1 2	Oneota Community Coop Minutes for Regular Monthly Board Meeting
3 4	Tuesday, October 26, 2010 Luther College Campus, Valders Hall, Room 367
5 6 7 8	Board Members Present: Robert Fitton, Jon Jensen, Joan Leuenberger, Lyle Luzum, Steve McCargar, Bill Pardee, and Steve Peterson GM Present: David Lester Coop member/owners present: 6
9 10	1. Call to Order President Steve Peterson called the meeting to order at 5:05.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2. Board Learning: How do we evaluate the GM? A flow chart outlining the process of GM evaluation was studied. Oneota already followed this approach in many ways. We already have written expectations for the GM (policies), monitoring reports on those policies, and a summary of the monitoring reports to use in the evaluation. How to make comments on aspects of GM performance other than policy compliance was discussed and a decision was made to add a comments column to the summary table. David Lester was asked to complete the self evaluation form used by the staff in their performance evaluations to aid in the discussion of his performance. It seemed that policy compliance is a baseline of performance and what Oneota's board really wants is excellent performance. One way focus more on defining and achieving excellence is to spend less time and energy monitoring policies and more time on strategic leadership, one of the points of our last board retreat. The contract negotiation process and timeline were decided upon.
22 23 24 25 26	3. Member Comments Birgitta Meade had three questions for the board. 1. If the member survey is a tool for the GM, how are problems communicated to the board? 2. How can board members choose not to participate in something voted upon by the board? 3. Isn't it troubling that one board member can tell another that he doesn't trust him?
27 28	4. Disposition of Member Comments Birgitta was thanked for her input.
29 30 31 32 33 34	 5. Agenda Review Motion: Steve McCargar moved and Jon Jensen seconded to add discussion of monitoring of treatment of staff during the period October 2009 to March 2010. Motion failed by a vote of 2 ayes (Steve McCargar, Jon Jensen, 5 nays. Pro: There was a belief that there was a significant difference between that time and now. Monitoring covers the full 12 month period. Could be added to the agenda with a time limit for
35 36 37 38 39	discussion. <u>Con</u> : Don't have time for that review. Monitoring of a former GM in abstentia seemed unfair. There was no data to prove monitoring assertions during that time, so only stories would be shared. Because it would be under a different GM, it would not help in the evaluation of either the current GM or policy.
40 41 42	Motion : Steve McCargar moved and Jon Jensen seconded to add discussion on board member access to the recent member survey. Motion passed by a vote of 4 ayes, 2 nays (Lyle Luzum, Joan Leuenberger) and 1 abstention (Steve Peterson).
43 44 45	<u>Pro</u> : It wouldn't be hard to get a hard copy of the survey. <u>Con</u> : There are environmental concerns of printing 7 copies of a 40 page report. The members expected confidentiality when completing the survey.

- 46 Motion: Steve McCargar moved and Jon Jensen seconded to add discussion on board member access to
- 47 the full quarterly financial report. Motion **failed** by a vote of 2 ayes (Steve McCargar, Jon Jensen) and 5
- 48 nays
- 49 Motion: Steve Peterson moved and Joan Leuenberger seconded to move the executive session for GM
- 50 evaluation to November and the executive session on Employment Agreement now scheduled in
- November to December. Motion **passed** by a 7-0 vote.
- 52 <u>Pro</u>: Allows David Lester the opportunity to complete a self-evaluation to be used during the
- evaluation and allows a decision on compensation and other employment terms to be based upon the
- evaluation. Moving both sessions back prevents the Nov. meeting from being too long with two
- topics in executive session. This timetable doesn't prevent the GM from completing the store budget for next calendar year if compensation is estimated.
- 57 Motion: Robert Fitton moved and Bill Pardee seconded to approve the agenda as amended. Motion
- passed by a 7-0 vote.

6. Approval of Minutes

- 60 **Motion**: Joan Leuenberger moved and Bill Pardee seconded to approve the minutes of the September
- meeting. Motion **passed** by a 7-0 vote.
- 62

88

59

63 7. Consent Agenda

- There were no items on the consent agenda.
- 65 **8. Reports**
- **8.1 GM Report**
- 67 <u>Financial</u>: October sales were up \$32,000 over last Oct. and 2010 sales are 9.8% above last year. Average
- labor for the last 4 weeks is 17.99% of sales, slightly above budgeted, but still lower than last year. Quick
- ratio is .75% and Savings #3 has increased to \$106,000. The gross margin is 39.43% of sales, slightly
- 70 more than budgeted. David gave some possible reasons for our good revenue growth including having
- 71 more members, better outdoor signage and more marketing, change in focus from gourmet to less
- expensive grocery/bulk, and happy staff creating a positive environment.
- 73 Physical Store Update: The electric bill dropped \$2,000 as we moved from summer to fall. Reliable
- 74 internet access continues to be a problem for credit card transactions and research continues into
- 75 switching providers.
- 76 Staff Update: Miranda Quandal will be lead cook in the Water Street Café and Elizabeth Finanger will be
- barista. October 24 will be the last all staff meeting to cover strategic planning, survey results, and
- 78 discussion on what motivates staff.
- Marketing/Special Projects: Articles on the store survey results and financial update will be published in
- 80 the *Commpost*. Adding local sales at the deli increases our percent storewide to 30% of everything sold.
- 81 David Lester graduated from the CCMI program. The classes covered big areas of the GM job including
- 82 marketing and working with a board which has already benefited him in his new position. The Bulk
- 83 Pantry Project will be an article in the *Scoop* which demonstrates the economy of shopping in bulk versus
- 84 pre-packaged. Member Appreciation Days are scheduled for 10/26 and 11/30 and will offer discounts on
- 85 a wider range of products than usual. By 6:00 during the meeting sales were already \$24,000, breaking
- the previous single day sales record of \$18,000. The second annual Taste of the Holidays event will be
- 87 11/4 to benefit the area food pantries. Beaujolais Nouveau will be uncorked 11/18.

8.2 Board Treasurer's Report (3rd Quarter)

Board expenses remain nicely under the ½% target set in policy even considering the 8% discount. The

90 board should be able to afford to send members to CMA and/or pay for some clerical support soon.

8.3 Board Development-Candidate Recruiting

- Motion: The Board Development committee moved for the board to grant the authority to name anomination committee (Bill, Jon, and Robert) to:
 - Review the election processes specified in the procedure manual and propose changes and updates that the committee sees necessary.
 - Recruit member-owners to assist the committee in the recruitment of candidates and the election process.
 - Fulfill various other duties, specifically develop a board recruitment packet, begin advertising for two positions, market those positions, and recruit two member owners to serve on the nomination committee.
- The motion **passed** by a 7-0 vote.
 - <u>Pro</u>: This is what the board development committee is charged to do. The things they want to do are merely a refinement of prior processes.

9. Action Items

91

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

102

103

104

105

9.1 L5 Financial Conditions (3rd Quarter)

- 106 **Motion**: Joan Leuenberger moved and Steve McCargar seconded to approve monitoring report L5
- Financial Conditions. Motion **passed** by a 7-0 vote.
- Summary: Sales growth of 9.8% is above the NCGA benchmark and the OCC budget. Net income is
- \$68,276 for the year. The current, quick, and debt-to-equity ratios are all better than the NCGA
- benchmarks. There have been no unauthorized debt or real estate transactions. Taxes, bills, and
- payroll have been paid on time. Compliance is reported.
- 112 Motion: Steve McCargar moved and Jon Jensen seconded to allow any board member to receive the
- Quick Books complete quarterly financial statements. Motion **failed** by a vote of 1 aye (Steve McCargar)
- 114 to 6 nays.
- Pro: The bank and auditors get access to this information so the board members should be able to as well. It is a matter of transparency to get this information. The members wouldn't be happy if they
- knew the board was getting less financial information than it did previously.
- 118 Con: The board gets all the relevant information it needs to do its job. No one thought we didn't
- have enough data to determine whether policies were met, or that David Lester's interpretation of
- our policies was inadequate. We already get less information since weekly reporting ended when we
- got in compliance with policy L5 and that hasn't made us any less effective or unknowing about our
- financial condition, nor have there been negative member comments. The board would have to
- change a specific policy if this were approved to require the GM to give specific information. If you
- don't have a specific purpose for using additional data, it doesn't make sense to require that
- additional data. Board members can't focus on every detail; that's part of operations that has been
- delegated to the GM. The only reason financial statements are printed at the level of detail
- previously given to the board is for reporting to the NCGA due to our poor financial performance,
- and that should end in January given our improved performance. The board could access more
- financial details at any time if it decided to directly inspect the financial records so what we are
- deciding upon is only what is routinely provided, not board access. Studies found that focusing on at

131	most 5-6 things which drive an organization forward is what makes them most successful. Oneota
132	has proven that by focusing on revenue, labor, inventory, and members in the past two years.
133	Questioning depreciation and income taxes, things we can't control, is not the best use of board time.
134	9.2 D4 Monitoring GM Performance
135	Motion: Steve McCargar moved and Lyle Luzum seconded to accept monitoring report D4 Monitoring
136	GM performance. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.
137	Summary: Compliance is reported because the board has been using a monitoring calendar to
138	monitor GM performance on policies; monitoring results will be used as the basis for reviewing the
139	GM in October; the board discussed which types of reviews will be conducted during the upcoming
140	year when it set the 2010 board budget; and part of the board training in May was on the use of the
141	reasonable person test for policy interpretation.
142	9.3 Consider RFP Recommendations for GM compensation
143	Motion: Lyle Luzum moved and Steve McCargar seconded to approve the request for proposal to be used
144	by David Lester in proposing his compensation and employee agreement. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.
145	Summary: Compensation must be affordable, should consider the whole package, and should be
146	similar to that at coops of comparable size and stage of development. The plan needs to be easily
147	and objectively measurable.
148	<u>Pro</u> : Having the plan run for two years doesn't change the at-will nature of the GM's employment
149	and evaluation will happen each year.
150	9.4 Meeting time/place
151	The pros and cons of meeting at Luther's Valdres Hall were discussed but no motion for changing either
152	was made due to lack of an even better option.
153	9.5 L2 Nepotism sub-policy (1 st reading)
154	Motion: Steve McCargar moved and Bill Pardee seconded to accept the first reading of the proposed
155	change to policy L2. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.
156	Summary: The proposed change would replace the stricken text with the italicized text below:
157	L2.2 The GM will not Operate without written personnel policies that:
158 159	(c) Protect against wrongful conditions, such as nepotism and grossly preferential treatment for personal
160	reasons, (c)Prohibit staff and the GM from supervising or managing the work of any person who is a spouse,
161	partner, immediate family member or person with whom a romantic or close familial relationship exists.
162	9.6 Member survey distribution
163	Motion: Steve McCargar moved and Bill Pardee seconded to allow board members to receive upon
164	request a hard copy of the member survey results.
165	<u>Pro</u> : The board is charged with reflecting member values. The survey contained valuable input.
166	Having to sit at the Coop to read the report is a barrier to access. This isn't asking for electronic
167	copy which could easily get away from us and expose competitive information.
168	Amendment: Steve Peterson moved and Bill Pardee seconded to require that the survey results
169	be considered confidential to the board. Amendment passed by a 7-0 vote.
170	Pro: Survey takers were candid because they expected that their remarks were confidential.

Betraying that could result in fewer people responding to future surveys.

Motion as amended **passed** by a 7-0 vote.

170

171

172

10. Consideration of Items Pulled from Consent Agenda No items were pulled from the consent agenda.
11. Next MonitoringL7 Asset ProtectionG3 Agenda Planning (Steve Peterson)
12. Next MeetingTuesday, November 23, Room 367 Valders Hall, Luther College Campus
13. Executive Session There was no executive session.
14. AdjournMotion: Steve Peterson moved and Robert Fitton seconded to adjourn. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.
Meeting adjourned at 8:07.
Respectfully submitted, Joan Leuenberger, board secretary
Documents reviewed: Setting a Process of General Manager Compensation by Mark Goehring and Carolee Colter Agenda Minutes, September 26 regular monthly meeting GM Report 3 rd Quarter Board Budget Report Motion from the Board Development Committee Policy L5 Financial Conditions GM Monitoring Report Policy D4 Monitoring GM Performance Board Monitoring Report Request for a Proposal to Modify the GM Employment AgreementOctober 2010 Policy L2 Nepotism Proposed Policy Change