

Minutes  
Culture, History and Governance (CHuG)  
Sub-Committee  
June 6, 2007

Present: Susan Brooks, Paul Giese, Nancy Henderson, Karen Keane, Jack MacLean, Bill Stason, Harriet Todd, Peter Sugar

We discussed the following:

- Paul handed out a list of potential bullets under the four headings: Culture, Historical, Governance and Financial. There was an extensive discussion as to how the bullets should be structured and what their content ought to be – the discussion is not included here: the points will be re-visited and sent to Paul by tomorrow, to be presented at that time to CLRPC
- We discussed the method of presentation we would prefer for CHuG: we agreed that there will be four presenters: Culture: Karen Keane, Historical: Jack MacLean, Governance: Bill Stason, Finance: Peter S. While we only have ten minutes to do this, we believe it is workable and we will be rehearsing it prior to 6/19 to ensure that we are properly prepared
- It is further assumed that there will be a Q&A at the end of the presentations and here everyone should chip in and respond to questions as appropriate (i.e. it will not be a sole chair responsibility)
- The RFP: we all expressed our grave disappointment. We believe that the RFP is on an aggressive timeline, before in fact all issues have been properly aired, and thus it is impossible to write the RFP in such general terms as to demand the same type of input from a consultant for all subcommittees. It is therefore critical that this be discussed first (Paul will approach Anita Schleipers) and try to have the document revised and tailored more precisely to what each of the subcommittees may require. This will ensure that no dollars are unduly wasted; however it may also require a slight postponement of the intended timeline to achieve a better document and thus succeed in getting the right consultant/s. (We also recognize that it is important to have the process move forward during the upcoming summer months.)
- It was suggested further that we may write a memo to the Steering Committee to express our views and concerns. The RFP needs to express the actual needs of each subcommittee and not just be a general, bureaucratic exercise!
- It was also suggested that the consultant at this time might be one to start the whole process and indicate to the various subcommittees as to how they would proceed to achieve their goals/vision. We might look at the consultant as being more of an advisor. This would be Phase I of the consultant's work
- One of CHuG's requirements would be worker bees/secretaries
- One additional point raised was to ensure that there are back-up people available to ensure that we are always properly represented. Thus Paul would be our back-up rep to Sarah at the Steering Committee - if he was not available, then Bill S and, if not Bill, PS.

Next meeting:

- June 13, at 7:00 AM – early in order to avoid conflicts with some members' time schedules