

Facilitator: Shamako

Notetaker: Rose/Need another volunteer—feel free to email Shamako in advance.

Present: Rose (notetaking) Shamako (HipHop Congress), David (Move to Amend), Michael (Hip Hop Congress and Global Fam), Dione (Multi-Media Center), Monica (Assembly to End Poverty), Rose (ACT), Jill (Peaceful Uprising), Jackie (INOSA, Communication-Tech) Evelyn (Poverty Working Group, DAWG), Cheri(Pherc) Rachel (Pherc), Pam (Occupy Theory), Charles (PPherC) Galen (PPherc), George (NC) Keith (AFSC), Walda (LRNA), Danielle (Alliance for Global Justice), Jerome (LRNA), Ahmad (Hip Hop Congress), Mary B-J (PWG), Rob (USCAI),

Agenda:

1. Check In's (10 min)
2. Jackson Proposal—Walda (15 Min/25 total)
3. Philly Update—Cheri, Galen (10 Min/35 total)
4. Budget—Shamako/Res-Dev (15 min/45 total)
 - a. Budget documents will be made available tomorrow upon earliest possible completion.
5. NPC Face to Face meeting—Jerome (15 min/1 hour total)
6. The Call (5 min/65 min total)
7. Black History Month Piece—Proposal (5 min/70 min total)
8. Working Group Reports (20 min/90 min total):

Res/Dev

International Committee—Jen

Road to USSF—Walda

Outreach and PMA—Jerome/David

Gender Justice—Rose

Poverty Working Group—Evelyn/MBJ

Com/Tech—Alfredo

Arts and Culture—Shamako

—Jackson Proposal—

Jerome: Visited Jackson for site visit. Productive visit. Multiple representatives. Enthusiastic about wanting to be one of sites of next USSF. Visited possible sites, communities, colleges. Left feeling good about Jackson's ability to host. Thought initially single site, so idea of multi-site changed their mind. Once clear multisite, came back into the process. Circulated the site report. Recommended selection of Jackson as 2nd site. Also second report about Jackson requests for support.

Walda: MXGM and Office of Mayor and four person team who have stepped up to lead the Jackson process. This is the initial team.

Stack open: Rob, Danielle on Jackson visit

Rob: What really turned Jackson around this time. Was it an easy ask?

Jerome: It was apparent not clear that the initial call didn't specify multi-site. Still working out idea of social forum of new type. Jackson had already responded. Once Jackson clear on multi-site, they reentered.

Danielle: New member of NPC. Try to understand how to get to multi-site model rather than single site.

**A good place to look for background on the decision to use polycentric social forum model is in the USSF Newsletter/Updates: <http://www.ussocialforum.net/node/508> (January 2014); See other articles at: <http://www.ussocialforum.net/taxonomy/term/5>

Walda: Explains how we got to the multi-site model. It was a long decision process but we wanted to make sure that a lot of people had access to the USSF by having various sites, we can make sure that many people can attend, especially those people who may not have the financial means to flying to the USSF, there will be another site for them close by so they can participate.

Jackson Proposal passes

Second request from Jackson was it that they are having two events upcoming in the spring and summer, 1) alternative economic conference 2) 50 year anniversary of the freedom summer. Want to partner with us to do PMA's at both of them. Proposal: USSF should endorse these events, be part of the process moving towards the USSF.

Monica: Process is to send an e-mail out about various proposals so others can know what is going on before the conference call.

Danielle – Objection: We should discuss the process of bringing up proposals before we decide on the process

Walda: This proposal for endorsing the various events was circulated as part of the Jackson Proposal

Since they were submitting the Jackson proposal as a site, they submitted this proposal at the same time along with the site proposal. Not trying to get around procedures.

Rose: If we want to sponsor events, there are processes in place to go about these requests.

The Jackson Site still proposal passes.

PPEHRC / Cheri: Two weeks ago we had a good COMS & TECH meeting here. On Saturday the 8th we had a successful meet & greet for the USSF, we had about 50 organizations there signing up. We organized committees similar to the national committees (more the structural ones, not issues) Coms & Tech, Outreach, Arts & Culture, Fund Development. W Philaposh, West Kensington Ministry, Neighborhood Networks, Decarcerate, Intentional Faith Community, Green Party, Socialists, Students from Upenn & Temple, AFSC, MMP, DIA, AAU, Environmental Justice, etc.

-Budget-

Shamako: Discussion & struggle around some challenges on completing the budget process. Some people were unavailable to resolve these issues so a sub committee was created to help solve these issues (Victor, Ellen, ACTS members, Shamako, etc) The final product was made available yesterday evening. Not the most efficient way to put a budget proposal out but we needed something to get us started (Anchor document) We understand numbers may or may not change due to various circumstances. One comment raised in this process, we have the potential to pick a dream budget number. The primary purpose of trying to pass the budget today was to gain clarity on the process and give the res/dev committee something to work with to move the process along.

This expense budget has not been worked out enough to be an operating budget. Groups can't use it to request funds yet. The email did not make this clear. We need to make it so the budget is operating so groups can use it.

Walda: There are many different budgets that we need and we need to be aware of these differences. Monica put forward the urgency of getting a document for the budget because we need a document stating the budget for grant writing purposes. Sense of all hands on deck of getting something moving forward.

Discussion of budget:

Mary BJ: Need for working groups to step up and help shape the work of Resource Dev. working group and identify needs/projects that can be basis for or that need to be incorporated into fundraising work.

How many sites are we trying to support. Earlier discussions were around 4, budget draft is 3.

Need to specify how expenditures link to goals/activities/ and outcomes and accountability/ evaluation plans.**

Asks Resource/Dev to tell working groups what is needed to help them compile all this: Requests and links to goals/activities/outcome indicators.

Monica: Res/dev. Working on letter of intent for foundation that is interested in supporting PMAs. They're working on a fundraising budget. Not an operational one. We do need to do all this work, but immediate need is for this LOI that will focus on PMAs and outreach-WG. (Due in 2 weeks)

Dione-one difficulty of res./dev. working group is lacking good info. from other working groups. Facilitating the RD working group is important for all working groups to do. Notes that there is a need for work on finance/budget that is distinct from fundraising, but this work should remain within single working group.

Clarification: The budget that was circulated is a rough template that aims to help fundraising work. This is not a formal budget that we're looking to get NPC approval for.

There is a request to approve \$3,000 appropriation for Philadelphia work.

MBJ: Requests that Resource Dev. send NPC a email of the draft aspirational fundraising

budget--clearly marked as such for approval in time for the LOI deadline.
For a working budget, we need time to review the budget, and discuss the total # of sites.
Supports expenditure of \$3K for Philly; but further expenditures should be based on more thorough budget review/approval process.

**Process for working groups to request help with resources for their work: See Resource/Dev "Affinity Group" proposal: http://wiki.usocialforum.net/images/f/ff/USSF_RDC_Affinity_Groups_DRAFT_PLAN_II.pdf

- 1) Aspirational budget--circulated on 2/11. Goal is to guide fundraising. Response requested from NPC members via email within one week (Send any objections/recommend changes. No response signals approval [but concern about how to integrate feedback into approved budget]). (2/18/14)
- 2) Formal budget with more details about goals/activities/outcome indicators should go to next NPC meeting discussion
- 3) Proposal for expenditure of \$3K for Philadelphia

-Aspirational Budget-

-Not the actual budget, its a template that we need to use to get started on fundraising money. No money will actually be taken out of it. We have some people who support this and others do not. Danielle has some concerns about what is stated on that aspiration budget. No one volunteered to provide feedback for the aspirational budget which would be why we put it on hold. Therefore, we are looking to approve it TODAY

Alfredo: He wants to pass the aspirational budget. Supports Shamako for providing consensus as the National Coordinator. Has no concern about what is in the particular aspirational budget because it will be changed later and we need it to support others to start raising money NOW.

MBJ: We need to move quickly on this. 1 week is not too long to review the aspirational budget and we need it. There is no narrative on it yet, we need the paragraph explaining the budget. A brief narrative is all we need. (Who will do this?). We should not have to rush this process today, we should take a week. Resource committee should write these narratives on the budget

Dione: There was a deduction of the national coordinator from 1/2 time to 1/4 time and wanting to add a COMS/TECH position. They are not funding a national coordinator now, they do not have money to pay a national coordinator. She will make it her responsibility to get Monica to put together a paragraph on the budget.

Shamako: Happy to coordinate the one week decision process on the aspirational budget. There are concerns about his national coordinating position. He has been still acting as a national coordinator even without the money. He wants to continue to be the national coordinator. As of right now, he is technically not getting paid. We are trying to figure this out. He is not stepping out of the role, being present to the process. We need to resolve the national coordinator question.

Ellen: There is a line item for a full time national staff. It has not disappeared from the budget, just does not name who it is. She supports passing the aspirational budget today. There are many questions about it, but if we keep waiting and asking a bunch of questions, it will take too long to answer all of these questions. This probably wont be very efficient. We need to get this out to those who want to fundraise. (#2 document = Aspirational Budget)

Dione: Clarity-- the position of National Coordinator is not in the budget. On wednesday, the position was reduced from the last budget from 1/2 to 1/4. Today, the cells on the spreadsheet are completely empty. (#1 document = what Sylvia produced)

Proposal #1 - Aspirational Budget

Two options:

- 1) Pass the aspirational budget today
- 2) One week process for feedback on the aspirational budget (Who will take the lead -- Shamako will help with the process but it should be Res/dev.)

-Res/dev can make adjustments on the aspirational budget, Shamako will work with them on it.

MBJ - does not want to pass the aspirational budget (stand aside), supports \$3000 for Philly
Danielle - Stand aside

**George - Remember that stand aside is not a big thumbs up, however, it is not a block

VOTES:

MBJ- Stand Aside
Danielle- Stand Aside
Rob - No
Cheri - Yes
Ellen - Yes
Alfredo -Yes
Keith - Yes
Jill - Yes
Jerome - Yes
Evelyn - Stand aside
Dione - yes
David - Yes
Shamako - yes

**PASSES: Approve the Aspirational Budget

Proposal #2
-\$3,000 to Philly-

Jerome would like to table this proposal. Wants more information about how the money will be used. Wants us to wait 1 more month
Rob - Agrees with Jerome

Dionne: Clarity - in a narrative or line item? Jerome wants both. He wants to know what is the time frame. The Philly budget DOES has line items. Jerome wants a narrative and time frame of the budget. Could be the responsibility of Philly or Res/Dev. Dionne will be willing to work with Ellen on the narrative. Proposal: work with Ellen on the timeline and narrative. Pass this in the next week or two. One month is a long time. We need a decision within two weeks about this proposal.

Ellen: Would be happy to work with Dionne

Rob: Jerome is still asking what is the process of getting money from the Planning Committee about distributing money. We need to work on this process.

Dione: Process is important. Can we develop a first step and the following step for the process of distributing money.

Jerome: The problem is that everything about the process is new. We have never had more than one site before. We have very very little money. If we are successful of getting 3 to 4 sites, we need a process to make sure that we are deciding how to distribute the limited amount of money we have and what the particular needs of the working sites are. It needs to be equitable. We need to begin to develop the process for distributing money.

Dione: Due to the fact that it is a new process, there is a difference between seed and full funding. Are we able to develop a short but thorough seed process to distribute money under \$5,000. Create a lead in process in cases of seed/ get started money.

Jerome: There are questions for the whole body. We need to start the process

VOTE on tabling:

***This has passed

