**Goals of the Strategy Session**

1) **Mission / Process:** To re-examine values and goals in a way where everyone gets a voice. To leave with some shared overall goals and values that we feel have buy in from the group.

Katie--Minutes

Values--2 values important fundamental values integral to working together in organizing as Toronto350.org

To help clarify--The purpose of Toronto350.org is to advance the goals of [350.org](http://350.org/) in the city of Toronto. 350.org MISSION:

350.org is building a global movement to solve the climate crisis. Our online campaigns, grassroots organizing, and mass public actions are coordinated by a global network active in over 188 countries.

The number 350 means climate safety: to preserve a livable planet, scientists tell us we must reduce the amount of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere from its current level of 400 parts per million (ppm) to below 350 ppm.

We believe that a global grassroots movement can hold our leaders accountable to the realities of science and the principles of justice. That movement is rising from the bottom up all over the world

## Values Go Around

* Participation
* Transparency
* Benefit of the Doubt
* Open-mindedness
* Openness-open to different ideas,
* Non-violence
* Receptivity
* Collaboration
* Change--openness to change
* Effectiveness in Climate Action
* Formidable
* Maintaining an open space
* Encouraging participation at every level
* Honesty--no being able to share opinions
* Diversity
* Professionalism
* Justice
* Respect
* Equity--bring marginalized voices forward
* Acceptance
* Non-judgment
* Focused Mission
* Effectiveness--changing outcomes
* Complexity
* Diversity
* Openness
* Vulnerability
* Trust
* Climate Justice
* Solidarity
* Participation
* Ambition/Initiative
* Education/Information
* Cohesive Message
* Creativity
* Participation/Escalatiion of Participation
* Daring/Discipline/Responsibility/Education
* Curiosity
* Quest for Knowledge
* Awareness of Climate Change Events
* Integrity/Reliability of Information
* Creativity
* Inclusiveness
* Adventure/Fun

Goals

From Survey--

Stop Tarsands Pipelines

Promoting Renewable Energy

Supporting Other Progressive and Indigenous Groups

Divestment at Universisties

Raising Awareness of Climate Change

Defeating Conservatives

Climate Justice Education

Making TO More Sustainable

Other Divestment

Forcing Climate Action by Ontario

Advocating for Social-Economic System Change

3 main goals/groups emerged--tarsands,

Report Backs

Common Values/overlapping goals

-Empowerment--inreach and outreach--politicians

-Utilizing media

-Help people feel the importance of stepping up--break through apathy

-How to set up pre-conditions for system change

-break through myth of no alternatives

-finding right vocabulary for talking to power/making our values their values but balancing that with system change, change mentality, re-framing away from profit and mainstream economics

-Climate Justice--not for manipulating different groups towards climate, but to unify different groups

-Agreement on how to move forward, even with varying priorities

-Tangible, achievable goals, things we can “win”, but approaching these goals from a justice ideological standpoint (underlying our work)

-Allyship and Climate Justice is hard to make a campaign on its own, but more intersectional, integrated into different campaigns.

--Divestment and Pipelines have very tangible goals, Climate Justice has some smaller (different levels) of tangibility--ie: how many different groups is Toronto350 allied with

Discussion in advance of dot-mocracy--

Do we fully understand the different goals as written? For example “Forcing Climate Action by Ontario”?

What is the point of this exercise? To prioritize? To narrow down? To create new campaigns?

To get buy in, to choose directions to go in? Should we try to group them for example--Acting Against Problems, Acting For Solutions, Awareness/Education.

Perhaps the categories are too intersectional to choose between them? Is this exclusionary?

One way to think about things is your dot represents something you personally want/intend to work on--because ultimately it’s us that will be working.

This helps us get information about where are priorities are as a group--whether there’s convergence or divergence, what priorities are currently being covered, what priorities are not--give us something to refer to later.

Agreed to change” Public Awareness of Clmate Change” to “Public Engagement and Education of Climate Change Issues”

Agreed to change “Defeating Conservatives” to “Federal Politics”

Discussion on potentially combining of “Supporting Other Progressive and Indigenous Groups and “Climate Justice Education. Much debate on whether they should stay separate or not. Was decided that that they should stay as separate goals, but also add option to choose them as combined.

## Dotmocracy Results:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FR6Yob7GiFDMvZsugEvR6c8tQD91JUyxfkojk7fo2Gw/edit>

2) **Process:** Particular questions of process will discuss things like:

(a) Decision-making during the session

(b) Relationships of Campaigns vis-a-vis the larger group

(c) How we direct resources to campaigns and support them

(d) How campaigns relate to organizational goals

3) **Goals:** Collectively decide on semi-annual goals for organization (that are in line with the collectively agreed upon mission). Prioritize these Goals. Goals should be specific and feasible. Consider existing TO350 goals as well as any new goals proposed by attendees. This discussion should also take note of organizational capacity and any particular strengths (such as existing campaign infrastructure) that we have.

4) **Strategies**. Consider how / whether existing campaigns can support these goals. Attendees may also propose new campaigns to address the above goals.

5) **Tactics:** As time permits, campaign / strategy specific breakouts may address narrower issues of detailed strategy and tactics at the campaign level.

(Draft) Survey to send out to members (PLEASE COMMENT):

1. Why are you in Toronto350?
2. Which campaign(s) are you actively involved in?
3. What do you see as the most important climate issue to be working on?
4. Where do you see our group having the most impact?
5. Toronto350 is working on the following campaigns. Please rank them according to importance to you
6. Toronto350 is considering adding the following campaigns. Please rank them according to importance to you

Potential Agenda--(please comment!!!)

THINGS WE WILL NOT DISCUSS:

1. Operating documents (Constitution, bylaws, policies, etc)
2. Meeting Procedures / How to function better, etc

**Part 0: team building**

30 minutes.

Facilitator: Louis, Katie

**Part 1: Review Toronto350.org mission statement/overall goals for next 6 months**

**30 Minutes**: Why are you in Toronto 350? Mission / Values (acknowledging this is an ongoing process) + incorporate survey feedback from members

Front page of favorite newspaper - “What have we accomplished / why are we mentioned?”

Co-Facilitators: Suhail, Louis

Minute-Taker:

**30 Minutes:** Process: (Decision making): What types of decisions CAN be made in this session (ie: identifying between when we are having discussion and when we are making decisions--acknowledging that not all decisions can be finalized in the time we have today) How will we make decisions at the session? (Consensus vs. voting--do we have someone who can speak to consensus decision making and how it works?) How will we implement them?

BIG QUESTION: What is the role of campaigns vis-a-vis the bigger group?

Co-Facilitators: Suhail, Louis

Minute-Taker:

**90 minutes:** Goals: What do we want to accomplish as a group? What can we achieve? What metrics can we judge them by? What would a successful six months in Toronto350 look like?

Co-Facilitators: Suhail, Louis

Minute-Taker:

Potential questions for overall goals:

(a) Do we want to adopt 350.org’s “Fossil Freeze” Moratorium on Tarsands/We>Tarsands as our messaging/focus/goals?? Can all our campaigns incorporate this into their specific messaging goals?

(b) How can we best work with/prepare for/engage with COP21? Do we want to?

(c) Which campaigns will have an election strategy? Do we need an overall election strategy or should we leave that up to campaigns?

Feedback from Sam:

1. What is our long-term strategy?
2. We are developing grassroots support for climate action. What does grassroots support look like? How is it measured?
3. What are our goals for long term "action on climate change" in the Canadian context? How do (at times) seemingly disjointed campaigns play into this?
4. What is the audience are we trying to influence with our work?
5. How do we spend our resources effectively to get to our two, five, ten year goals?
6. What is the purpose of this group as a separate entity from other major environmental groups?

Co-Facilitators: Suhail, Ben

Minute-Taker:

**Part 2: Strategies and Campaigns**

**30 minutes:** Updates from Existing Campaigns - What are they doing? What resources do they need?

Co-Facilitators: Suhail,

Minute-Taker:

**30 minutes:** New Idea Proposals (Pitch ideas here!)

Co-Facilitators: Suhail,

Minute-Taker:

PLEASE WRITE A 1-PARAGRAPH DESCRIPTION OF YOUR IDEA HERE AND WE WILL CIRCULATE IN ADVANCE OF THE SESSION FOR MEMBERS TO VOTE ON TO SEE WHICH IDEAS HAVE SUPPORT / PEOPLE WILLING TO WORK ON THEM

Katie: Formation of an “Allyship Squad” that will work to keep aware of and support other social/economic justice group’s issues/campaigns through participation in rallies, actions, demonstrations, petitions etc. as allies, while also working to articulate connections with climate action and climate justice.

Climate Justice Education: develop a team of people working on regular education about climate justice. This is about changing the conversation in activist circles and education our membership. It means publicly articulating how and why white supremacy, colonialism, the patriarchy, and capitalism are the root causes of the climate crisis. Internally it means creating spaces including white caucuses, the POC caucus, gendered caucuses, etc. Ideally though, this could have connections to the allyship squad proposed above because they address different lenses of Justice work.

Support a Divest OMERS campaign (Lee Ramsay) - whether we want to support a campaign through hosting online, advice (not a lot of effort from us, but we can choose our level of involvement). It could be called a “Divest Toronto” campaign.

Ben: Incorporate Divest Ryerson as a Toronto350.org campaign, similar to UofT Divestment, so students, when they graduate, plug into Toronto350.org and so Divest Ryerson can recieve resources (network and money) from Toronto350.org

Katie: Work with TCAN’s city-focused campaign plan to potentially develop a Fossil Free Toronto Divestment campaign

Amelia Rose: Support a Divestment of Banks and Credit Unions.

As a possible campaign, taking money out of banks and credit unions for moral reasons has been a practice going back many years and within the past decade related to fossil fuels. Encouraging individuals, groups and others to talk to their banks and credit unions about the possibility of divesting from fossil fuels and re­investing is a start, while building on previous and current campaigns (such as the Rainforest Action Network campaign against Royal Bank, and Australia Environmental Activists). Over the next 6 months, the campaign will build towards a large pull out of funds from banks and credit unions who don't commit to looking into divestment of fossil fuels within their investments. Within that time, there will be continued pressure put on the banks and credit unions by individuals, in the media, outreaching to the public, creative art, and talks on divesting and re­investing from these institutions.

**90 minutes:** Strategies to Move forward. Given our goals, existing campaign plans and resource requests, new ideas, what will we DO?

Co-Facilitators: Suhail,

Minute-Taker:

Toronto350.org strategy session 2015-08-09

Minutes starting at 3:28pm

[‘Dotmocracy’ debrief](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FR6Yob7GiFDMvZsugEvR6c8tQD91JUyxfkojk7fo2Gw/edit#heading=h.pzzhc2z4r1t1)

[Final hour](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FR6Yob7GiFDMvZsugEvR6c8tQD91JUyxfkojk7fo2Gw/edit#heading=h.lel5ki8pvgee)

[What needs to change? What concrete recommendations can we make?](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FR6Yob7GiFDMvZsugEvR6c8tQD91JUyxfkojk7fo2Gw/edit#heading=h.ta65hmlbs7p0)

[Choosing three goals for the next six months](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FR6Yob7GiFDMvZsugEvR6c8tQD91JUyxfkojk7fo2Gw/edit#heading=h.cajoxvh2yccj)

## **‘Dotmocracy’ debrief**

Suhail has calculated percentages for the listed options

22 people participated, with four dots each

* The online survey results were fairly different, but we changed the categories used at the session itself
* 25 people completed the survey online: 56% listed tar sands in their top two, 50% listed university divestment, 24% climate justice education, 20% promoting renewable energy/solutions (far fewer in person)

What should our discussion be going forward? What do these results mean for the group going forward?

* Based on the discussion prior to the vote, a large number of people saw a lot of overlap between these ideas. Maybe an effective way forward, rather than exploring our campaigns as separate entities, try to come up with (a) a very clear mandate for Toronto350.org as a whole (b) how do we make sure our campaigns align with the mandate (c) where is there intersectionarily between the campaigns, and how to do we use intersection to bolster all the campaigns
* In the original survey, there seemed to be a lot of interest in dealing with the pipeline question. Addressing the issue of our general use of fossil fuels is core to what 350.org is about. Bill McKibben recently had a *New Yorker* article about solar:<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/06/29/power-to-the-people> In the US there are now conservatives supporting solar. A prime focus is dealing with the question of fossil fuels.
* The key metric determining investment in campaigns has always been how much time group members have been willing to commit to them
* The most popular options fit well with the 350.org fossil freeze and just transition
* Divestment and pipelines have been two strong pillars so far. There are also cross-cutting themes that need work, and which are dealt with a lot in other organizations. It would be good to have a group of people working on climate justice, bringing the campaigns together. Several campaigns have an intersecting interest in federal politics and should get together and strategize.
* This is a good expression of direction. From there, can we take the campaigns and suit them to what our directions are?
* First, it’s correct that campaigns determine their own direction based on the level of effort organizers are willing to make. At the same time, we as a group make choices that determine where effort is devoted - encouraging campaigns to report back, making decisions on funding, etc. As planning meetings happen, and as the exec makes choices, it contributes to priority-setting. Not all campaigns are equally well represented on the exec. More clarity about priorities would be desirable: better to do explicitly than implicitly. Are these campaigns unsupported? Oversupported? Do we even have a way to know now? We have some important process questions to discuss (which may be painful). They tie into prioritization, since it ties into how we operationalize this information. How will we make decisions here? (So far, voting.) How will campaigns relate to the larger group? How will we direct resources to campaigns? How do campaigns relate to organizational interests? Answering these questions could help us move this conversation forward. Perhaps we should side-track the discussion toward answering those questions?
* Regarding choosing process and campaigns, this would be driven by our mandate as a group. Our mandate is also connected to the process we use. What are we? The description online doesn’t seem concretely connected with our campaigns. Perhaps we need to clarify this. We may need to consider this before we choose a process.
* Question of process: experience so far is that something has come along, we have identified it as something we would like to have happen (divestment, climate march) and that process has expanded our awareness. This has led to an expansion of what we do, such as to jobs and justice. These have moved from the periphery to the centre of our worldview. We need to have an openness to change what we’re doing.
* Revisiting the mandate is something every organization does as they evolve.
* Question: is the mandate on our website the same as the one in the constitution/incorporation documents?
* There isn’t a formal process for approving what is on the website, so it isn’t very authoritative. It’s not necessarily the same as what is in the constitution or the articles of incorporation
* Our Twitter bio: building a grassroots movement to solve the climate crisis. What we do is all-encompassing. What purpose do we serve? Making people in power uncomfortable?
* Articles of incorporation: advocate climate justice and other complementary purposes not inconsistent with this objective
* How important is a written mandate written by one person or a small group, compared with the organic totality of what we do?
* “Building a grassroots movement to solve the climate crisis” (BAMTSTCC) has been on a banner and other documents, and seems to link the campaigns together: movement building through campaigns that are winnable and effective. As we did more and became more aware of the complexity of what we are doing, there has been more of an appetite for climate justice campaigning. Perhaps we have never articulated this.
* 350 mothership Twitter bio: “Join a global movement that's inspiring the world to rise to the challenge of the climate crisis. 350=safe upper limit of CO2 in atmosphere.” As a local of 350, perhaps we should be focusing on this that really affect Toronto or Ontario, or have a clear objective like ‘stop all pipelines’ or ‘pipelines and divestment’.
* “Is this going to advance the group” as a metric? Is this what people meant when they voted?
* Other climate change groups (Greenpeace, Environmental Defence, etc) - how do they define their mandate? Can we use that to help define ourselves? Is BAMTSTCC adequate?
* Other groups can be seen as more professionalized environmental groups. Other organizations are more focused on policy. Greenpeace is “more hardcore activists who take a lot of direct action”. Are we distinguished by being more participatory than other groups? Getting people involved is a major way we move forward? All groups evolve to fill spaces that are not filled. We are a latecomer to the climate scene in Toronto. This links to how we got involved in divestment and pipelines.
* Greenpeace “We are passionate about protecting the Earth. We are independent… We work to bring about change through… peaceful direct action”. More of a guide than a very precise description.
* We tend to be more locally action-oriented: focused on Toronto itself. “The name could be a bit limiting”. Does the collection of local 350.org groups give a false sense that the whole organization only works on local issues.
* Amanda and Jody’s description: “a local climate action group running campaigns to pressure public leaders to take strong action on climate change...”
* What actually sets us apart is that we are grassroots. Environment Defence and Greenpeace are not structurally democratic. They never have open strategy sessions like this. There is no other significant environmental organization that has this way of making priorities.
* 350 is a facilitator for people who want to act on climate to meet others. Perhaps this should be part of our mandate.
* We are focused on climate change exclusively, unlike most other environmental groups. It would be logically consistent for us, for instance, to support more use of nuclear energy.
* There are issues with the term “grassroots”. Does our linkage with the mothership undermine this? Has the term “grassroots” lost the meaning it once had? Is it too vague? Does being incorporated undermine our grassroots status? What about the size of our budget? The size of our membership? Maybe it’s a term we need to move past, as a description of ourselves.

## **Final hour**

One hour left in the meeting, and a number of people have left

* Are we past the point where we can make decisions? Recommendations only?
* What is a productive use of the remaining time? Make recommendations for organizational goals? Recommendations re: process?
* One way we could proceed: erase what’s on the board, ask people what one thing they would like us to do as a result of this strategy session?
* Should we have a discussion on whether to pay co-presidents? The people here are the ones who came out for a day-long strategy session, and so far this has only really been discussed by the executive / innovation committee
* Recommendations about campaigns: our work is done by the people who show up, so the fact that people have left doesn’t stop us from making choices. We don’t have time to address deep structural questions. Should we have a discussion about how regional groups and campaigns are going to work?
* We could discuss possible recommendations, and see whether there is consensus on anything - keeping discussion short

### What needs to change? What concrete recommendations can we make?

**1) For every action, we should have a written debrief in a standard format, stored in a place everyone can access**

People do not consistently complete debriefs. We do have some from several events, but people rarely look at them. Could be objectionable to force people to complete them if they are not used.

In the weekly meetings, there are oral debriefs when campaigns have accomplished something. These should be recorded in the minutes. Perhaps it should be on the blog or website too.

We have used Google Docs for several events, but they don’t get filled the majority of the time.

Building a norm of standard debriefs could be valuable for institutional memory. We are planning events now which are like events from years ago, but most of those people are gone and have taken their institutional memory with them.

The U of T divestment campaign has had success with a shared drive. Someone needs to be assigned the task of bottom-lining a debrief.

Perhaps responsibility should be assigned to event planners, not always to the Operations Coordinator.

We could have a Toronto350 drive, with folders for different campaigns. Making debriefs a norm and organizing them consistently could help people learn from past events.

For major things, like retreats and marches, we generally create a Google Doc as a debrief document and send it around to those involved in planning.

Side discussion: [Should we be talking about this at a strategy meeting? Isn’t the issue our “identity crisis, not having a strategy, not knowing who we are”. ---Can we do anything effective on these issues now? ---Should we be turning what we voted on into our recommendations, like doing more solidarity work? ---Wasn’t the idea for people to propose anything where we might be able to form consensus in 10 minutes? ---Are we getting away from the focus of strategy? ---Should we try to pick three goals for the organization to focus on during the next six months, then decide whether to continue, create, or eliminate campaigns based on whether they line up? ---There is an endless list of process issues within Toronto350, this meeting is meant to be about strategy? ---Can we close this and move forward with the proposal to set three goals? ---Strategy is about what types of issues we are working on, but coming out of this we should also talk about process, which is beyond the scope of this meeting. We can make a recommendation about process]

How would debriefs become a norm and who makes it happen?

* How do you make the bottom-liner do this, or assign someone to do it?
* By having it emerge as an institutional norm

### Choosing three goals for the next six months

Are people pitching ideas, or are we using the vote? Or should we start with campaigns?

Divestment, pipelines, climate justice? To be treated here as issues we want to be working on, not as campaigns

Five current campaigns: pipelines; Fossil Free Futures (what is the objective of this? Supposed to be a campaign around reinvestment and solutions); divest U of T; divest Ontario Teachers Fund (subset of Divest All the Things); Step Up Canada

* Is Fossil Free Futures still an active campaign? No expenses in a year
* Step Up Canada has “almost split away” from the group. (Some people disagree)
* U of T 350 is also splitting away to some degree

Methodology: start with goals, then look at how campaigns align?

Regarding goals, they should reflect priorities but there are things that may not fit in in a literal way. Goals don’t need to perfectly match campaigns - can be cross-cutting.

Possible goals

* **Double Toronto350.org membership during the next six months** (defined how?)
* Movement-building generally
* Can be defined in terms of regular attendees at meetings, including regional groups
* Build the local climate movement in the Greater Toronto area by engaging with communities not previously involved in climate issues
* Engage existing allies, reinforce connections
* Why not use **divestment, pipelines, climate justice** as our three goals?
* Can these things be achieved during the next six months? Does that matter? Can we choose intermediate steps along the way? Do goals need to have a clear metric, or are those “targets”?
* **Reverse the growth of the fossil fuel industry**
* Freezing tar sands expansion? Reducing reliance on fossil fuels? -Neither can be achieved in the next six months, but we can set priorities for that timespan
* Our ultimate goal is to address the climate crisis, through strategic campaigns based on X, Y, and Z. Most environmental groups are about protecting the Earth writ large, but have different ways of going about it.
* Is this local enough to Toronto350? The fossil fuel industry is global. **Fight the fossil fuel industry’s power** ---Something we can do locally, and which ties into our divestment and pipeline campaigns

Are the campaigns Toronto350? Are these our mission? Or are they the way we achieve our missions?

* Is it in our name? Try to keep the level of CO2 in the atmosphere as low as possible? Isn’t this what ties all of our activities together?
* Is this a helpful goal? Something we can achieve?
* We are well beyond 350 ppm now - at 401.30 (though it can be brought back down with very aggressive mitigation)
* Too long-term? Or a good way to introduce people to the issue

People have a sense that strategy sessions are meant to happen every six months, but this is actually only the second one in the three-year life of the group

* The constitution doesn’t say anything about strategy sessions
* We may not need goals that can be accomplished in six months, we just choose to re-examine our strategy that often and see if we are doing anything
* This strategy session hasn’t involved any rigorous or systematic examination of the efficacy of our campaigns over the last six months or since the last strategy session
* Should we spend more time developing what these six month reviews will involve?

What are our goals as Toronto350? What are the goals of our campaigns? How does that relate to planning and the executive?

* Divest U of T has been discussing what it gets from being a campaign of Toronto350 as opposed to an independent organization ---Do they get support from the executive? From the planning process?
* What does being part of a group with multiple campaigns do for divestment?

For the exec, “the framework is unclear in terms of deliverables”

The original plan was to allow time for campaigns to go over what they have done in the last six months, but there wasn’t time because the wording discussion before Dotocracy took too long

* We could have had campaigns summarize their actions, and provide their own impressions about what has been working well or badly

We should be setting broad goals for Toronto350 as an overarching body: movement building, slowing tar sands

* Let individual campaigns set the specific goals?
* If so, what value added do we provide to the campaigns?
* How would we evaluate whether campaigns are meeting the top-line goals of the organization?

How could we set a goal about the integration of climate justice into our activities and allyship?

Three possible goals: movement building, slowing or reversing the growth of the fossil fuel industry, climate justice

To book City Hall, there needs to be a non-profit that will be responsible for the booking

350 has a strong brand: 400,000 person march in New York City, has prevented Keystone XL approval so far

* The goal of 350 ppm “is bloody worthwhile. It’s not a random number”
* “Such a tangible goal” compared with Greenpeace’s “peace”

Are we still grassroots? What does that mean?

* This should be connected to the question of whether we should pay people or not

Does it make sense to have climate justice as a goal? Or is it the principle that underlies our actions?

* Identified as a subject of interest to the group - something all campaigns should look at seriously
* Does this include education? We could set tangible goals in this area, or let the campaigns do so ---Should be internal and external
* Regular equity caucuses and workshops

In terms of movement building, effective volunteer coordination and delegation ---Managing executive overwork

* We don’t have an effective general system for assigning tasks to volunteers or getting quality work back
* Shifting volunteers from weekly planning meetings to campaign meetings

People are unclear about how much / what the board does

* Being incorporated means having a board
* The board is legally responsible for most of the aspects of being incorporated
* Oversight: financial and of other kinds

Do we have agreement about what has been written on the board?

* Consensus question - do people support using these three as our goals for the next six months?
* Movement building; fighting the fossil fuel industry’s power; climate justice
* How should the second one be phrased? “Slowing / reversing the growth of fossil fuels / tar sands”
* How should it relate to a six month timeframe? That will include the federal election and the Paris COP

Can we recommend another separate meeting about structure/process?

* An Innovation Committee meeting?
* Would this include moving people away from planning meetings to campaign meetings?
* The exec has discussed the possibility of scrapping planning meetings, with strong feelings on both sides
* How do Innovation Committees work? Can anyone call one? How do they relate to exec decision making?
* Should we restructure Tuesday meetings?
* The exec does a lot of organizational / managerial stuff that isn’t suitable for new volunteers ---We want a regular meeting where these matters are discussed, but most volunteers would prefer campaign meetings

We’re at the end of time

* We have made progress, but we have things still to work through
* We need to discuss the question of paying staff, as well as our identity
* We need a framework to evaluate how campaigns are related to goals
* Goal number 2 should be simplified / made broader?
* Should we have another strategy session? We haven’t chosen our campaigns? Is Fossil Free Futures done? Someone could contact Tina
* How will we deal with semi-autonomous campaigns, U of T 350 / Step Up ---Campaigns that are “sliding out of our decision-making structure”
* People don’t feel they know what all campaigns are doing
* If campaigns don’t align with our three goals, we should consider whether they should continue

Can we re-word goal 2 now?

* We > Tar Sands?
* Fossil Freeze?
* Fight Fossil Fuels?