

**NASPA Region IV-West  
Denver, CO  
June, 2011**

**Mark Your Calendar**

- **2011 New Professionals Institute (NPI), Denver, CO October 30<sup>th</sup> – November 1<sup>st</sup>**
- **2011 Regional Conference, Denver, CO November 1<sup>st</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup>**  
“Views That Inspire”
- **2012 NASPA National Conference, Phoenix, AZ March 10<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup>**  
“Ignite Leadership – Influence Change”

**Board Decisions & Recommendations**

- 1) The proposal to invite CPAC (College Personnel Association of Colorado) members to attend the Denver conference at the NASPA member rate was unanimously approved.
- 2) The proposed registration rates for the Denver conference were unanimously approved.
- 3) The proposal to add a \$500 line item to the conference budget for a NUFP reception was unanimously approved.
- 4) The proposal for our region to cover the registration fee for the recipient of the Support Staff Award was unanimously approved.
- 5) The proposal for our region to fund the recipient of the University President award up to the amount of a full conference registration, including food costs, went to a hand vote—28 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion was passed.
- 6) The proposal to table a discussion and vote on further funding of award recipients until the March or Summer board meetings went to a hand vote—29 in favor, 1 opposes and 1 abstention. The motion was passed.
- 7) The proposal to increase the NPI registration fee to \$475.00 with an additional \$2,000 of support from board if sponsorship funds are not secured was unanimously approved.
- 8) The proposal to establish a \$575.00 NPI registration rate for non-NASPA members was unanimously approved.
- 9) The proposal to keep the \$5,000 line item for new initiatives in the 2011-2012 budget, publicize our regional priorities and empower the Executive Committee to make the allocation decisions for those funds was unanimously approved.
- 10) The proposal to add a \$1,500 line item to the budget to cover accommodation needs was unanimously approved.

**Region IV-W Executive Committee Agenda Items**

(none)

**Action Items for Executive Committee**

Board reports due to Eric on June 10, 2011

**Action Items for Advisory Board**

(none)

**Board Agenda Items – November, 2011 Advisory Board Meeting – Denver, CO**

Continue strategic planning for Region IV-W

**Advisory Board Agenda & Minutes**  
**Denver, CO**  
**06/02/11- 06/03/11**

In Attendance: Abell, Alvarez, Brinton, Burrigth, Cardenas, Collard Jarnot, Crichton, Doman, Eason, Griffin Overocker, Grospitch, Hess, Johnson, Lofton, Mabery, Mason, Mason, Mata, Mendoza, Mincer, Monroe, Newell, Pack, Page, Reed, Roberts, Roney, Stoner, Strawn, Townsend, Williams and Wilson.

**Thursday, June 2, 1:00-5:00pm, Advisory Board Meeting**

1) Welcome & Introductions - Eric Grospitch

Congratulations to Tim Alvarez for his upcoming RVP role and Beau Johnson for the birth of a new baby girl. Eric asked each Board member to introduce him/herself and identify their respective role on the board. Agendas distributed. Ground rules for the meeting: this should be a comfortable environment to share ideas and opinions, ask questions, raise concerns but also follow protocol with voting. Open dialogue moving forward.

2) Consolidation results and discussion - Eric Grospitch

First item of business is consolidation. Of the NASPA members who participated in the vote, sixty-two percent voted in favor of consolidation. This did not meet the legally required 2/3 majority. Only 42% of NASPA members actually voted. Two groups not allowed to vote were 1) Associate members (full paying members whose institution does not pay membership) and 2) Graduate members. How do we ensure what we've learned in this process helps us move ahead? Does anyone have questions about consolidation or voting that Eric can answer now? It is also important to know there are no conversations about bringing up this topic in the near future. The membership has voted and has spoken and goal now is to make NASPA better.

3) Region IV-West Budget Update – Kris Hess

Kris noted that the board will not be approving the budget now—discussion needs to be had regarding the regional conference, NPI and new initiatives supported by the board. Kris passed out 2 handouts.

First was a look at statement of activities. This document shows the cash moving in and out in a fiscal year. Also shows conference revenue and regional revenue for a big picture view. Our cd's earn little interest. Annually, national office allocates the region funds based on our membership. Total expenses only about \$70K as of now. The region currently has approximately \$127,000 in hand (checking accounts, cd's, etc.) with no liabilities. Region IV-W is a very financially robust region.

This type of growth is dependent on our conferences. Various locations for the regional conferences have a significant impact on the regional budget. Since the return from Omaha was so high, it would be difficult to use the current statement of activities as a basis for moving forward. Denver's costs will be much higher. Eric recommended between \$60,000 and \$80,000 be retained in reserve in the event of a catastrophic conference. If a conference had to be cancelled, the region should have enough in reserve to pay hotel cancellation costs. The overall goal is to have more revenue than expenses.

Second handout was the 2010-2011 fiscal year budget, which will be closing soon (June 30, 2011). It is helpful to view our finances with two separate budgets—a conference budget and a regional budget. We are currently “under” what we budgeted for expenses year to date.

Moving forward, board looked at an outline of the 2011-2012 fiscal year budget. The board always asks conference committee to return revenue to region, and Denver conference chair Earle Doman has committed \$5,000 at this time. Our membership dues will remain the same and the region typically covers a few of the conference expenses. See handouts. The bottom line is that with a \$5,000 return and other sources of revenue and the anticipated expenses, the board will not have a balanced budget.

The board needs to reevaluate regional support, needs approximately \$7,000 from checking account to balance the budget. Kris thinks the region can afford this as a short-term strategy, but the goal is to be self-sustaining. When the conference is in an expensive location, the return and other sources of revenue will not cover our annual expenses. If more than \$5,000 is returned from Denver, the excess can then be returned to region. Eric states general principles—the desire to be in the heart of the city comes with high food costs and service charges. In 2012, South Dakota will provide a much better

financial situation simply based on food costs.

The other piece to consider when discussing the budget is new program development. What new initiatives will the board want to fund? Currently, the proposed budget includes a line for new program development, for \$5,000. The amount is a placeholder to get started. It was also suggested a line item be added to operating expenses to cover accommodation needs. Eric also states that NPI and MLI rotate years and are not expected to return funds to the region.

Eric asks we consider the budget through our discussion.

4) 2011 Regional Conference Update & Budget Presentation—Earle Doman

Hotel rates for singles/doubles are \$189 per night plus 14.85% tax. Triple rooms are \$204 and Quads are \$219.

Quick highlight of conference--it will follow same format as other years with new twists, while trying to hold costs down. For the dessert reception, the group will walk to the Chambers Grant Salon at the Opera House, approximately four to five blocks from hotel. Earle has added guest speakers to the noon awards luncheon. Committee is planning exciting ways to kick off the conference, as well. There are twenty-five program spots, and currently have forty-three proposals. Deadline extended to Friday, June 4.

Earle proposes the conference rates should be consistent to those from Santa Fe: Members \$249; Non- members \$349. If attending NPI, guests will pay \$160 extra to attend conference. Pre-conference sessions will cost \$20 and graduate member rate will remain at \$100 (although this return will not cover food costs as in past years, Earle feels it is important to keep the grad rate consistent).

Eric mentions outreach to members of ACPA's state association and offer them NASPA member rates. This year, CPAC (College Personnel Association of Colorado) has expressed interest in partnering. CPAC is separate from ACPA and also includes members from Wyoming.

**A motion was made by Tisa Mason and seconded by Matt Brinton to invite CPAC members to attend the Denver conference at the NASPA member rate. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**A motion was made by Scott Strawn and seconded by Pablo Mendoza to approve the Denver registration rates as presented by Earle Doman. The motion was unanimously approved.**

Registration should open within two weeks from today, so members have the option to spend out of current year's budget. Notice will go out to inform members of timeline, including policy on cancellations and refunds.

Dusten Crichton has secured \$600.00 from Golden Key for to waive registration for six graduate members. In return, the recipients must volunteer at least 8 hours at conference. Discussion on increasing the number of volunteer hours required, if there enough jobs to accommodate, and how many graduate members apply for the waiver. It all depends on how the waivers are advertised, as well as application deadlines. Eric states there are about 200 graduate members in region out of our 1100 members. Board discussed graduate members being a priority for the region, and how to encourage their attendance. Since there is no motion on the table, Eric encourages further discussion on supporting graduate members and new professionals.

Celestina Torres is our NUFPP liaison and cannot be here today. Eric mentions our current budget shows \$1,000 support for NUFPP scholarships by the region. Should Earle add a line item expense for NUFPP support by the conference? Board is supportive of the message it sends to NUFPP participants.

**A motion is made by Kacee Collard Jarrot and seconded by Richard Monroe to add a \$500 line item to the conference budget for a NUFPP reception in Denver. The motion was unanimously approved.**

5) NPI Update & Budget Presentation –Emily Griffin Overocker

Emily distributed two handouts. The first document was an overview of NPI and tentative schedule. Program will begin on Sunday afternoon and end on Tuesday morning; regional conference starts after lunch. Most NPI participants choose to stay for the conference. Most of NPI will take place in conference hotel, and roommates are paired to save costs. NPI registration fee covers hotel for two nights, all meals and any materials. Proposed rate is \$450.00 (same as Santa Fe).

Emily is budgeting for 20 participants. Fairly simple application and requires letter of support from SSAO and/or supervisor. Emily needs approval for registration rate. It was asked if the participant is local, must they room with colleague? Emily proposes they stay at hotel to take advantage of the full experience. Emily plans to bring A/V equipment and will incorporate NASPA's professional standards in the NPI curriculum.

Discussion on the maximum number of participants for NPI—want to promote attendance to local colleagues but too high of a number creates challenge. Earle and Kris verify the hotel contract is for 30 participants and cannot be changed for Denver. Eric mentions an issue that arises every year—do we require a hotel room as part of the \$450.00 registration fee? MLI may be different due to where the participants are in the profession. It was discussed that more staff may attend if room rate was not included, the possibility of offering two separate registration costs, as well as a commuter-only track. What would this do to the schedule? Regional survey results show members want lower cost options.

**A motion was made by Scott Strawn and seconded by Kacee Collard Jarnot to table the NPI budget as it currently stands, with more discussion tomorrow. The motion was unanimously approved.**

6) Region IV-West Survey results and Strategic Planning – Sam Ortiz

Eric introduces Sam and reviews vision and mission of NASPA. When thinking about our region and about NASPA, professional connections and conversations with colleagues are critical. Sam states our region has never had vision and mission, only goals. Now the region has an opportunity, post consolidation vote, to use our knowledge to move forward. This is an attempt to begin the conversation. Not trying to come up with a strategic plan today, but what changes are important? At the fall advisory board meeting, Sam will join us again to move forward with strategic planning.

Board discussed: 1) How does Region IV-West currently support the vision and mission of NASPA?; 2) What should Region IV-West be doing to support vision and mission of NASPA?; and 3) What are the issues our profession is facing?

Through the exercise, the board should see where the gaps are in order to begin a strategic plan and take to the membership. Recent survey administered to regional membership garnered 194 responses, a 20% response rate. Survey shared that the NASPA national board proposed a list of potential areas for change and innovation. Top three preferred by region were:

- Advocacy for critical issues affecting our campuses and our members (57.9%)
- Continued support to further strengthen NASPA's regions (51.1%)
- Positioning of NASPA's Knowledge Communities to develop new research and knowledge that support student affairs (43.2%)

Survey feedback shows several areas expressed as opportunities to strengthen our organization at regional level.

Board discussed NASPA's six goals for strategic objectives. Some will change as nationally, the strategic plan will change. As a region, board may want to change some of the actual strategic objectives. Principle of supporting our students will not change. As the board sends Eric to the national strategic planning discussions, he needs our voice of what our region wants to see nationally. Their strategic plan can be formed by our voice.

Eric shared our regional survey with the national office before distribution—now other regions are using our format. National meeting should have great information June 20-21, 2011.

Leadership opportunities on board are great for networking, but everyone was in a bit of a holding pattern with the consolidation issue. Now it is our time to engage each other and have quality discussions. Region does some things well and others not—how is our communication? Think strategically about how to share expertise. Tonight's conversations could lead to action items tomorrow.

**Friday, June 3, 8:00am – 12:30pm, Advisory Board Meeting**

7) Opening Discussion – Eric Grospitch

Eric opened day two of our meeting with the question, "As our staff is asked to do more with less, what is being done on campuses to reenergize/refresh staff to show they are appreciated?" Monthly staff development opportunities to reinforce

the team concept; iron chef competition within dining services; annual awards given at state of division meeting; just saying “thanks” to colleagues; making sure others at university include Student Affairs staff in critical planning; continuing to support professional development as long as the staff member is presenting or serving in a role; learning what our younger staff are interested in learning and offering cross-training in-house to build knowledge base; encourage staff to participate in wellness activity during work hours; in-house conferences to network with colleagues; sharing information learned from conferences; off campus entertainment events; making sure everyone has opportunities instead of the same person doing everything; pay attention to interests/strengths and assign projects that match.

8) Regional Membership Coordinator Report & Discussion - Tim Alvarez

Group is currently working with national office to gain access to member email addresses, as well a few other changes to the membership database. Tim’s job is to give the state coordinators information to make outreach easier. One challenge is that our current membership is down to 1,108 as opposed to this time last year when our region was at 1,116. Plan to participate again in newcomer’s orientation at regional conference. Our region typically sees increases just before the regional conference and again before annual conference. Some discussion about reaching out to members who do not renew membership, flagging memberships before they expire and keeping up with colleagues who transition from graduate to professional members. Tim states that 25% of our members are graduate members. Eric reminds the board it is all of our responsibility to recruit. Our goal is to be at 1,200 members.

9) Silent Auction – Eric Grospitch

Eric brings up the idea of adding a silent auction to the regional conference to generate funds for either the region or the conference. Region IV-W has not attempted this event in the past, but other regions host successful auctions. Revenue could go to the NASPA foundation, which funds research, to graduate student scholarships, towards research in region or case study awards. Eric states the board members will need to commit to donating items for the auction. Earle will identify a spot on the schedule for this event and Eric will work on soliciting a volunteer to coordinate.

10) Regional Awards Update – Tisa Mason

Tisa has started a rollover process this year—if a colleague was nominated last year for an award and they did not win, their nominator will have the option to rollover the nomination for the following year. She is moving forward with building her committee with one representative from each state. Last year, there was at least one submission for each category last year, with the exception of the Rising Stars.

Tisa brings forward a new funding request to cover the conference registration fee for the recipients of the University President and the Support Staff Awards. This would equal two complimentary registrations. Currently, the Rising Stars receive free registration, but professional awards do not. For the 2011 conference, it would be \$325 for the each. The group discussed whether recipients would have attended the conference aside from receiving the award. In the past, some recipients have asked for financial support once they are notified of the award. There was additional discussion on utilizing the University President as a speaker or mentor at the conference to enhance their experience versus simply picking up an award. Feedback from regional survey shows SSAO’s are looking for more from the conference; this may provide a unique opportunity. Question was raised, should the board be offering this support to all award recipients? The national model is able to do this, but the cost would be high for the region.

**A motion was made by Pablo Mendoza and seconded by Jerry Mason for the region to cover the registration fee for the recipient of the Support Staff Award. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**A motion was made by Ruth Stoner and seconded by Larry Lofton for the region to support the recipient of the University President Award up to amount of food cost only.** Some asked for interpretation. Eric states this would cover the cost of attending the meal provided at the awards reception. If they stay for conference, the region could then cover their registration fee. So, the region should be prepared to pay up to the full amount. A friendly amendment was made for the University President to have the option to decline the waiver, but that may be an awkward conversation for the Awards Chair to have.

With a motion on the floor, the group discussed funding the University President up to the amount of a full conference registration, including food costs, with Awards Chair coordinating. Tisa will adjust the award letter for the University President to mention our desire for their engagement at the conference, as this may entice them to attend. It was suggested the board continue to examine support for award recipients. **A hand vote was taken in regards to the motion—28 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion was passed.**

**A motion was made by Matt Brinton and seconded by Nathan Roberts to comp registration fees for all individual award recipients and for one representative from the institution receiving a group award.** Estimate of \$2,500 to cover it all. The group discussed that most recipients can fund themselves and to consider how the region could sustain this over time. This would not be a temporary initiative, but rather a long-term piece of the awards. It was suggested we look for a sponsor for our awards. Some board members were not prepared to vote for this motion. It was recommended the awards committee work on various options to present at November meeting. **A motion was made by Pablo Mendoza and seconded by Beau Johnson to table this discussion pending the awards committee reporting back in November, clarifying that no changes will be made for the Denver conference.** Tisa recommends her committee waits to discuss until the March 2012 meeting so that the committee may garner feedback from recipients after the Denver conference. Two other motions (University President and Support Staff) have passed and will go into effect for the Denver conference. **Eric states the motion is to table the discussion on further funding of awards until the March or Summer 2012 board meetings. 29 in favor, 1 opposes and 1 abstention. The motion was passed.**

11) Sponsorship Report—Dusten Crichton

The region has currently secured \$14,500 in sponsorships for the Denver conference and the goal is \$15,000. A form has been created for our Web site for interested sponsors to indicate interest. The form provides the breakdown of sponsorship levels. Board members who are contacted individually should refer the interested party to Dusten. There are only 14 spots for exhibits at the Denver conference. Eric reminds the board to thank sponsors for attending in November. Dusten also mentions the possibility of securing a sponsor for NPI since costs are so high.

12) Communication Workgroup Report—Kristen Abell

Transitioning into new roles—Laura Page and Richard Monroe are in new positions and Ruth Stoner is outgoing. Kristen and Richard are exploring new formats for the newsletter and offering on a more frequent basis. Dianne Burrig, our Historian, sent 2 boxes of documents to archives. Kristen will continue as IT coordinator for the region, and is looking at graduate students to do more social media in the region. The region will also have a Twitter account. Matt Brinton distributed a handout showing a suggested template for our regional Web site. The workgroup will consider new ideas and balance what our national office will allow. September 15<sup>th</sup> is the next submission deadline for regional newsletter, and Richard will send information.

13) NPI Report (continued from day one)—Emily Griffin Overocker

After further review, NPI would need to charge \$550.00 for registration to break even, including going off-site for most meals. It would be nice to keep the tradition \$450.00 registration rate to be consistent, but will need \$2,000 from sponsorships or elsewhere. The board would need to be prepared to support NPI for up to \$2,000 in the event it is not secured elsewhere. It is mentioned that keeping a \$450.00 registration fee consistent for 5 years is not reflective of our economy. Would moving to \$475.00 help? A separate track for commuter participants is brought up again, but Emily states that is not feasible for the 2011 program.

**A motion is made by Pablo Mendoza and seconded by Scott Strawn to increase the NPI registration fee to \$475.00 with an additional \$2,000 of support from board if sponsorship funds are not secured. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**A motion is made by Pablo Mendoza and seconded by Richard Monroe to establish a \$575.00 NPI registration rate for non-NASPA members. The motion was unanimously approved.**

New board members request clarification on important items for the region. Eric should have full list at November meeting, but the board may need to prioritize. It is suggested a letter be send to all SSAO's to outline our priorities so they may earmark funds. Some board members will review our leadership manual after our strategic plan is established, and may establish a presentation to be sent to new advisory board members, linking them to the leadership manual.

14) New Initiatives—Eric Gropitch

The current budget shows a line item of \$5,000 to fund new initiatives. This may be earmarked for specific projects or for members to apply for use. Currently, a proposal has been submitted to Eric for the funding of research grants. The total would be (three) \$500 research grants for students, staff or faculty. Would the board like to add a \$1,500 line item for this initiative? Board members express a wish for the research data to later be presented at a regional conference, or at least to

the board. After much discussion, it appears the board is not ready to vote on the research piece. Moving forward with regional goals and priorities may help in this discussion. The board will discuss at November meeting.

Revisiting our priorities for 2011-2012, Eric states that so far, they are the NUFPP program, graduate students and research.

Additional items are: access and involvement; drive in workshops; KC initiatives; underrepresented groups (more clarification needed on who this entails—LGBT, first generation, women, people of color, disability); technology; structure programming tracks at conference; mentoring and networking opportunities; outreach to community colleges (especially in regards to institutional memberships) and faculty outreach—Others?

Eric proposes a new budget be sent to board via email. At the November meeting, the board could actually vote on specific projects/initiatives that will come out of the \$5,000. Or, the Executive Committee could make decisions on how to spend \$5,000 as items arise.

**A motion was made by Scott Strawn and seconded by Beau Johnson to incorporate the \$5,000 into our regional budget, publicize our regional priorities and empower the Executive Committee to make the allocation decisions. The motion was unanimously approved.**

It is suggested that feedback/needs from our survey results be included in the priorities. When Eric sends out the new budget, he will include the list of priorities established at this summer meeting.

**A motion is made by Pablo Mendoza and seconded by Kacee Collard Jarnot that the \$1,500 research initiative be the first to come out of the \$5,000 for new initiatives.** After discussion regarding a desire for more specifics on the program, the motion is withdrawn.

15) Voting – Eric Grospitch

Currently, graduate members and associate members are not allowed to vote in NASPA. This issue was discussed a lot during the consolidation voting, and Region IV-W actually proposed changes to this format years ago with no success. During the last national board conference call, Eric put forth a motion to allow graduate and associate members to vote in national and regional elections. The proposal was accepted unanimously, but the regions must vote. NASPA has put together talking points for this issue.

To clarify, this bylaw amendment would propose that graduate and associate members be allowed to vote for President and RVP elections only. Professional members only could vote for bylaw changes.

The board discussed the benefits and challenges of this change. It would move the association towards a more democratic process. Criticisms are the numbers and the idea that an individual running for office could stack the deck. This hasn't proven to be a problem given our past leadership. It is suggested there be two separate votes for 1) graduate members and 2) associate members. The national board is looking to Region IV-West to lead the discussion on vocalizing why this is important.

16) Accommodation Needs

**Referring to an item brought up on day one by Joie Williams, a motion was made by Larry Lofton and seconded by Matt Brinton to add a line item to the budget to cover accommodation needs moving forward. The motion is amended to clarify the support be \$1,500. The motion was unanimously approved.**

17) 2012 Conference Update—Tim Alvarez

The 2012 regional conference will be held in Rapid City, South Dakota. Hotel rates will be approximately \$95 per night. The hotel is looking to offer unique opportunities given the geography. Board members are encouraged to share our excitement about Rapid City. Alex Gonzalez and Lois Flagstaff will co-chair conference. Reuben Perez will chair MLI.

Eric states that we used a free service called Experient to locate hotels and put together packages for the regional conference options. Moving forward, board members need to determine what is important to our members—a downtown location versus outside of town and our priorities in relation to costs. In addition, reasons for hosting the conference in November versus the summer months. The board will discuss 2013 conference options at March 2012 meeting.

18) Closing Remarks – Eric Grospitch

Eric recognizes Jerry Mason as the outgoing Community College rep and Ruth Stoner as the Communications Workgroup Chair and longtime advisory board member.

October 9th is the deadline to book hotel rooms for Denver. The next advisory board meeting begins on October 31<sup>st</sup> at approximately 1:00 pm. The Executive Committee needs to submit reports to Eric by June 10<sup>th</sup>. Eric closes the meeting.

Minutes prepared and submitted by Laura Page, Secretary. A copy of these minutes and accompanying handouts are filed in the Historian file. Corrections to these minutes should be sent to Laura at:

University of Missouri  
S1 Memorial Union  
Columbia, MO 65211  
Phone (573) 884-9933; Fax (573) 884-0646  
E-Mail: [pagel@missouri.edu](mailto:pagel@missouri.edu)