at the beginning and the door is closed.
- For me, I really appreciate the words spoken every time. It brings them home to me every time. It feels important to me for the container. I don't always get here right at 6:30. If there was a wave going right at the beginning—it could be a real interruption. I like it the way it is
- I'd like to tack on that we need to serve "liability" by speaking the rules to ensure the space is safe.
- I think it is a good idea to retain it and perhaps condense it. Sometimes it gets a little long winded. It was pointed out to me that some language was being worked on. There is something on our website and the coordinators have discussed using that and not be overly dramatic
- I think the warm up is very important and transitioning from the outside space and getting ready for the actual experience of the wave or the ritual. I think it is very important. It may need to be condensed or have some kind of tweaking, but saying the guidelines are very important and being reminded of safety is important. I think it is important that we keep our

way of doing things and I think coming in and getting acclimated to the space is a very important time.

- Amina asked me to share that she was not in favor of the break and the talking. But I get the sense that we're mixing two things. I think there is a warm-up and then the wave. And then there is the talking. I get that people don't like the talking. I like the idea of a warm-up and then a full wave. I do not like the talking too much. Saying the guidelines is one thing. The theme is okay. But the talking part needs to be looked at. But no one likes anyone rambling on and on and on. I think we're mixing those two and I'd like to clarify it
- I've done a lot of ceremony and what John says about warming up to the ceremony is right on. The warm-up warms the body, warms the breath, warm the muscles opening us up to ceremony. The guidelines are *ceremonial instruction* combined with a theme for people to dive into as they choose. The guidelines are a reminder of how we each are responsible for holding the container for ourselves, for each other, and as a community. I invite anyone who feels that their dance is being "broken" to go deeper into themselves and how they hold the space in this vein. How do they show up knowing their boundaries in ceremony. How do they show up dancing their own dance. It is an invitation to go deeper into ceremony by consciously acknowledging that the entire journey is an opening up into deepness
- I would like to suggest that on Sundays that there could be times when we offer a warm-up and the wave with the break in between in complete silence. That it could happen on a Sunday, but not on a Thursday. Like Alec, did this, "Ya'll know what you're doing so let's get into it"
- I recommend that this discussion be looked at another time. However, in the meantime, why not have the facilitators experiment and see how it feels and then revisit this subject. I don't think we're ready to make a decision.
- To break or not to break is the question. To speak or not to speak is a question. I went to the extended wave and I felt it was too long. Too much chaos. too much silence. I love that the warm up session and it is music I want to dance to . . . it gets my body moving. I like the warm-up and the wave ritual. I think reciting the rules is a good idea. Having no constraints on what the facilitator can and can't do-- the rules being contained into a shorter fashion.
- Shelve this conversation-- to bring up at next meeting

T-Shirt Orders: Black Shirts—orders closed by mid-December (Presented by Ana)

If anyone here wants a t-shirt—they will be prepaid—- we are ordering black. We're getting prepaid and do a modest order. Put this on the website and put an email out and FB and get prepaid orders.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:10 pm