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Overview of Washington Food Coalition

Washington Food Coalition (WFC) was founded in 1992 as a merger between the Western Washington Food Coalition and Eastern Washington's Northwest Regional Food Network. In a state with an historically significant east-west divide, WFC was formed to create a synergetic network of hunger-relief organizations statewide. Since its founding, WFC has been a hub for information sharing, a powerful support for smaller food banks and food pantries, and a neutral convener for Washington’s emergency food system. Currently, WFC represents over 300 organizations working to address hunger and its root causes.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, WFC has played a crucial role in helping food programs across the state adapt to fluctuating health, safety, and distribution protocols. WFC’s rapid information sharing has helped organizations stay effective and in compliance over the last year. This only adds to WFC’s legacy as an organization that creates educational opportunities and spaces for sharing best practices in Washington’s emergency food system. In particular, WFC is known for its annual conference where individuals and organizations gather for various trainings, presentations, and networking opportunities.

Snapshot – Current Board of Directors

The current board of directors maintains the same structure as it has had since its inception. It is comprised of District Representatives and At-Large Members. All board members serve two-year terms. There are no term limits. The sum total of the At-Large and District Representative positions is thirty-eight. At the moment, there are several vacancies for At-Large and Alternate positions on the board. The current number of board members is twenty-five.

WFC created a map to divide Washington into fourteen districts. Two District Representatives are elected from each of district, one as a Primary Representative and one as an Alternate Representative. The Primary has voting rights on the board. The Alternate only has voting rights in the absence of the Primary. Elections of District Representatives are by popular vote amongst WFC members within each district.

The At-Large positions are designed to create space on the board for the inclusion of individuals with particular knowledge and skillsets. The election process for these members is undefined. The bylaws read that the election of At-Large directors “may be conducted in such manner and at such time as the board shall determine.” There is also language in the bylaws indicating that two At-Large positions are reserved for people interested in helping to advise the Washington State Department of Agriculture’s (WSDA) Food Assistance Programs.

The board meets quarterly with the option of additional ad hoc meetings. Meeting duration traditionally has been between a half day and a full day. Since meeting virtually in the wake of the pandemic, this time has been shortened to between two and three hours. The agendas at these
meetings typically include District Representative reports, committee updates, a review of the quarterly financials, and any additional business.

Since WFC currently has one paid staff person, the board committees are where much of WFC’s work can and should happen. Each board member is expected to serve on at least one committee. Presently, WFC has five standing committees:

- Executive Committee
- Board Development & Membership Committee
- Advocacy Committee
- Fundraising, Marketing & Special Events Committee (Conference Committee)
- WSDA Food Assistance Program Advisory Committee

**Project Process Overview**

I wanted to ground my project in the understandings and perspectives of WFC’s stakeholders. This was particularly important considering my position as an external consultant from out-of-state. Accordingly, the focal point of my information gathering and learning process was my interviews with current and former board members, past and present WFC leadership, and others who work in Washington’s hunger-relief sector, including Food Lifeline, Northwest Harvest, Second Harvest, the Anti-Hunger & Nutrition Coalition, Harvest Against Hunger, and the Washington State Department of Agriculture. In total, I conducted over thirty in-depth interviews to understand how people viewed WFC, its purpose, threats, and potential.

To prepare for these interviews, I completed a multi-step process with WFC’s Executive Director and former Board Chair to develop various sets of questions. I also connected with multiple consultants that specialize in nonprofit boards and with several executives from relevant organizations to gain insights into best practices from their board structures. These conversations, paired with independent research into nonprofit board structures, helped me formulate my initial recommendations for restructuring WFC’s board.

I then presented major themes from my interviews and my initial ideas for restructuring the board to a small group that included WFC’s Executive Director, the Executive Committee, a former Board Chair, and a selection of current board members. They provided me with feedback, which I used to clarify the direction of my recommendations. I then honed my proposal by workshopping my ideas with several nonprofit board consultants. Afterwards, I gave a revised presentation to the same group that provided me with initial feedback. The Executive Committee voted to accept my proposal. I then presented my ideas to the full Board of Directors. The board had ten days to pose questions in an open forum so that I could publicly address any concerns regarding my recommendations and ideas. I then met with the board for a final discussion, after which they voted to adopt my proposal.
Lessons Learned: Ideas for Organizations Interested in Board Restructuring

• **Speak with everyone.** The best decision I made during this project was to speak with as many people as I could. Learning from everyone’s experience was incredibly valuable. But I also found this to be particularly important in light of the nature of the project. I knew it was possible that my recommendations might require folks to leave the board. I wanted to make sure everyone felt heard before I made such a suggestion. Speaking to everyone also bolstered my credibility during presentations. People knew I cared about their perspectives and saw our conversations reflected in my proposals.

• **Assess threats and opportunities from various perspectives.** I found that people got to the point when I asked what they thought were the greatest threats and opportunities for WFC. Board members launched into their vision for the organization. WFC’s main funders outlined what could jeopardize continued funding and what could garner more. I also found people’s answers to this question to be an important tool – a touchstone that I could use to measure the viability and value of all my initial ideas for restructuring the board.

• **Show humility. Check your ideas against smart people you trust.** As someone with little nonprofit or board experience, it was easy for me to admit ignorance. At first, I thought my lack of knowledge would be a weakness. It turned out to be one of my greatest strengths. Not knowing much meant I had to constantly speak with others. I never came away from a conversation knowing only what I initially sought to learn. I always discovered more than I expected. Starting from the position of “I am ignorant about this” led me to bonus knowledge that reaped benefits throughout the entire project.

• **Seek exemplars.** Find other organizations that have stellar boards. What are they doing right? What aspects can be replicated to fit into your organization’s unique culture and purpose? I found it helpful to have discussions with leaders of other nonprofit coalitions about how they view the composition and structure of their board, how it got there, and in what ways it may be even further improved.

• **Center around a vision.** It was powerful when I centered my proposal around a vision for the organization. The vision I formulated was fully based on the ideas that others had expressed during our conversations. I drew out themes of what people cared about, why people wanted to be at WFC, and what they feared would happen if WFC disappeared. By centering my proposal around a mutually shared vision, board members felt comfortable moving forward with ambitious goals. I found that giving people a reason to step up was favorable to asking people to step down.

• **Give specific action steps and a timeline.** In 2018, WFC hired a consultant to run a strategic planning process. A lot of good ideas came out of this, including ideas for restructuring the board. However, almost none of them happened. There are many reasons for this. But one obvious one was that the final product of that planning process did not include specific action steps with estimated timelines. I did not want my proposal to be accepted only to be put on the shelf and gather dust. Since I would not be around for the implementation of my proposal, I knew it was important to be as clear as possible about what needs to happen, who needs to
do it, and how long it should take. I wanted to make it easy to move forward and hard to do nothing. The less ambiguity, the less likely a plan is to stall. Additionally, specific action steps and a timeline lend credibility to a proposal. It can help address the concerns of those who are understandably skeptical about another attempt at organizational change.

- **Allow flexibility within structure.** In the ideation process, I was sometimes tempted to suggest changes to the bylaws that would set my ideas in stone. However, I received excellent counsel that encouraged me to avoid making changes to the bylaws that might become cumbersome in the future. Instead, I learned to focus on creating structures that allowed for good decisions to be made on an on-going basis. To this end, I found certain structural aspects like term limits, board size, committee structures, and nomination processes to be instrumental. Create a structure that allows people to be effective decision makers and address needs as the organization changes and evolves.

**Project Materials**

**Presentation Slides:**

*WFC BOARD RESTRUCTURING PROPOSAL*

XAVIER ROBERTS | 1.28.2021
Here is the agenda – I will give a quick overview of the current state of WFC and the board of directors. I will include some topline takeaways from my interviews. Then I will go over my main restructuring proposal. Then I will give a few quick fixes that could be implemented without a restructuring of the board. Finally, I will review a document that outlines steps to reach my main restructuring proposal. Later, I will share all materials I present and some others like a Board Matrix that is a tool to track and reflect on the board’s composition, revised committee language, and clarity around election processes.

Also, just as a quick disclaimer, I am not making any recommendations that will keep folks from being involved with WFC in the capacity they most want. My recommendations do not kick anyone out of the organization.
I conducted over 30 in-depth interviews for this project. There were some major themes from these conversations. Foremost, people acknowledged the importance of WFC’s representational quality. It is what makes us unique in the eyes of the state. It is what makes us righteous in the eyes of our board members. And it is what makes us the perfect organization to do authentic grassroots advocacy. However, a dovetailed theme that came up often was that WFC can do better in its representation. Several other interview themes branch from this: the need to increase engagement amongst board members; the need to better train district representatives and give them clear expectations to which they can be held accountable; the need to clarify and unify around WFC’s goals and mission; and the need to increase WFC’s financial capacity.

In general, my impression was that there are many people who care deeply about WFC and believe in what it does and in its potential. At the same time, almost no one thought WFC did not need to develop, grow, and live into its potential lest it risk becoming obsolete and/or unsustainable. This major takeaway led me to opting for a more ambitious restructuring plan that draws from people’s collective vision for WFC.
I was also able to quantify some of my qualitative interview data to create a visual representation of how people are thinking about issues and opportunities on the board and within the organization. Overall, people generally thought WFC should increase its financial capacity, board member engagement, and mission clarity. Fortunately, I think these are symbiotic goals.
From reviewing the Board Member Manual and talking with Trish (WFC’s Executive Director) and many current and former board members, my understanding is that, currently, most board members play two key roles. First, they represent and serve food banks and pantries from each of their districts. This involves two-way information sharing and outreach. Second, they provide governance and fiduciary responsibilities to WFC through their more traditional role as a member of the Board of Directors.

The entire board meets quarterly with the addition of ad hoc committee meetings. All board members are expected to serve on at least one committee.

At-Large positions are opportunities to get people with expertise and knowledge onto the board to support in targeted ways.
The purpose of the board of advisors would be to fully know and support the needs of food banks and pantries across the state. The knowledge from members of the board of advisors would be critical in informing strategic decisions made by the board of directors.

Board of Advisors members are emissaries for their communities. They know what their communities need because they seek out such information. They also help disseminate information and best practices to help make food banks and pantries successful and stay in compliance. The work of the Board of Advisors also plays a key role in WFC’s outreach and recruitment of new members.

The composition of the Board of Advisors should look familiar. It is the same as the current representative structure. The main difference is that there is no alternate position. Instead, there are two members from each district that share title and responsibility. This allows for the utilization of teamwork and diversity within districts. However, this would mean there would be 28 members on the board of advisors. It may be that, in the near-term, this is too large a group to effectively manage. In this case, we may want to consider having only one representative from each district. That would be a total of 14 members on the BOA. But there are also options of redrawing the districts to find other ways to change the number of BOA members while keeping two members in each district. This is a discussion that should happen in phase 1 of the restructuring process. I will note this again when we review the phases document.

Lastly, members of the Board of Advisors should be familiar with each other. This will be aided by meeting at least every other month to maintain awareness of each other’s needs and progress and continually realign on WFC’s goals.
Connection to Needs & Challenges: So now I will go top to bottom clarifying how each of the highlighted needs and challenges in the hexagonal graphic are addressed by the BOA.

RD (Racial Diversity) – In regard to racial diversity, the Board of Advisors will facilitate increased racial diversity within WFC because it will be an opportunity to renew a commitment to representing all food banks and pantries in the state, particularly those that are traditionally underrepresented. Additionally, with a clear purpose to connect with and understand the needs of all food banks and pantries in the state, WFC will grow into representing the needs and interests of POC-led organizations and organizations that primarily serve communities of color.

MD (Mission/Role Clarity) – In regard to mission and role clarity, the Board of Advisors will also generate increased clarity around the purpose of WFC, particularly amongst its members. BOA members will have a more focused scope of duties than current board members do. Additionally, determining and measuring success amongst BOA members will be more straightforward.

IR (Increased Representation) – Regarding increased representation, by establishing the Board of Advisors, WFC may enhance its role in representing the needs and interests of food banks and pantries across the state. More thorough connection to food banks and pantries statewide would increase WFC’s direct support and impact in those communities. It would also increase the degree to which WFC can adequately lobby for the needs and interests of those communities. This increased representation positions WFC to be the most authoritative voice in funding and policy discussions regarding food banks and pantries. Most importantly, this increased representation positions WFC to do advocacy in the way that only we can.

IE (Increased Engagement) – In regard to increased engagement, by focusing the purpose and responsibilities of the Board of Advisors, individual members will be able to hone their efforts. Currently, a lot of people on the board feel spread thin. The array of duties current board members hold is sometimes too numerous to execute consistently. The BOA may see higher levels of engagement when its members are asked to focus more clearly on specific duties. More focused duties will also enable increased accountability. Increased accountability would result in increased engagement.

IF (Increased Finances) – Regarding increased finances, although members of the Board of Advisors would not have the same fundraising duties that members of Board of Directors 2.0 would have, BOA members would still help ensure the financial well-being of WFC. The more focused duties of the Board of Advisors would allow and encourage its members to conduct more effective outreach into their communities. One outcome of this would be increased membership as more and more food banks and pantries become aware of WFC and the benefits of membership.
The BOD 2.0 would exist to ensure the success of WFC. Its sole focus would be on the wellbeing and longevity of WFC.

The BOD 2.0 would be responsible for developing WFC’s goals and strategy. It would operate as an efficient decision-making body. Its members would lead committees and fundraise for WFC. Particularly at the beginning of this restructuring period, the BOD 2.0 would be responsible for establishing and executing the new nomination and election process for the board of directors. I outline this process in a separate document.

The BOD 2.0 would have between 13-15 members. This size would be more manageable than the current board size and increase accountability amongst its members. It would be comprised of an executive committee like the one we currently have, a collection of at-large board members who provide sought-after expertise, and 3-5 nominees from the Board of Advisors. This last piece is important because it helps to maintain the representative quality on the board of directors that distinguishes WFC from other organizations and allows for our strategy to be informed by our constituents.

The BOD 2.0 would meet six times a year with the idea that a couple of these meetings could be virtual to reduce the physical and time demands of travel. However, it is important that in-person meetings take place post-pandemic to facilitate relationship building on the board. At meetings, the board should use a consent agenda to allow for meeting time to be focused on reviewing, reflecting, and refining WFC’s strategic goals and development.

Connection to Needs & Challenges: So now I will go top to bottom clarifying how each of the highlighted needs and challenges in the graphic are addressed by the BOD 2.0.
BD (Background Diversity) – The BOD 2.0 will allow for increased background diversity. A portion of its members will be from the direct-service hunger-relief space, but most of its members may be from varying backgrounds. Additionally, using tools like the Board Matrix can help support an emphasis on background diversity in the long-term development of BOD 2.0. The creation of BOD 2.0 allows for a renewed focus on finding people from diverse sectors to provide the skills and expertise that WFC decides it needs on its board.

RD (Racial Diversity) – The BOD 2.0 will allow for increased racial diversity as well. The use of the Board Matrix will help. Term limits will help. Regular discussions with the use of relevant literature on board diversity will help. A robust Board Development Committee will help. However, racial diversity is not a given. It will take intentional and sustained effort. And it is an on-going process. Tools and best-practices need to be regularly revisited, revised, and refined to develop healthy and effective racial diversity.

MC (Mission/Role Clarity) – By having a smaller group that is focused on organizational governance and strategy, the BOD 2.0 will be well positioned to increase clarity around WFC’s mission and help clarify organizational goals. Additionally, members of BOD 2.0 will have a more focused scope of responsibilities than current board members. Like the BOA, as board members are asked to do less, they will be able to do more.

UR (Under Resourced/Staffed) – BOD 2.0 will have a growing focus on fund development. Over time, folks will be recruited to join the board because of their expertise in fundraising. Additionally, BOD 2.0 will have a renewed emphasis on the Fund Development Committee since it will stand apart from the Conference Committee. BOD 2.0 members will also have relatively more bandwidth to focus on organizational development, both financial and personnel. All of this will allow for increased financial capacity which will open up additional hiring. So, the structure of BOD 2.0 facilitates increased fund development and increased staffing capacity, both through new hiring due to increased financial capacity and more deeply engaged board members.

IE (Increased Engagement) – There are a couple clear ways in which the structure of BOD 2.0 will allow for increased engagement amongst its members. First, by having a smaller group of people, there will be stronger social pressures and increased accountability. There will not be the same perception that someone else will pick up the slack and it will be more obvious if a board member is checked-out or disengaged. And as I mentioned before, board members will have a more focused scope of work which will allow them to dive more deeply into the tasks and responsibilities at hand. I would also recommend that board members participate in two committees unless they are a committee chair. This would also increase engagement as board members share more responsibilities and have more interactions with each other. These increased interactions may allow for better relationship building within the board, and deep relationships on the board would increase the degree to which board members felt compelled to step up and support each other in the work of the board.

IF (Increased Finances) – I mentioned this before, but BOD 2.0 will have increased fundraising capacity relative to the current board. Partly this is due to a renewed focus on fundraising, particularly through the fund development committee. Additionally, as the backgrounds of board members become more diverse, the board’s capacity for fund development may be increased.
Currently, many board members are hesitant to do fundraising for WFC because of a real or perceived conflict of interest. If board member backgrounds are diversified, this will become less of an issue.

OS (Increased Oversight/Support of ED) – Increased oversight and support of the ED is not a given. It is a matter of execution. But I think the structure of BOD 2.0 will allow for increased oversight and support. I think a lot of the things I have already mentioned will lead to increased oversight and support. More engaged and accountable board members will help. More targeted and measurable goals and mission clarity will help. Developing funds to do new hiring will help. Having a more diverse board will also help since the ED will have a wider pool of expertise to draw from and a more dynamic support system. A lot of these goals work together, and their synergy will be a boon for an ED.
With the bifurcation of the current board into BOD 2.0 and the Board of Advisors, I am also recommending slight modifications to the current committee structures.

The Food Assistance Advisory Committee, Executive Committee, and Advocacy Committee would not change. However, the “Fundraising, Marketing & Special Events Committee (Conference Committee)” would turn into two committees with different but symbiotic purposes. The first would be the conference committee, which would be focused on the annual conference and other smaller event opportunities that increase the notoriety and impact of WFC. The second would be the Fund Development Committee, which would focus on fundraising for WFC. Over time, as the BOD 2.0 becomes comprised of people who do not have real or perceived conflicts of interest in fundraising, the potential of the Fund Development Committee can be more fully realized.

Finally, the “Board Development & Membership Committee” would be remade into the Board Development Committee. This committee would focus on developing the membership of the board of directors and the board of advisors. For the first couple years of this transition process, this committee will be the most important as it determines who becomes members on the BOD 2.0. On an on-going basis, this committee will be responsible for assessing the needs of the board and recruiting the right people to meet them.
While the bifurcation of the board as I just outlined is a long-term process, there are some short-term actions that could be taken to improve WFC’s board.

First, we need to implement term limits. Board members would be limited to three consecutive two-year terms, after which they must step down from the board for at least one term. These term limits would also apply to the Board of Advisors to ensure healthy turnover there as well. For the transition of implementing term limits, current board members who are serving their third or more term can run for one more term. Board members who are serving their second term can run for two more terms. And board members who are serving their first term can run for three more terms. This would allow for all current board members to have served for at least four terms before being asked to step down.

Second, we should consider requiring board members to give personally to WFC. This is a complicated issue. Requiring board member giving raises issues of racial and economic equity. However, the current reality in the nonprofit sector is that many funding organizations look for 100% board member giving. In their eyes, it demonstrates investment on behalf of board members and is a prerequisite for funding. To make sure giving does not prohibit anyone from being a board member, I would suggest that giving can be any amount, even as little as $1. However, common language around board member giving is that “board members should give an amount that is personally significant.” Another idea is to use a sliding scale where giving expectations change depending on an individual’s socio-economic status. Another option is that board members are expect to either give or raise a particular amount each year. In the short term, this would be a conversation that would need to happen on the current board. Regarding my restructuring proposal, the final decision on the details of board member giving should be a conversation that happens in Phase 1 of the restructuring process.
The current board of directors can increase the frequency of meetings right now. In my interviews, a number of people noted that the time between meetings contributes to stalled progress on various initiatives and hinders relationship building. Meeting more frequently will allow members to build momentum on projects and increase the value of district check-ins. Since we are currently meeting virtually, this would be a straight-forward action to implement.

We can also activate committees immediately. Some committees are meeting more regularly than others. And some meet more seasonally. However, there is potential for more work to be done in committees, particularly regarding board development and thinking about WFC’s strategic goals and priorities in the near- and long-term.

I also forgot to add this to this slide, but we can immediately increase training and mentorship on the board, particularly for newer board members. This was also commonly mentioned as a need on the board.
Here is a super straight-forward, not at all confusing flow chart for how the restructuring would take place.

First, there would be a decision on whether or not to restructure the board of directors. If yes, then the next step would be completing phases 1-4. I will show those next.

The main thing this flow chart is meant to show is that the BOD 2.0 is comprised of three pieces. One, the executive committee. Two, at-large members. And three, nominees from the board of advisors. This demonstrates the balance that the BOD 2.0 would have in district representation and fiduciary oversight and governance.

The flow chart also shows how important the Board Development Committee is in determining the success of the Board of Directors 2.0.
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Note: This document should be viewed in tandem with the slides and speaker notes from the “WFC Board Restructuring Proposal” PowerPoint.
Phases of Restructuring WFC’s Board of Directors

**Decision:** Choosing to change and committing to serve.

- **Phase 0:** (Single *ad hoc* board meeting to take place shortly after initial proposal)
  - Vote yes or no on whether or not to do the restructuring.
  - Board members have 24 hours to opt out of consideration for Temporary Transition Committee.
  - Executive Committee finalizes selection for Temporary Transition Committee.

**Action:** Need to schedule *ad hoc* meetings (*monthly*) to complete phases 1-3 within given timeframe (7-10 months total).

- **Phase 1:** (4-6 months)
  - Define BOD 2.0 & BOA.
    - What is the purpose of each body?
      - Create statements of purpose. Why do we exist?
    - What are the responsibilities of each body?
      - Create statements of general responsibilities. What is our function?
    - Revisit the WFC district map to inform BOA representation.
    - Decide on the election process for BOA and BOD 2.0.
  - Define roles and responsibilities for each member.
    - What is expected of members of BOD 2.0?
      - Create job description.
      - Determine details around board member giving.
    - What is expected of members of BOA?
      - Create job description.

- **Phase 2:** (1-2 months)
  - Disseminate information from Phase 1 to all board members for review.
  - Make an agenda item for discussion at the next board meeting (*ad hoc*).
  - Each board member self-selects on which body they want to serve, BOD 2.0 or BOA.
    - Note: If more people want to be on BOD 2.0 than its Executive and At-Large membership capacity (10 members, excluding BOA nominees to BOD 2.0), then board members would remain on BOD 2.0 until their term limits expire. At which point, there would be no replacements until the board drops below its membership capacity. Essentially, the BOD 2.0 would downsize in the long run due to attrition.
  - Update bylaws 4.4.3 and 4.5 to reflect restructuring. Add language about BOA in Board Manual.

- **Phase 3:** (2 months)
  - Disseminate new board structure and composition to all board members.
  - BOD 2.0 schedules its first meeting.
    - Review roles and responsibilities.
- Determine how often the group needs to meet.
- Determine how to measure progress to ensure we are achieving stated roles and responsibilities.
- Establish standing committees and their composition. Bylaw 4.21.1 allows the Chairperson to appoint BOD 2.0, BOA, and other community members to committees. Recommendations:
  - Advocacy Committee
  - Conference Committee
  - Executive Committee (already established by bylaws)
  - Food Assistance Advisory Committee
  - Fund Development Committee
  - Board Development Committee

- BOA schedules its first meeting.
  - Review roles and responsibilities.
  - Determine how often the group needs to meet.
  - Determine how to measure progress to ensure we are achieving stated roles and responsibilities.

- **Phase 4**: Ongoing (via regularly scheduled and *ad hoc* meetings)
  - For BOD 2.0, review, reflect, and refine policies, strategies, and development.
  - For BOA, review, reflect, and refine strategy and advocacy goals/progress.
Draft Board Matrix

This is a tool to be used by the Board of Directors. It tracks the composition of the Board of Directors according to pre-determined categories. It can help create clarity about what types of skills and expertise the board seeks for itself. It can be a useful tool both for goal setting and for reflection. The board should revisit it annually.

The Temporary Transition Committee should decide on the details of this spreadsheet. Questions to answer include:

- What are the areas of expertise that we want to have on the board and why?
- How many board members do we want to have on the board and why?
- How many representatives do we want from the Board of Advisors?
- What are the various regions we want to track to meaningfully reflect geographic diversity?
- What are the appropriate categories for race and ethnicity?
- What are the appropriate gender categories?

Additionally, the Temporary Transition Committee should decide if a similar spreadsheet should be created for the Board of Advisors.
Revised Committee Language

Advocacy Committee
The Advocacy Committee is composed of board members and WFC members. The committee is responsible for following state and federal anti-hunger related issues and providing a link to other local and statewide coalitions. The committee will conduct specific research as needed to help inform the board when making a decision on a public policy issue. The committee will assist in determining which issues are supported by WFC and assist in advocating, testifying, and drafting letters of support as requested by the board.

Board Development Committee
The Board Development Committee is composed of board members and WFC members. The committee is responsible for orienting and mentoring new board members, identifying and recruiting potential board members, and establishing slates of candidates for election or appointment to various positions on the WFC board or for the state’s advisory board appointments. It also assists with board training opportunities and board evaluation as needed. This committee is also responsible for reviewing, monitoring, and recruitment activities related to membership, particularly as it relates to under-represented or non-traditional members and developing relationships with partner organizations. The committee assists with the annual membership drive and reviews the Annual Report.

Conference Committee
The Conference Committee is composed of board members and WFC members, as well as representatives of organizations with whom we partner to provide opportunities. The Committee assists in identifying and soliciting funds from external sources of support for the annual conference while working with the Executive Director. The Committee also reviews and advises staff on matters related to the public presentation of the Washington Food Coalition, i.e., the brochures, website, etc., and assists staff with planning and coordinating major events, such as the annual conference, listening sessions, and workshops.

Executive Committee
The Executive Committee is composed of the four elected officers and the immediate past chair. The Executive Committee is responsible for reviewing and monitoring activities related to finance including budget preparation, financial statements and the annual audit. They are also responsible for personnel related issues and for decisions on behalf of the Board of Directors between regularly scheduled board meetings. All decisions are later presented for full board review and minutes will be disseminated to the entire board following committee meetings.

Food Assistance Advisory Committee
The Food Assistance Advisory Committee is composed of board members and WFC members, as well as Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipients including tribal representatives and other interested community members. The Committee will also include representation from WSDA’s Food Assistance Program. Invitations to join the committee will be sent to each FAP Tribal contractor in recognition of each tribe’s sovereignty. The purpose of the Food Assistance Advisory Committee is to provide broad stakeholder input and formal recommendations to the Washington
Food Coalition’s board and the Washington State Department of Agriculture’s (WSDA) Food Assistance Programs.

The agenda will be developed collaboratively by the Washington Food Coalition’s board, the Committee Chair, and WSDA’s Food Assistance Program staff. Agenda items proposed by FAP staff will be given priority as this committee is charged with providing recommendations to the WFC board on policies, procedures, and structural changes to the Food Assistance Programs. The Food Assistance Advisory Committee will meet a minimum of three times a year, prior to select Washington Food Coalition board meetings. As needed, additional meetings may be held at the request of the Committee Chair.

**Fund Development Committee**
The Fund Development Committee is composed of board members, WFC members, and community partners. The primary function of the committee over the next 12-18 months is to develop a comprehensive fund development plan that contains a mix of strategies, including an annual campaign.
Election Processes for Board of Advisors & Board of Directors 2.0

Election Process for Board of Advisors:
This process will look similar to how elections are currently held. Members of the Board of Advisors will be elected by popular vote within their respective districts. At this time, there are not specific recommendations for modifying the current nomination and election process. However, board members have varying viewpoints on the efficacy and equitability of the current process. After the Board of Advisors is established, the election process and procedures should be revisited.

Election Process for the Board of Directors 2.0:
This process will look more like a traditional Board of Directors nomination and election process. This would require a change in bylaw 4.4.3. Instead of having a popular vote election, potential board members would be identified by the Board Development Committee. They will then be vetted by the board and voted on for nomination. Once nominated, they will go through an interview process and a final vote by the board.
Closing Note:

My experience with WFC was both challenging and rewarding. I was remotely working in a different time zone with an organization that was new to me in a state I have never visited. Upon starting my field placement, my understanding of emergency food systems in general was novice, and my understanding of Washington’s unique emergency food system even more so. However, through the generosity of people’s time and resources, I was able to discover some of the nuances of Washington’s hunger-relief landscape and deepen my knowledge about emergency food systems writ large.

To all of the people with whom I spoke, I am endlessly thankful. It was a delight speaking with so many professionals who have invested their careers in addressing hunger and its root causes. Even virtually, people were willing to develop relationships with me. Without this, my project would not have been possible. Indeed, it was through conversations and relationships that my ideas came to fruition and weathered scrutiny. I have come to care deeply about WFC and its stakeholders. Although my path is now leading elsewhere, I hope to continue to be involved in the future, particularly as WFC moves forward with the restructuring process.