NCEC Leadership and Decision-making Task Force:
DRAFT (July 9, 2009)

Leadership Models

Group brainstorming activity about leadership:

Leadership

- runs efficient meetings
- ensures everyone has opportunity for input
- manages input efficiently and respectfully
- spokesperson
- ambassador
- supports active engagement of all members

- is a servant leaders
- distributes leadership

Leadership does NOT

- have special decision-making authority or "limiting"
- have too much control or authority
- uses their personal agenda
- allow people to quit engaging

OUTCOMES:

- TF recommendation to commission- create a Bylaws Task Force at 7/28 meeting

MODEL INCLUDED IN PRIMARY DISCUSSION:

Model	Description	Components ask commission	Why we are recommending this:

Rotating "leader/facilitator" (mix of traditional and rotating model)	• 2 leader/facilitators at a time
	• Rotating leader/facilitator with overlapping terms
	  - Rotate quarterly, rotate every 4 months; staggered by 2 months
	  - Facilitator responsibilities/roles include: finalizing agenda; handling new agenda items (working with staff); running the meeting
	• Members do not pick their facilitating partner
	• Rotate on a quarterly basis
		• What sequencing method should the commission use to determine facilitators?
		• Do we require all members to participate as facilitators or is it voluntary based?
		•
			• Structure may help the commission in balancing effective, efficient meetings and leadership development for members
			• Distributed leadership (avoid deep hierarchical structure)
			• Allows members to work with each other as co-facilitators in a leadership manner
			•

Other Comments Related to Model:

- TF would like to try this for the next 6 months while the commission is in its beginning stages before deciding whether to keep this structure or change it as needed. It will also allow members time to be more familiar with each other.
- To get new items on the agenda: All community agenda item requests are directed to staff, staff works with co-facilitators to discuss when/where to place agenda item request.

OTHER MODELS CONSIDERED IN LEADERSHIP DISCUSSION:

Model	Description	Pros	Cons	Implementation Options
Rotating Chair Model	• Commission members rotate being the chair of each meeting • Order of choosing chair is up to the commission • Staff helps coordinate chairperson and organize agenda items • Participation is voluntary	• Distributed authority (no permanent concentration of authority) • Leadership development opportunities for all members • No consistent burden on one or two people • Opportunity for commission members to support one another	• Agenda planning falls to group or subgroup • Additional logistics responsibility for staff (such as scheduling & follow-up) • Not everyone may be interested in rotating • Meeting effectiveness could be affected by the leader/chair of each meeting	• Commission members volunteer to be added to the chair list • A chairperson schedule is created (who's chairing the mtg what month?) • Commission or subset sets agenda • Staff provides administrative support • Staff works with month's chair to prepare for the meeting (beyond agenda setting) • Committee agrees to approve task list, council directive, formal processes/requirements to help shape agendas
Traditional Governance	• Established roles (Chair, vice, etc)	• Divided roles • Familiar model • Formal • Easily understood and recognized	• Can create significant burden for small group of people and/or chair • Create power differential among people who are by definition formally peers • Locks leadership structure whether effective and successful or not • Election process can cause polarization • Group as a whole does not establish agenda • Chair has less of an opportunity to participate in conversation if Robert's Rules (also see decision-making models) • More focused on oversight & mainly relies on reports	• Established roles • Chair works closely with commission members for agenda-setting prior to working with staff to create agenda • Staff provides administrative support (coordination between members, meeting minutes, etc.) • Chair leads meetings • Committee agrees to approve task list, council directive, formal processes/requirements to help shape agendas
No Formal Commission Leadership, Staff facilitates	• Commission establishes the agenda, staff facilitates meetings	• All members can fully participate in every conversation • Commission members establishes the agenda • Frees time for individuals to participate in tasks, doesn't exclude leadership from participating	• Increased logistical responsibilities for staff • Increased coordination responsibilities for staff	• Commission establishes task lists and agendas for each meeting and staff facilitates meetings • Committee agrees to approve task list, council directive, formal processes/requirements to help shape agendas

NCEC Leadership and Decision-making Task Force:
DRAFT (July 9, 2009)
Decision-making Models/Processes

MODELS INCLUDED IN PRIMARY DISCUSSION:

Model	Description	Pros	Cons	Implementation Options
Formal Consensus*		- Can produce a high quality decision* - Can produce strong commitment to implementation* - Makes best use of group resources* - Gains full benefits of group interaction* - Future problem-solving ability of group is enhanced* - Useful for serious, important, complex decisions that affect a lot of people*	- Takes a great deal of time and energy* - Time pressure must be minimal* - Places majority demands on group members' skills* - Requires rich exchange of ideas and information; the group needs to be informed prior to reaching the decision* - Hard to use in large groups*	•
Majority Decision		- Good when there is not time to build consensus* - Closes off discussion on matters not important to the group as a whole* - Seen as a very legitimate method in a democracy - Good when commitment to decision by everyone is not necessary* - Good when members of the group are equally informed* - Good when majority can handle implementation without minority involvement*	- Full benefit of group interaction not gained* - May not make best use of relevant group resources* - May not result in full commitment to decision* - Can leave a disgruntled minority; there should be a plan for handling such a situation*	•
Robert's Rules of Order *(Type of majority decision)*	Please visit: http://www.robertsrules.org/rulesintro.htm	Please fill in your thoughts for this column	Please fill in your thoughts for this column	•

Comments Related to Decision-making Models/Processes:
- TF members wanted more information about consensus
- TF members wanted an example of hybrid between Robert's Rule and consensus decision-making

OTHER MODELS CONSIDERED IN DECISION-MAKING MODEL DISCUSSION:

Model	Description	Pros	Cons	Implementation Options
Minority Decision*		• Useful when delegation to a smaller group is necessary* • Can be used when not everyone can meet* • Good when time is short* • Good when rest of group* lacks skills and information needed to make decision* • Good when commitment to decision is not necessary* • Good for simple, routine decisions* • Good when subgroup has necessary information*	• Does not take advantages of the resources of most group members* • Does not gain the benefits of group interaction* • Does not build widespread commitment* • May not resolve conflicts*	•
Martha's Rules *(Type of majority decision)*	Please visit: http://www.earthconclave.org/Marthas.htm	*Please fill in your thoughts* • • •	*Please fill in your thoughts* • • •	•

* **Source:** Copyright: 2007 University of Minnesota. Adapted from: Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, F.P (2000). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (7th ed.) (pp.289-296). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.