Board of Directors Meeting #3

July 12-13, 1997

A meeting of the Board of Directors (BOD) of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers AACRAO) was held Saturday, July 12, 1997 in the Grand Tradition Room of the Chicago Hilton and Towers in Chicago, Illinois. President Fred Fresh called the BOD meeting to order at 8:26 a.m., Central Standard Time (CST)

Board of Directors members present included:
Fred Fresh, President
Paul Anderson, President-Elect
Kathy Plante, Past President
Diana Guerrero, Vice President, Group I
Enrollment Management, Admissions and Financial Aid
Johnny Johnson, Vice President, Group II
International Education
Faith Weese, Vice President, Group Iii
Registration and Records Management
Heather Smith, Vice President, Group IV
Professional Development, Research and Publications
Louise Lonabocker, Vice President, Group V
Regional Associations and Institutional Issues
Melanie Moore Bell, Secretary-Treasurer

AACRAO National Office Staff present included:
Wayne Becraft, Executive Director
Roger Swanson, Associate Executive Director
Cecilia Balazs, Assistant Executive Director
Henny Wakefield, Assistant Executive Director

Guest:
Michael Dolence

President Fresh asked the BOD to read Reports and Information Items available in Agenda Item 1, if they have not already done so.

Discussion of Transformation
Actions at Annual Meeting
and Next Steps with Michael Dolence
(Strategic Plan A.I.a)
Agenda Item 2

President Fresh reported that we cut on the full-blown transformation and took it from a common starting point rather than a "from scratch" approach on transformation with committee chairs during the Leadership Conference. He thinks we did get good feedback and we want to get some feedback from Dolence about where we are, what he hears, and his suggestions about the future. Dolence asked the BOD what they thought of our discussion on transformation went? Dolence asked if this was an appropriate approach at this time? Guerrero responded that when the different groups reviewed different topics it was better than rehashing the same issue. Some of the committee chairs could not put the two roles of leadership and transformation together. Some were concerned where the leadership institute was. Dolence said where is the leadership? Guerrero thinks that a better description up front would have explained more as to why they were there. Dolence said he overhead a conversation with an individual asking, "Is this a leadership institute?" The response from another individual was, "Yes, you are the AACRAO leadership." Johnson said that several people he were unclear as to the function of the July meeting. He understood that leadership development was one function of the July meeting, but none of the state and regional reps were present so an important part was missing. If we went solidly and across the board leadership that is an important ingredient and it was missing. It was more focused on committee activities. Weese asked Plante about the past practice of inviting state and regional presidents to the Leadership Conference? Plante responded that we took a regional and invited them to Washington, D.C. in February but it was not getting out to all state and regional leaders and that is why we moved to a format where we have the premeeting program for them. (Lonabocker arrived at 8:30 a.m.) Johnson said that he was thinking back on the Business Meeting that they had a few days before the Annual Meeting and they were on the defensive, whereas, if the chairs had ten months in advance, they have that ten months to spread the word about what the issues are. Smith said that it is quite clear that we do not articulate to the chairs that our expectations are for more than just putting together a program, but that the committee should be thinking why they are offering that program. Maybe we should tell them more that they are in a leadership role and what our expectations are. Weese said that we need to clarify more up front; they did finally connect. Dolence said that his sense was that people were not uncomfortable dealing with the issues but did not necessarily see how the issues interfaced with the leadership function of AACRAO. There seemed to be a "why are we having this discussion" look. They seemed to be task oriented in terms of AACRAO functions rather than concept oriented in terms of what is going to fund AACRAO and how does the association prepare the profession to meet those challenges. It did not appear to him to be a level playing field in terms of people's perspective about what was going on and what should be going on. President Fresh said that we had toyed around with some scoping and it turned out to be a communication. He read from a handout: "To provide an opportunity to develop organization leadership by involving potential leaders in professional development activities. These activities shall serve the members by exposure to issues related to the involvement in trends in higher education. They shall serve the association by assessment of the projects for achieving strategic planning goals and by inputting into the evolution or transformation of the association." It was a goal to have folk here. We did not communicate that very well. Dolence said that people are arguing about that goal. He 100 thinks in this stage of the evolution that what we are going through as an Association, while painful, is not rare. He wishes it were. It is a journey, not a destination. There are critical junctures where things come to a head and then something happens and the group is perplexed and then they move on with each one of them. Transformation is a painful process. Plante said that we do not do a good job telling them they are leaders and they do not recognize themselves as leaders. Dolence said that there is not consensus that AACRAO's role is to lead a group of professionals. He thinks we have a split in what the role of the Association is. He does not think that this is an old guard, new guard situation. He thinks there are just as many young folk in there that have a difference of opinion about what AACRAO is all about. He thinks that the BOD has a very strong opinion that AACRAO is at a critical juncture in the evolution and development of higher ed and that asserting this role in higher education is important. He is not sure that the members get the same sense of urgency that we need to do that. He thinks that a lot of the folks in the room did not have the same impact with the transformational forces. He thinks that the admissions folk have more sensitivity toward transformation forces only because they run that annual cycle where they are out beating their heads against everyone else. Those that are not out there on the street looking at what other people are doing and are not confronted with how difficult it is to bring in the class Admissions officers, it is very easy for them to get rolled into complacency. Guerrero said that different professions within AACRAO have different perspectives. Dolence said that it is endemic that we are not one more than one professional group aggregated into a professional association. International is different from admissions, which is different from registrar, which is different from technocrats, etc. There are very different enclaves of individuals with very different perspectives. He is not sure which one perspective binds them all together other than the future of higher ed and being able to transition into the 21st Century. Becraft shared that some believe strongly that AACRAO is a nuts and bolts/practices organization, not policy in the arena. Dolence offered that is just the perfect one to look at the juxtaposition and different philosophies. He has heard that a number of times also and at the same time when he said "it is time that practitioners sit at the policy table" at the Annual Meeting, there seemed to be overwhelming support for the concept. Having practitioners at the table when things are written into laws is an extraordinary benefit to the person who is actually putting the policies on paper. There are a lot of nuances in law that only the practitioner interprets. He does not think that we are of one mind that it is urgent that we sit at the policy table. It is not the intention to let some of this stuff be promulgated without us being able to step up to the policy table. Smith said that she thinks that it is quite clear that Dolence can say that we need to step up to the table, but she does not think that they know in many situations how to go about that without taking large risks. Many of them are not willing to take some of those risks. Dolence asked what are some of those risks? Smith responded that admissions people are in a risk position every semester to account for their numbers. Unless there is a financial crush or changes in management, such as the president, registrars are not in that risk type of position. They see that their positions have somewhat been eroded but they have no idea how to gain back what they lost. We need to figure out ways to get back to that primacy position. Becraft shared that there were people at the meeting who indicated that they did not have a primacy role at their institution. Dolence said that there were just as many who indicated that they were in a primacy role. He said that is another fragmentation where a registrar is not a registrar. There are different types and are used differently within different types of institutions. We do not have the same frame of reference among the profession about the professional role they play either on their campus, or in the state or regional arenas. Becraft wondered how much is based on the perception of that person in the role, particularly with the risk issue, so they are not willing to step out? Dolence said that he worked with people from institutions yesterday and he said that having sat with presidents and vice presidents, faculty, and deans that the perspectives expressed in the room were not the perspectives that they are carried by the campuses. That is his first hand knowledge. Dolence said that is a very consistent thing in how we perceive our roles, it is not how institutions perceive it. Weese said that she has heard individuals express this past year that they are not comfortable on their campuses. It is the environment we are living in. It is what is happening with transformation that individuals are denying that it is happening. It is really hard to change. There are pressures that we have not had before. She said that she has experienced this. we expect that our Association that we have been with for years, to give us that comfort level that they are in the same mode of change and it is not comfortable there either. Dolence added that they expect to come to AACRAO for their comfort zone and AACRAO is in transition also and that causes discomfort. Weese said that is why the name thing just went nutso! It is a time thing. It is not something that will happen over night. It will come with communication over a period of time and determination that we are going to get in there and do it. She is talking about Association issues that will give them a sense of comfort. Dolence observed that these are uncertain times, for sure. President Fresh said that he sensed a shift in mood. Dolence indicated that he did not sense a shift in mood but he sensed that these issues have to be dealt with. He does not think that we have one mind on how these are to be dealt with. Almost the process is more important than the product and is not inconsistent from what is happening on our campuses. He did not get a lot of blocking signals to transformation. What he got was that many are not comfortable with the process. It is easier to blame process than it is the substance of it. It is difficult to argue when we see 50 virtual universities that we are going to have to respond to conceptually even if we do not change anything in the institutions. We are at least going to have to evaluate, analyze, and see what impact that is going to have. It is easier to blame process when we are confronted with some of those fundamental shifts. Smith said that we encounter the process everyday at our institutions and now the Association is involved in the process. Dolence said that the efforts that the BOD used to communicate, such as the items put out for discussion, the White Papers, the discussion papers, and the constant kind of feeding of the discussion were extensive. We know now that it was an erroneous interpretation that it was out there and it must be very well understood and people are anxious because we did not get a negative reaction. In reality what he heard was it was an accumulation of the material and no one realized that this was the discussion. They thought that the discussion was going to happen after that material was shared. Dolence's interpretation was that the question was called out of sequence and out of order before the discussions happened. In actuality, we mistook communication for discussion when we pushed the materials out to the membership. It was pointed out very crisply that it was a one-way dialogue and not two-way dialogue. It was perceived as a one-way dialogue when in actuality what was happening was to provoke a two-way dialogue. He thinks that we have had no major shifts since April. People came to him and said that we made a big error and that we should have passed a lot of that stuff. We focus those who did not vote in favor of those things more than we need to. What we need to do is ask why was this the perspective. The question was called out of sequence in their minds and if he thought a question is called out of sequence, he would bristle, too. That was the major error. He does not sense a lack of willingness to continue the transformation. He is not hearing anyone saying that we need to stop the transformation. Lonabocker reported that individuals want to be more involved, such as with the reorganization of the BOD and the committees. They would have liked to have the reorganization at this meeting and give them a change to talk about it. If that comes up for vote at the Annual Meeting, we are in big trouble because that is another example of us saying that they are a part of the leadership but yet here this is from us. Fresh said that he guarantees that it will not happen that way because whatever we arrive at today will be a major item for the regional visits. Plante reminded the BOD that she made a comment earlier that the membership is not moving as fast as the BOD. If we act on the proposal, if we spend the next full year selling it and it is 1999 before we vote on it, that is almost okay. They will have several opportunities to hear it in several venues, such as the leadership conference next year and to discuss it with state and regional officers before it is put to a vote. (Swanson arrived at 8:47 a.m.) Dolence said that what they are reacting to is that they do not want to feel that they have been sold. It is not so subtle a piece; they do not want the proposal put to bed before they have had time to discuss it. The sense he got that it was done in a smoke filled room without any smoke and then sold to us rather than we being able to participate in the discussion. Plante said that there are people that are afraid of tomorrow and that was very eye opening. People do not realize what is in the future, just like talking about virtual learning for half a day and several individuals were saying that will not affect them. Plante says that it does. Dolence said that we need to stop preaching and start engaging people in the fundamentals. The problem that I have is that there are things that slow down the process, such as the voting procedure. The voting item was to streamline the process; it was not perceived as a way to take their voice off the table. With the scene set, we cannot deal with that again for a whole year. We can sit at this table and say that we cannot take three years to make this decision but the membership will not move in less than three years; that is the uncomfortable place for the BOD. Dolence said that one of the frustrations that was laid out at his first meeting with the BOD was that we understood that massive changes were taking place and we were not moving at a pace that helps us to keep up much less get ahead of the changes. Lonabocker said that then we were starting at square zero and now we are more in the mode of continuing quality improvement. Dolence sees evidence that the Annual Meeting and the things we have done over the last year and a half really have moved the Association; people are understanding that something has to happen. Some members say that their institutions were safe. No one he talked to was against AACRAO moving ahead. In that term, there was progress. President Fresh asked Dolence to take the reorganization of the BOD and walk the BOD through it. Dolence said he thinks that if we put a proposal out to reorganize the BOD, that will be a big mistake. He would put out two or three proposals to frame the discussion. He suggested one that takes it this way, one that takes it another way, one that advances this kind of methodology and one that advances another kind of methodology. Lay out to the members that we really are looking at the reorganization with an analytical approach. No one understands how much time that the BOD spends really thinking about the organization. Put out an array of recommendations that illustrate difference approaches, then have an open invitation to debate to work those and put those recommendations to every committee and the state and regionals that we have. He would not put out one proposal because it would be perceived as a sell job. He suggested that we articulate that there are 100 points to be dealt within a reorganization of the BOD and the committee structure. If we do too much of an executive summary and then ask the members to buy into it, we are courting disaster. Everyone needs to understand that there is a lot of detail to consider. For example, in reorganization the BOD, the issue of being able to play a policy role is an important element and issue for the BOD. Let's hear a discussion on this. What does policy mean? States are losing 85% of their policy purview, right now. The minute you have virtual learning crossing state boundaries and it cannot be regulated by state agencies, all the purview that they applied to state master planning, regulations, rules, authenticating the learning institution, is mute. That is all going away. The only thing that they can assert then is rules and regulations on state financial aid. Because you can do business in a state without being licensed in the state the minute they go virtual and they cannot stop it. That has to be laid on the table. That means that the Association is going to have a lot more say in the evolution and development of policy. Committee structure historically has been to do the functions of AACRAO. We have asked for a subtle but very important transition for the committees to begin feed that policy route and feed the substantive areas and not the day-to-day, nitty gritty of operating the Association. That needs to be laid out that is of the elements that needs to be debated. There will be lots of folks that react negatively to that because they do not understand the larger context. With the process of running the organization, you as the BOD recognize that if we do not get a mechanism to operate in a more rapid fashion, we are sunk because initiatives can happen and come to fruition and it will kill us before we can even bring it to the membership. The issue in the membership got to be who was controlling the association, not how fast are we responding to critical issues at the federal level or at the state level. The sheer commitment that an individual needs to make when going on the BOD is the one of time and that needs to be laid on the table. He thinks that it is anecdotally known that the BOD members commit a major portion of their time to BOD work. He said that he works for a lot of associations and there is no other association that he knows out of the 30-35 he works with that require the kind of commitment that the AACRAO BOD requires. President Fresh asked what is the difference? Dolence responded that most boards are policy boards only. Ninety percent of the paper that this BOD gets, the other boards will not get at all. He does not know boards that get the whole budget. He is not saying that is right or wrong, good or bad. He is just observing that fundamentally the kind of organization that operates differently and when you try to change those rules of operation, those rule changes have to be made conceptually before you make a proposal. Johnson says that he can visualize this and that the BOD has way too much info, the membership has too little. An example is Guerrero's reorganization grid. If the grid is placed in the Date Dispenser, many members will just go to their affected area or committee and carrying that a little further, if we have 100 points most will glaze over like they do the budget. Plante said that we also have all the options that have been talked about. Dolence suggested we look at a quarterly discussion tempo. We have the research; we have the Data Dispenser; we have the reorganization grid. We are not using all of them effectively. Dolence recommended that we look at quarters of time and say that we are going to discuss issues related to reorganizing the BOD. Declare the discussion open. Here are the 100 elements that are feeding the need to make the change. The discussion is now open and here is how members participate. Members can send us a letter and here is how to address the letter. Members can get on the listserv and be part of the Listserv. Members can work through the committee chairs. Give them the framework for the discussion and set a time frame for the discussion. Heavily report that the discussion commenced on April 1 and closed on September 1 and now some group is pulling that discussion together to make a proposal or a series of proposals that will then go back for discussion. The Data Dispenser is produced often enough where we can actually open the discussion and start getting the discussion moving. We did not previously declare the issues open for discussion. Lonabocker said that what members find very valuable is the opportunity to talk about it. She thinks that the most valuable thing we have is the Town Meeting or the Roundtable because that is where members come to an agreement or closure and all the movers and shakers are there. There is no other opportunity to get that to happen; we cannot get that to happen just on the Listserv. We can get part of the way there on the listserv but not all the way as would occur in an open forum of discussion. Dolence said that then we are on an annual cycle. Weese asked why could not we expand that to state and regionals appropriately? Lonabocker responded that in some instances in the state and regionals maybe there are only five that really care and they do not have a chance to hear all the other voices. CACRAO is completely different. Johnson said that at least each quarter people would see progress, movement and direction and they would be a part of the process. We do not have that broad input now. Everything is decided on the spur of the moment. Dolence said that the other problem is that in previous years when we have done that, no one shows up. He says at least some people showed up this year. Plante said they will be there now! Lonabocker added especially when the issues are lively, they will come. Plante suggested that it needs to be named Town Meeting. Becraft said that some things can be done one way and some another. Something relative minor might be handled a different way from those issues that are substantial. Smith asked about introducing the reorganization of the BOD and committees to committee chairs today? President Fresh responded no. Plante said we need to jump fast but we need to temper it. Becraft suggested that we invite input. Dolence would lay out the proposal that in order for Association to address the professional needs that AACRAO represents, we have to look at modifications to structure and lay out some of what the elements of change are, for example, a transition of the BOD from an operations BOD to a policy BOD is a significant issue. People will say what does that mean and what are the implications. We have to look at reorganizing the committees because the committees have to play a different role if AACRAO is going to move toward the policy focus. President Fresh said they will be getting feedback on the strategic plan and the interface between the committees and the plan. Plante emphasized that the timing is not good. It is not the right time. Smith said that is the issue; we need to plant the seed. The discussion needs to be here and they need to know that there are leaders in the organization who believe in the reorganization. Plante responded that they can get that in a letter that we want their continued involvement and here are some things that they need to be involved in, such as committee structure and board structure. Smith says that gives another indication that the committee chairs have been present for two days, they have gone through the institute, and they have worked and there is not one BOD member that is saying "thank you." The committee chairs say that the BOD has gone off into their corner and they have not been actively engaged and involved and that may be a way to start breaking that barrier down instead of giving the impression that we take the feedback and you are the representing committee chairs representing committee members. President Fresh said that he needs to write letters to people that were in attendance and say that here is what we heard and this is what we are going to do about it. We have to do something to bring closure to the fact that the committee chairs were here. Plante added that we need to show them that their time was well spent. Smith suggested that it would take only five minutes for a member of the BOD to say, "Look folks, you worked hard this week. We appreciate what you do for the Association. You are the leaders of the Association. You are going to present a program to your colleagues for all the work that you have done." Guerrero suggested that it would be helpful to spend at least an hour with them at the end of the conference. She felt that she did not have enough time with them as a group. Dolence asked if we were listening to ourselves? We are discussing the reason why you have to restructure all this. Plante said that a part of what is happening now is the reason for the program committee. Smith thinks the program committee is good. We all sat in leadership positions and now we have walked out of it and they will not see a BOD member until April or state and regionals. Guerrero suggested looking at their committees and seeing if they need to exist. If they were asked to think about it, then they might suggest combining some committees. Smith suggested that we reinforce that. Dolence suggested that it needed more than reinforcement, the communication pattern needs attention by the BOD. He thinks we need to establish a pattern that every single member can say that the BOD does not act until the following things happen and they are comfortable that the following things will happen. We do not intend to blind side them but that is how they perceive what happened. The other lesson we learned is that just publishing that stuff is not enough. We need to anchor that feedback and step up the pace. Plante offered that she is not sure how fast we can step up the pace. Smith said that we did not do it too fast, we just did not incorporate enough people fast enough. Dolence said that he thinks that we made changes and people did not understand what the changes were. We got really aggressive about commuting things out and he thinks that we did not articulate that wanted feed back. We did not say "read this" and get back to us. We said, "Here it is." The message did not ask for feedback from members now. That is why we accused we were accused of one-way communication. We were using the print media because it was there, not because we wanted to cut their discussion. We expected that the members would not be shy and if they had a reaction that they would get back to us. We did not say, "This is for feedback," and then give them a time frame for feedback. Becraft said that some of the articles did ask for feedback. Dolence responded that it did not invite feedback in the way I am saying. It was inviting feedback but it did not say that this is the discussion and that members' responses can change the destiny of this piece. Therefore, members thought that there would be discussion at the Annual Meeting and it will be discussed there. The stuff on the vote went out and then the February Data Dispenser went out and all of a sudden it was coming for a vote. Then members are asking, "Where did the discussion go?" No one intended that. It was trying to move things along with an aggressive pace and to get action at the Annual Meeting. He thinks we need to change the tempo. President Fresh asked Dolence as he was wrapping up to address the issues such as voting and budgeting and to identify any that are dead. Dolence responded that none of the background that was used to put those proposals together is dead. One of the things he heard from registrars again and again was that instructional management was misunderstood greatly and when it is explained that the purpose was to elevate the role of the registrar, the registrars he talked to said, "That was not clear and did not come through that discussion. I now see the logic; I do not know if I agree with it or not. I did not understand the proposal or why the proposal was there." People did not understand that the primary force to change the name of the Association was not to remove registrar but the word "American." Dolence told those he talked with that the primary reason for the name change was to assert global leadership and the individuals 500 responded that it did not come through that way. Why did not we just drop American? That would have passed. Why did registrar have to be dropped? The instructional management domain was an avid point of discussion by the BOD and we were still digesting it as we went into the Annual Meeting. When people, that were adamantly opposed to some of those issues, got involved in the discussions, the discussion is really substantive. They just did not get that and would say, "I just did not get that; all I saw was the registrar change. It did not occur to me that American was dropped. If American was dropped, why is it still AACRAO?" Becraft said that a lot of what Dolence just said was what he heard at the Alabama AACRAO meeting. Dolence said that he did not think that the membership rejected the concepts, he thinks that people did not understand the logic, rational, and intent. It became a political debate, not an issues debate. Johnson offered that if this was repackaged under the Task Force 2000, which is what he heard, then members were thinking that they did not have to do anything now but that they could wait until the report comes out in December 97 and that implementation would occur after the year 2000. Dolence said that he cautions us that we have to stop the ten-year outlook. That is the cycle that has to change. AACRAO 2000 has to be the last ten-year look. We need to have one year looks! Things are moving so fast that we cannot wait ten years. Ten years from now higher ed will look different from now. Becraft offered that what happened was that the Task Force 2000 was appointed and publicized and then this whole other effort went forward and it was viewed as the BOD undercutting the membership activity of the Task Force 2000. Fresh asked for more burning questions that should be addressed while Dolence was in attendence. There were none. President Fresh addressed the idea of a decision cycle: that we announce issues and propose discussion timetables; identify issues with options; have discussion through various channels such as listservs, etc.; summarize that and perhaps send it back around; and then set up single issues in Fireside Chats, etc. to bring members in and give them opportunities to deal with the issues face-to-face; summarize that discussion; and then take to the membership for votes. This puts it into a two-year cycle if the vote can only occur at the Annual Meeting. If we can propose the voting as one of these issues and discuss that at the Annual Meeting and then put it out for a vote to all the membership by another mechanism. Dolence offered that once we get that framework, then people can understand why we want to have a different voting pattern. They will understand what voting options are and why the BOD might propose many more points throughout the year. Becraft said that the biggest issue is the need for discussion as Lonabocker and Smith have so strongly emphasized. The biggest question is how to provide that discussion? President Fresh said we lay out discussion opportunities up front. Dolence said that the problem is that discussion and vote happens in the same Annual Meeting only once a year. That means that if the issue is discussed this year then we cannot vote on it until next year. That is the problem that we discussed when we laid the voting alternatives. We had this great discussion and it would be nice that within 90 days after having the discussion at the Annual Meeting to be able to vote by ballot and bring closure before the next fiscal year. The membership heard we were taking their vote away. Becraft said that the other issue was one of letting all those people vote who do not come to Annual Meeting and did not hear the discussion. President Fresh thanked Dolence for his contributions. We have a roadmap. We have the issues. He expressed appreciation for what Dolence had done during the Leadership Conference and for the BOD. BOD members asked Dolence to say "hello" to the Princess, the Queen, and the Prince.

The BOD broke for a five-minute break, 9:25 a.m.-9:30 a.m.

President Fresh shifted the agenda to the financial issue due to the crisis situation and how we are going to deal with the finances and the other decisions that come up. Bell presented the financial picture and identified to the BOD that the financial statements and documents that accompanied the Agenda already reflect some cuts. Earlier, she distributed a three-page report of financial concerns. She reported that an Administrative Committee composed of President Fresh, Plante, Anderson, Becraft, and Balazs and she had already had two working sessions this week to come up with some proposals on how to deal with the financial crisis. Bell emphasized that this situation has materialized since the Annual Meeting and as we deceived the June Balance Sheet. Here is Bell's Secretary/Treasurer's Report dated July 10, 1997:

"A grave financial situation has materialized since the April 1997 Annual Meeting in Salt Lake City. I have some real concerns about the Balance Sheet and the Budget and I have outlined these concerns here.

1) I was dismayed when I saw the $351,815 deficit for the '97 Fiscal Year identified on line 72 of the "Statement of Cash Flows FY97." It would be extremely difficult to report to the membership at next April's Annual Meeting that we overspent the Budget by more than $200,000.

2) When comparing our Investment Portfolio of $267,006 presented on the top of page 1 of the June 30, 1997 Provisional Balance Sheet with $573,000 on the June 30, 1996 Balance Sheet, we have $300,000 in Reserves. We owe an additional $200,000 that we did not own last year. (Refer to June 30, 1997 Provisional Balance Sheet, page 3, Current Liabilities, Nations Bank Line of Credit.) When I subtract $200,000 from $267,006, AACRAO has only $67,006 in its Portfolio because we owe the remaining monies. Do we want to be in this situation? What can we do about it? We must set up a plan to recover!

3) What is status of summits? Registrations are currently at 42. What is the expected revenue?

4) I am very concerned that the June 30, 1997 Provisional Balance Sheet, page 3, shows $9,650 in "unearned summit revenue" and we have already spent $120,492.

5) Why were there over expenditures for the Salt Lake City Annual Meeting? The Statement of Revenue and Expense for period ending June 30, 1997, page 4, shows that we increased the budget for the Salt Lake City Annual Meeting from $310,000 to $403,000 in December 1996. Look at how much was spent, $408,730 ($5,680 over the revised budget)! What caused the Salt Lake City meeting to be so far over budget?

6) Look at the revenue for Salt Lake City Annual Meeting on the Provisional Statement of Revenue and Expense for period ending June 30, 1997, page 11 and note that the

original revenue budget was set at $469,400. This was changed in December 1996 to $537,950. Now compare the revenue brought in at $521,349; this is $16,601 under budget. This was under budget in revenue and we are over in expenses due to the workshops.

7) Note that $40,000 has been cut from vice presidents' Budget by Program FY96 through FY2OO1. There are no funds for carry forward items.

My recommendation is that we need to work together as a team very quickly to determine how to correct this financial crisis and give direction to Becraft.

Bell reported that the Administrative Committee asked Becraft and Balazs to identify priorities for cutting the budget and these were displayed on a large sheet of paper taped on the wall. It was a very painful process for Becraft and Balazs to go through and we need the BOD's help in working toward a solution to this budget crisis. Becraft indicated that he and Balazs identified budget cuts in priority order as they would impact the Association and services to members. Bell noted that the first five items totaling $72,068 were things that could be cut immediately.

AACRAO Financial Recovery Plan

1. $10,000 Rent
2. 10,000 Video Project at Annual Meeting
3. 5,818 One issue of Data Dispenser
4. 16,250 One issue of College & University
5. 30,000 Professional Fees
6. $28,750 Marketing Administrative Assistant
7. Professional Development:
    a) 20,000 Savings on Travel
    b) 11,000 Five New FERPA Workshops
    c) 27,600 Meetings Assistant
    d) 5,000 Temporaries
    e) 6,376 Leadership Conference
    f) 1,964 New Adm. Office Workshop
8. 10,000 Committee Activities Cuts
9. 32,200 OIES Administrative Assistant
10. 32,200 Marketing Manager
11. 10,000 BOD Expenses-February Meeting
12. 89,050 Standards Council
13. Government Relations:
    a) 18,090 Assistant
    b) 30,820 Director
14. Two Operating Staff:
    a) 87,500 AED
    b) 53,750 Accountant
15. 111,123 Revised Budget Surplus

Smith commented that when she looked over the budget she was surprised to see that both C&U and Data Dispenser were over budget last year. We need to tighten that up and that would have been one of her recommendations earlier. Bell asked Becraft to go through each item on the Financial Recovery Plan and share his observations:

Item 1. Becraft indicated that this is cutting the square feet by $10,000 in the move of the National Office to the fifth floor.

Item 2. The plan for the Annual Meeting budget was to provide big screen video projection of the keynote and plenary 671 speeches. Plante suggested that corporate sponsorship be sought to cover this cost. Becraft indicated that Datatel might be interested.

Item 3. One issue of the Data Dispenser is possible by going back to eight pages. There use to be 12 issues of the newsletter and it had already been cut back to ten. We did 11 this year and the additional one was to be for the summits, then the summits were canceled and by then it was already in motion.

Item 4. One issue of C&U could be cut.

Item 5. Professional fees were to enhance our system to be able to do direct data entry from the Web into the database. We had a proposal submitted for this.

Item 6. We have an individual in the Administrative Assistant position in the Marketing Department that would be laid-off.

Item 7a. Fifteen Student-Right-To-Know Workshops were planned and we planned on sending a person to each one. Now we are proposing to obtain someone locally to coordinate the local arrangements so that travel expenses could be omitted. Smith asked about the possibility of scheduling these workshops around the state and regional meetings. Becraft indicated that two had been scheduled around state and regional meetings. NCS is doing these with us. We clustered them three a week connecting them geographically so that someone could fly to Los Angeles and then do one in San Francisco and one in Portland or Seattle.

Item 7b. Based on what had been budgeted before for each FERPA Workshop, plus the one that was held in Chicago two days ago with 260 participants, we had budgeted for 100 participants for the workshops. So going conservative, we can cut $11,000.

Item 7c and 7d. These were canceled.

Item 7e and 7f. These two workshops and conferences were proposed and the amounts of $6,376 and $1,964 were the projected revenues after indirect costs were paid. So we would lose this revenue and enable us to not fill the Meetings Assistant position which is vacant and not fill the Temps that we had planned to hire to assist with the Student-Right-To-Know Workshop administration.

Item 8. We looked at the committee activities and the budget had gone up $70,000 to $80,000 last year. We took a lump sum cut, not cutting any individual items. No committed funds were included.

Item 9. The OIES Administrative Assistant was to find new ways to generate revenue for that office which we would need to continue.

Plante said that all have revenue connotations and, like Bell said, she cannot imagine any of us sitting before the membership at the Annual Meeting without sharing how the financial crisis was resolved. We have to show that we have done everything that we could to shore things up and create a plan that we are not just in this for one year, but that we are creating and rebuilding that reserve. We need to reach down and use more of our members on-site, like FERPA and Student-Right-To-Know. Becraft shared that the problem that we have with that is that follow-through is lacking. There is a lot of personal contact and there is a large amount of time to pull the workshops together. Johnson raised a question that he would do his fair share and pay for his lunch. He commented that Government Relations seemed to be doing so well. There seems to be an increasing demand for it and by putting it on the recovery plan down the list of priorities shows how serious the financial problems are. Smith expressed as a new person on the BOD that she is concerned with cutting an issue of the Data Dispenser and C&U. What is the constraint in going with 16 pages and shortening to eight? Becraft said that a part of it was a misunderstanding on his part because he thought that we were billing programs for advertising pages and we were not. He said that Balazs straightened him out on that. Johnson observed that Becraft mentioned that something was already on its way and he would be willing to give up an article in the September issue to save space if it needs to be cut. Becraft said that they talked about the need to do lead-ins to things that are on the Web. Plante said that she knows that Johnson gets the NAFSA News. He said that it is good and timely, She asked him what he received electronically? Johnson responded, "Not much," in reference to the Inter-L chatroom. Becraft said that we would like to provide the Data Dispenser electronically instead of in print but one of the concerns is that everyone does not have access. He said that he will be looking to the BOD for direction about all the surveys that are being produced. We would like to go out and ask for people if they have access to the Web if they would like to receive the newsletter and even C&U on the Web. CUMREC sent their program on a CD and indicated that if their members wanted a copy, then it could be printed. The cost of the CD might be less than the cost of printing the program. Plante said that many members would receive it and never plug it in based on many individuals who were sitting around the tables in the session on virtual learning who had no idea what it was. Johnson observed that the group in virtual learning is not a random sample of the membership. Plante said that we have to force people to use other media. Balazs mentioned Bell's reference to the deficit in FY97 and she wanted to emphasize that deficit is not going away by what we are doing. It will show up on the audited financial statements and that will appear in the C&U when it is published as the Annual Report and also in the February Data Dispenser. We cannot hide the deficit but we need to work on that by the time that the February Data Dispenser comes out and we are preparing for the Annual Meeting that we have made up or well on our way to financial recovery. It is going to show up for the membership. Smith responded for we must put it out there to the membership. Becraft said that if we cut the designated items on the Recovery Plan it will get us to a zero level and cover the deficit this year. What we have suggested is to immediately cut the first five items and postponing the others until July 31 when we should have a good idea of what is going to happen with the Denver summit. We would then adjust accordingly to that experience. If we get more than 450 registrants, we may not have to cut anymore. If we get less than 450, then we will have to do more. Smith asked what steps have been taken to not have this situation of a deficit for the Annual Meeting such as this year? Becraft responded that we had an original budget that showed a surplus at the December 1996 meeting. That budget was adjusted with the intent to generate more revenue and things were added, such as premium exhibit space that we could charge more for and to add vendor presentation areas in the exhibit hall that we could charge for. We had already sent a mailing to the vendors in December with the old floor plan so by the time a new floor plan was developed and sent out it was late January or early February 1997. By then, most of the larger vendors had already signed up for space and they were not interested in changing and we were not able to attract a whole lot more. Similarly, we anticipated selling 15 or 20 areas for presentations in the exhibit hall but we sold only five or six. Other expense increases included publicity and LAC budgets were overspent, for example. Balazs said that the Provisional Report is very provisional and that we have never pulled the Financial Statement this early so there are a lot of transactions that are not reflected in the report. If we look on the June Provisional, the deficit is only $205,000 while there is at least an additional $120,000 in salaries and outstanding bills that are not reflected. Bell responded that is why some items on the Recovery Plan will be monitored very closely on July 31. Becraft reported that it is difficult to control the Annual Meeting expenditures because so many people are involved. Plante talked yesterday with Roger Swanson, Gloria Rutberg and the LAC folks are that we have to have committee members report to the National Office rather than six people dealing with Conferon so that we have better control. Balazs indicated that the LAC says, "This is our budget," instead of it being viewed as the Annual Meeting budget over which the treasurer and the presidential liaison have oversight. Plante said that the LAC should not count on 50 more people to make the budget fit what they want. She thinks that is a mistake that we are making. While Dolence is saying that we need to be thinking bigger and working harder to get the numbers, but the registrar in Plante says we need to be a little conservative. She had rather make money on something and plan conservatively than be sitting where we are with the summits. Becraft indicated that they will continue to look at ways to keep expenses down as we go through the year, but he would like to suggest that we look at revenue streams that we could bring in this year. He asked what the vice president's think of the Recovery Plan? Bell clarified that $40,000 has been cut from their Budget by Program and she reminded them that there are no funds for carry forward items. Becraft went through line-by-line with the vice presidents to show them specifically where each vice president's budget was cut. Anderson said that looking ahead in September Becraft has to send a check for $200,000 to Nations Bank to pay the line of credit. That $200,000 isn't in the budget as an expense item. Balazs indicated that Anderson is mixing cash and revenue. If we recover $238,000, $200,000 is going to go to the bank. That leaves $38,000 to buy some stuff. The $111,000 is still what we want to make as surplus for the year and if 450 registrants show up in Denver, we are not going to make the $51,000 that we have as revenue, then we are down to $61,000 surplus for the year. Bell asked Anderson what was his point? Anderson responded that his point was that we are being positive but that we are treading water. He said that we are making a symbolic statement that we are recovering from problems in this past year. Balazs clarified that we are not replacing the Investment Portfolio. The bottom line on the Recovery Plan includes the main items we are looking at cutting amounts to $349,691. What we have as a projected deficit this year is $350.000 for FY97. Of that $350,000, we borrowed $200,000 to pay for it. Of the $349,691 we are going to recoup for this year, we have to put $200,000 back. So we are not replacing reserves, be we are making up for the deficit. Anderson said that is all we are doing with that money. Balazs agreed and then said that it is up to us to build additional recovery. Becraft said that a financial report includes a Revenue and Expense Statement and a Balance Sheet. Revenue and Expense Statement for this year will show $350,000 shortfall or deficit. What we are proposing could end up showing a $350,000 surplus next year on the Revenue and Expense Statement. On the Balance Sheet we are down $300,000. As a cash item we need to reserve down. Partly how we got into the problem is that we have been looking at Revenue and Expense Statements and not looking at cash! We have been deficit spending, purchasing equipment, and moving from a cash to an accrual system resulting in building the mechanisms to allow us to annuitize the equipment, put our publications in inventory on the Balance Sheet, and only expense them when we actually sell them. What we did not do was build in the funds to underwrite that and we need to do that. Balazs indicated that we need to have a capital budget and have a plan for building up the investment portfolio and we recommended that in last year's June 30 portfolio report. Balazs recommends that we should have $1 million in our investment portfolio. We had at one point more than $800,000. We now have $67,000 and part of it is because items on the Balance Sheet have moved from the cash and investment portfolio to publications inventory to furniture and equipment to keep up with technology. Without a capital budget, planning how we have to replace equipment over a five or ten-year period takes cash on hand. That affects investment instead of return because we are not going to have any interest income next year because there is nothing to earn interest on. Anderson said that this may sound ugly but what we are doing instead of transforming, we are just surviving. Balazs agreed that we are in a recovery mode. Anderson said that is still the point and we need to be thinking that every time we make a decision and look at the strategic plan, but recovery has to occur and then there has to be improvement so we can get there. Balazs suggested a five-year plan that builds the investment portfolio to $1 million. Becraft commented that the decision was made three years ago on the reserves. We have a policy that the reserves are to be equal to half of our operating expenses and if they exceed or fall below that we are supposed to notify the BOD and the BOD can take whatever action they choose. The National Office did that three years ago because $800,000 was $300,000 above the threshold. The BOD at that time decided to reinvest those monies in the Association. It has been drawn the last three years. What did not get taken into account was the cash effect of that; we spent money that was not there. The other thing that has happened is that Boards take action based on the situation in a given year without looking at implications in the out years. He identified a little thing like the BOD's scholarships where when a BOD member leaves the BOD, that person's institution is given a scholarship in the person's name as a little way of saying, "Thank you." Well, that program was implemented few years ago. It is modest at $3,500 a year. But that creates a $3,500 bill every year and so we need to keep adding in the dinners and waiving some fees at the Annual Meeting. In and of itself it is a small thing but that means every year we have to make that much revenue to cover the costs. It goes on and on. We need to think long term when making decisions so that we are not making a short term decision that leads to a catastrophe down the road. Balazs referred to page 3 of the Balance Sheet where the total Association equity is $569,060 and that is exactly where it should be, half of our operating expenses, but none of this is cash. President Fresh said we are reinventing understanding and as the BOD rotates there are the implications that each of the BOD members will come in and pick up the Balance Sheet and the Statement of Revenue and Expense and understand what is going on. What needs to be in place is the fact that the National Office has the mechanism for seeing the budget status short-term and long-term, instead of the BOD members. He emphasized that the National Office is the continuity factor. They can determine the impact on cash, on reserves, the out-years, and on budget. Without the ongoing assistance from the National Office, we are going to continue to have this sort of thing happening and continue to disrupt the operation of the

Association. Balazs pointed out that the continuity is the Strategic Plan and that plan has specific actions tied to it so that when a new vice president or president-elect comes on the BOD then their ideas have to fit into the plan. If we had a plan that had a five-year spending budget attached to it and each year the BOD modified it for the fifth year out. What we do is that we operate year-to-year. President Fresh added that the Strategic Plan is not tied to this current situation. What he had in mind was a five-year plan that is realistically based, not on projections, but programs that have been implemented in the out years. Balazs added that our Leadership Conference every July should feed into the Strategic Plan. President Fresh made a couple of observations and asked some questions. What he heard Becraft say was that $89,050 is what is left in Standards Council assuming that we raise that we raise $60,000 so the real bogey is $149,050. The issue becomes at what point do we need to have the $60,000? He is picking on the Standards Council because it is very clear what that is and what it does. The same thing is true with OIES. We had at one point a business plan for OIES and projected that it would become solvent, are we there yet? Balazs reported that this is the first year that we will break even without any indirect cost; it has taken longer than was projected. President Fresh cautioned that we need to be realistic about projections. What does that say about the Standards Council? What can we do to make sure that the projection is realistic? We are bleeding in this area but we are bleeding for a cause that is going to be recovered. Balazs said that it would be in our Strategic and Five-Year Budget Plan. President Fresh said that we have a more immediate need to be able to explain that in the next six months. Plante offered that we must tell the membership that one of the reasons that we are "in the hole" is because we have placed our efforts things like the Standards Council which the members are in favor of. Balazs said that we say that we cut it back. Plante responded then we do not do anything for two years, then we lose a lot of ground and our reputation and credibility in the field. President Fresh said that our credibility is a quality factor in all this. The reality is that we say here are the things that we know we are losing money on but we are going to make up for in volume. Anderson observed that the $60,000 is the income for the Standards Council; where is this projected to come from? Can there be an ultimatum given to bring in the income? Balazs responded that for six months of the year and if by December 31 we do not have the monies, then cut the loses in half. President Fresh said to say that we can live with this for another whatever, otherwise we are running on and hoping we can settle it. Columbus Posey in the Tuesday meeting clearly said, in essence, we need to impeach the BOD for malfeasance or some such thing. We have to be aware of the fact that we are responsible for the financial matters of the Association. It is not about wanting to abandon anything. Plante responded that we have six months to have it pay for itself or it is out. We certainly did not do that with OIES; it has been a noose around our neck. President Fresh observed that we lost the proposal; we have lost the position. Bell asked how much more time do we have for this issue? President Fresh said that the main thing we are going to have to get from the BOD is this an acceptable Recovery Plan? Plante said that we put the crafting of the Recovery Plan on Becraft and Balazs because they are the ones who work with the money and the daily running of the Association. If she had to go through the budget and individually pick out items to cut, she would be dealing with minutiae; that is not her role, her role is to be concerned about where we are at and try to place us in the best picture that she can. Smith asked Becraft what discussion has he had that if we do not receive more than 42 registrations for the virtual conference what would the cuts be? Becraft responded said that the problem is that we have contracts with hotels that peak room night restrictions that would require us to pay if we cancel. Johnson said that we have to be concerned about credibility here since we had such a public relations blitz. Becraft said that hotels have changed their requirements dramatically in the last two years; it was a buyer's market for the previous ten years.

M/S/Passed Smith/Plante 9/0/0 To accept proposed cuts of $40,000 from the vice president's areas

M/S/Passed Plante/Bell 8/1/0 To accept the Recovery Plan cuts as identified as A, B, and C amounting to $349,691 in the time frames as proposed with A (Items 1 through 5)and C (Item 15) items being immediate cuts.

Anderson expressed that he voted no because he believes that C (Item 15) on the Recovery Plan is not realistic. He asked what was the framework for the decision on July 31? Fresh suggested that we come back to that as a separate issue. Weese expressed that she appreciates the time involved in developing a plan. President Fresh directed the BOD to Anderson's issue on the decision process. How is the action plan? Plante responded that when the Administrative Committee met we determined that this is an executive director's decision and Becraft needs to look at the financial picture on July 31 and make moves as he sees appropriate.

President Fresh permitted a ten minute break at 10:45 a.m. The BOD meeting resumed at 11:05 a.m.

Task Force 2000
(Strategic Plan A.I.a)
Agenda # 4

President Fresh reported that Task Force 2000 lost Mike Thompson and Laura Patterson as members. Chair Christine Kerlin asked President Fresh to encourage each of the BOD to fill out the survey developed by the task force. The task force will meet in September and then finalize a report for the December BOD meeting. Then they want a meeting in January with a final report by March 1. President Fresh's message to Kerlin is to plan for the September meeting and then the BOD will review the financial situation in the December. The line item for the task forces is $30,000. Bell directed to BOD to visit the Minutes of April 25, 1997, Tab 5 in their Agenda Book, page 9, line 15, showing that the Task Force 2000 requested funds. There was a motion to designate $8000 out of the $30,000 to the Task Force 2000; the motion was withdrawn. It was determined that the BOD needed to see some output before funds would be designated and President Fresh would follow up with Kerlin.

M/S/Passed Fresh/Smith 9/0/0 To approve funds for one meeting of the Task Force 2000.

The task force budget was noted on the board for the BOD to review:
$30,000 in Budget for FY98

1. $6000 Credentialing (Approved in April 25, 1997)
2. $5000 Technology (Approved in April 25, 1997)
3. $11,200 Task Force 2000 (Changed to 5600) $2,300 for postage
4. $6475 Virtual Learning
5. 6500 Fraud (Denied)

$37,475 New total $25,375

Academic Fraud and Abuse Committee
(Strategic Plan A.I.b,f; B,II.a,b; B.IV.b)
Agenda Item 20

Lonabocker explained the Fraud Committee requests to create a verification system on a Web site and provide for implementation and maintenance. The proposal also included to implement a marketing plan to inform business and industry about the verification system and to encourage participation by colleges and universities. The consensus of the BOD was to send the proposal back for further development.

Task Force Reports
(Strategic Plan A.I .a,b,c,f;B,II,a,b;B.IV.a,b;B.V.a,b,c;B.VI.a,b)
Agenda Item 18b

President Fresh identified that the Virtual Learning Task Force requested $6475 to attend the summit in Denver. Becraft said that the registration fee was $345 for the conference and $200 additional for the conference and summit together. He said that we can waive the fee, but not the cost. The Virtual Learning Task Force is expecting to attend the 5 days. Plante said they are trying to bring this together. President Fresh indicated that this is about $1100 per person but does not cover meals; $1225 is considered to support best 4 people for 4 days, no fee, and meals.

M/S/Passed Plante/Weese 9/0/0 To approve $25,375 for task force activities as outlined above.

Plante will communicate the change in funding to the Virtual Learning Task Force, Weese to the Credentialing, Lonabocker to the Fraud, and President Fresh to the Task Force 2000. R

Review of April 19 and April 25, 1997 BOD Minutes
Agenda Item 5

Bell presented the minutes of the April 19 and April 25, 1997 BOD Minutes. Several corrections were identified and corrected.

M/S/Passed Bell/Guerrero 9/0/0 To approve the April 19, 1997 BOD Minutes as corrected.

M/S/Passed Johnson/Plante 9/0/0 To approve the April 25, 1997 BOD Minutes as corrected.

Plante reminded the BOD that the July 1996 and December 1996 Minutes were accepted as they were. Anderson had an item dealing with the Minutes of the Conference Call on March 31, 1997. He distributed a handout of changes to his remarks from the remarks transcribed by Bell on her laptop during the conference call. He said since they were official minutes he would like for them to reflect what he said. Johnson noted that Bell recorded his remarks in those Minutes very appropriately. Anderson replied that his remarks in the Minutes did not reflect what he said.

(See Attachment, Page 22A, for paper that Anderson distributed to the BOD regarding his remarks on the Conference Call.) He wanted to vote again on the Minutes. President Fresh said that the Minutes had already been approved in April 1997.

President Fresh reviewed the list of concerns that Bell had distributed regarding the financial crisis.

President Fresh dismissed for lunch at 12:15 p.m. to reconvene at 1:15 p.m. President Fresh reconvened the BOD at 1:24 p.m.

Strategic Plan Review
(Strategic Plan A.I.a)
Agenda Item 3

Henny Wakefield distributed a blue sheet which was the National Office update and summarized what is going on. The yellow sheet is the calendar for the year. She reported that Joe Head gave his Credentialing and Certification Program and he got some very good feedback. He asked people who are going to State and Regionals to present on this topic. There were concerns expressed about the grand fathering part of the program. Head indicated to them that he was just trying to get ideas right now. Head did not follow through with his facilitation of that session. There was some confusion about what the chairs were supposed to do so Wakefield directed them to discuss the transformation institute. Wakefield reported that the BOD not being in the session was a problem. They have good suggestions:

1. They need more information before hand. Not all chairs were at the session.
2. They want time to discuss issue with BOD.
3. Head wants orientation prior to Annual Meeting. Plante said that the luncheon was supposed to do that. They felt they did not know each other. They wanted to say that their committees would rise to BOD expectations. As they are planning five or so years out, they would make some recommendations. They are setting a listserv for the chairs. Head wants the BOD to be more accessible to them; he felt that the BOD was talking to them, not with them.
4. The committee chairs, if asked, would have come up with the same ideas that Dolence came up with.

They thought they could come up with the same issues. They want more participation in the selection of the committee members. A suggestion was that for the Committee on Community Colleges to form alliances and affiliations with other professional groups and they believe that this might enhance the process and also increase their credibility on campuses. They want freedom to direct their future. Smith reported that the impression she received was what we discussed down here to say that we cannot talk at them we must talk with them. We seem not to do that and we do not do a good enough job with that. Do not walk in on Thursday afternoon with Dolence; we are not setting the stage. Plante suggested to get the program stuff out of the way; get the role of the committee chair clarified. If leadership is the topic, then do that and then bring them back together. Smith observed that people did not get to know each other. She also said that there is a big need to incorporate the BOD. Smith asked where do we set the stage for April? Guerrero responded that we have lost it; what she did with her committee is the program person is doing that now. Smith observed that the program committee is doing a fine job this year We forget the enthusiasm and excitement they feel to come to Chicago or to any other meeting; we do not capitalize on that. Wakefield suggested that including state and regionals would be a good idea; that is what emerged today. Smith asked if they requested an evaluation? Johnson indicated that it was not very developed; he does not even know some of his chairs. Fresh indicated that part of the transformation institute was that we wanted to start to get them to react on issues. Lonabocker suggested there needs to be designated tables. Smith said that there is a need to make the chairs be important. Becraft raised the issue of "who should be at this meeting?" Smith responded that every chair and task force should report to the entire group; we made no reports to the group about what has happened since April. They should have been involved in the budget crisis. They have gone on their way. Wakefield asked if we want her to go ahead and follow up on the listserv or will someone else do that? They want listserv of chairs. Plante said that BOD needed to be on the listserv as well as National Office executive staff. Who will do it? Wakefield added that the data base has come up quite often. Fresh asked Wakefield to summarize. She responded that they were energized. Becraft said that we need to look at the committee process. Swanson said that there is a statement in the manual but you have to get in there and read it. Fresh said that there is more to do and then we are geared to nothing but the program. Then we come to the July meeting and we try to enhance that with something other than the program; it sounds that they perceived it pretty much program. Bell suggested that we educate them and empower them. Fresh emphasized that we have a good with the program. How do we restructure so that the committee chairs feel that they are the leaders? Becraft indicated that probably most of the BOD are members of some other organization; we have the most cumbersome process of any association. We ought to look at what we do to develop the program. The end goal was to have the program committee to do the program; can this be done off line. Plante said we can wait until .... freezes over. Swanson said we have an opportunity for them to take on a larger role and to improve the relationship. This will be a problem in Chicago because of Easter. Define what that might be. Fresh said that sounded like a good approach; it is working against cross purposes if we put that layer in then it really looks like the BOD is moving away. We already have people looking at us suspiciously. Becraft said his thought was just the opposite. Fresh offered that if nothing else they have to know what is going on. Johnson indicated that we want this meeting to be a leadership event. If they are not going to do anything in July but program, then having a more cohesive structure, training, role definition would be desirable. Wakefield said that not just VP's and their own committee chairs should participate, but it is also the other chairs. Lonabocker asked, given technology, why do they need a meeting? Swanson said we were able to get control of data and we really condensed that part of it. Just the discussion back and forth was helpful. The program stuff can it be condensed more than in the past. Fresh asked how do we see the time being reconfigured? Swanson suggested that we kept roughly the same time frame. He thinks it would have gone well, but they did not know what else was going on at the meeting. Some wanted to work on committee stuff. Plante suggested they needed an agenda before they came. Guerrero likes the idea of reversing it; do program work first, then leadership. Plante responded that then we do not have task force people sitting around. Smith suggested that task force chairs talk with the committees about what they are doing. President Fresh said to Anderson that we are setting the agenda for next time. Anderson would like to see it finalized in December. Lonabocker wants to leave it open as to what we want to discuss. Anderson reminded us to not forget that LAC's are involved. Becraft offered that it would be nice to tie those things together. Becraft suggested like Lonabocker did in Boston. Plante said that we did get the tour in. Smith observed that we do not capitalize on that; where are registrations? President Fresh asked about concerns of the BOD. Lonabocker asked for no more Mike Dolence. President Fresh responded that this is a transition point.

Becraft identified the new calendar, requested by the BOD, that was on the goldenrod sheet handout. Johnson said that he would distribute this to his chairs. Anderson identified the days, place, and times of the December BOD meeting at Coronado Springs and Disney World in Florida. Swanson said that SEM 7 Conference will be there too. The grand opening is next month. It is supposed to be a state-of-the-art facility.

Wakefield distributed the "proposed directions for strategic planning, July 1997" handout. Refer to 1 b "marketplace message." This would take someone days and day to research. 3c is a time line; a final report will not go to BOD until Dec 1998. Second page suggests a strategic advisory group 7/97 targeting state and regionals. Some roles are Missing-admissions, enroll management, info tech. She welcomes suggestions. Plante advised that we need to look closely at composition. President Fresh suggested to make sure the chairs are incorporated into this. Weese asked if this is just an advisory group to Wakefield? President Fresh emphasized to make sure what the process is; so that they have input as to what the strategic plan should be.

Wakefield said that this is the first message to the chairs. Weese volunteered to set up listserv.

Items from meeting with Chicago LAC
(Strategic Plan A. I. d)
Agenda Item 7

Plante identified some issues:

1. Location of registration area
2. Accessibility to exhibits space
3. Meeting deadlines and time lines for publications
4. Concern when the Annual Meeting program publication is produced
5. Early bird deadline for registration (March 1 agreed on) Balazs said that it takes ten working days to get early bird stuff to the computer.
6. Tate has some issues about revising exhibit hall hours.
7. Increase breaks by 15 minutes for 8th floor.
8. Extra fee for working on Sunday. For those who move in on Sunday, they will pay through the nose. Could open exhibit hall at 6 a.m. on Monday?
9. Their budget versus our budget.

Agenda items 7 and 8 were deferred until the BOD meets with the LAC.

BOD and Committee Restructuring
(Strategic Plan A.I.a)
Agenda Item 9

Guerrero reported that the subcommittee of VP's got together to review the current structure of the BOD. Handouts of the current/proposed structure and a listing of the differences were located in the Agenda book. Guerrero went over the differences with the BOD. There were two significant differences that were proposed,

1) the vice president for development and publications position would be eliminated, and

2) the secretary/treasurer would become vice president for finance and development.

The National Office would take over the clerical functions of the current secretary/treasurer functions. Plante reported that the professional resource panel is under the secretary /treasurer not the past president. Bell suggested that the vice president for finance and development should be listed as ex officio on LAC's. The BOD went over the handouts several times making comments to Guerrero. Plante indicated that we need to take this proposal to the membership. President Fresh said that we need to include guidelines; there are some things we need to take out. Weese suggested putting a new page on the web site where members could respond and put their discussion. Wakefield shared that Wade Robinson felt that the VP's should ask the committees to respond to this. Plante does not want to present anything that is a done deal. President Fresh indicated that we need to get the parameters. Smith offered that this is one of the 100 questions that Dolence referred to. President Fresh wants BOD consensus so that those going to state and regionals can talk about this. He said we have to have the BOD moving this forward and identify the decision cycle.

M/S/PASSED Guerrero/Johnson 9/0/0 To present proposals for restructuring of the BOD and committees and that we present these proposals to the Membership beginning with the state and regional associations.

Guerrero indicated that she would redo the proposal adding the suggested corrections identified by the BOD. President Fresh will identify some guidelines, such as,

1. limited expansion of the BOD,
2. balancing responsibility,
3. relevance the strategic plan,
4. try to make the committees more responsive and streamline the process, and
5. is driven by the strategic plan.

President Fresh said that we did not vote on the process. He suggested to

1. announce the issue,
2. summarize the initial discussion, and
3. develop an issue oriented Fireside Chat instead of a Roundtable.

Johnson suggested that it could be presented as a flow chart. Plante said that the subject is on the reformation of the BOD; all we are asking for is for input. Becraft indicated that we need to mention Task Force 2000. Plante asked about the timetable? Wakefield thought that the discussion may not take long. President Fresh thinks the first one will be long and he emphasized that we cannot cut corners. Becraft emphasized that this is a major thing. Becraft raised questions about the number of committees. Plante heard this when she went to ASAE and not all that was discussed were related to AACRAO. Weese said that Dolence was right that we need to start looking every year not every two years. President Fresh asked what are we going to do about the process? Who is going to frame all the issues that go out with this? As a matter of record, we are committed to do our processes this way. Weese suggested to place these in the highlights of the BOD. Bell asked where are we with the 100 list? President Fresh responded that we have enough issues to carry out this year. We have our plate full. President Fresh offered this:

1. announce issue for discussion and give timetable
2. distribute issues and give several options
3. discussion variety of means
1. Data Dispenser
2. state and regionals
3. listservs
4. summarize initial discussions
5. re-discuss
6. issue oriented roundtable at Annual Meeting
7. summarize
8. propose change
9. vote

Plante asked what kind of time frame are we going to do this in? President Fresh indicated that the discussion would occur on Saturday of the Annual Meeting, summarize for July, propose change, and vote in December. He asked is there consensus on this process? The BOD had responded with "yes, yes, yes."

President Fresh dismissed the BOD for a break at 3:22 p.m. and reconvened at 3:28 p.m.

Committee Appointment Process
(Strategic Plan A.I.c,f)
Agenda Item 10

Plante wants the BOD to review their committee assignments and give her the pages with their edits of who should not be re-appointed, who should be a chair next year, who should be a vice chair, etc. so that letters can go out this fall identifying reappointments. She wants everything done on time and correctly. The cycle is date driven so this process goes the same way every year. Johnson suggested that the committee chairs gather the information for the National Office and vice presidents so we can improve the database. He also suggested that we should make it a part of the VP's responsibility; take it from the bottom up instead of top down. Plante said that all 95's should be rotating off! Lonabocker said that her changes did not get made. Smith asked to put date in the letter so they know what the commitment is. She also asked is there any BOD policy or tradition regarding nominations. BOD can nominate just like members. Plante responded that there is no policy. There was no action required. Plante will hold to the July calendar.

Judith Halen as Interassociation Rep
(Strategic Plan A.I.c)
Agenda Item 11

Plante suggested Judith Malen, Director, Admissions and Financial Aid at Northern Illinois University College of Law as the interassociation representative to the National Network of Law school Officers. S thought it strange that the organization sent in the nomination. It has been a practice on this one.

M/S/Passed Anderson/Guerrero 9/0/0 To appoint Judith Halen as interassociation representative to the National Network of Law School Officers.

Becraft suggested that we need to incorporate them into the committee structure.

Plante presented Bruce Shutt for Honorary Membership effective April 1998.

M/S/Passed Anderson/Plante 9/0/0 To present Bruce Shutt with Honorary Membership effective April 1998.

Plante presented Jeanenne Rothenberger as the nomination for distinguished service award recipient. Swanson spoke to Rothenberger's skills. She commands great respect from her committee members.

M/S/Passed Plante/bell 9/0/0 To accept Jeanenne Rathenberger as the 1997/98 AACRAO Distinguished Service Award Recipient

Plante has been approached for a similar award for Val Mead for her work on Virtual University. She did not have anything prepared at the time for her work with the Western Governors Conference. Plante asked that as the BOD goes out to state and regionals to collect the names of members who are retiring and let her know so that she can check to see if they are eligible for honorary membership.

National Student Loan Clearinghouse
(Strategic Plan B.VI.b,c)
Agenda Item 12

Plante reported that she and Jeff Tanner would like to continue as reps to the National Student Loan Clearinghouse. Plante said that the folks are moving forward on transfer tracking, that some there are some question on web access, and that they are getting more and more schools involved. Plante chairs the School Relations Committee and Tanner chairs the Operations Committee.

M/S/Passed 9/0/0 Lonabocker/Smith To continue Plante and Tanner as representatives to the National Student Loan Clearinghouse.

Voting by Mail Reconsideration
(Strategic Plan A.I.a,c,f)
Agenda Item 13

President Fresh is concerned that we should not put it back on the ballot and instead put it in the process. We said in April that we were going to put that out for a vote and in the same category as the ones to send out for feedback. Guerrero thinks we should and that we should discuss this at the state and regionals.

Status of Secretary/Treasurer
(Strategic Plan A.I.a; C.X.c)
Agenda Item 14

President Fresh asked Bell what was the status of her job search resulting from the elimination of her position of University Registrar at Gonzaga University. He said that basically we want to be in compliance with the Constitution and Bylaws. Bell reported that she has applied for seven positions; she has heard from four and did not obtain an interview from those four. Two of the remaining applications closed in late June and the third one closed in August. She indicated that this is the first time in her career that she has not received interviews for the positions she has applied for; she believes strongly that the stigma of a laid-off registrar affects this situation. She wanted direction from the BOD on her BOD position. President Fresh indicated that the Constitution says that to be eligible for a BOD position she/he must be a member of the Association. Plante said that she was at the time of her nomination for the position. President Fresh spoke to the options that he identified in the President's report,

1. continuing the current secretary-treasurer if a position is obtained by the July board meeting,
2. using a past Secretary-Treasurer to serve in an interim capacity(avoid conflict with the N&E process),
3. using the past-president in an interim capacity and accelerating the activation of the incoming secretary-treasurer, and
4. other as defined by the Board. He said that we were trying to be sensitive to Bell's position and not complicate the issue any further.

Balazs indicated that in light of the financial situation and Bell's history of involvement it might not be a very good idea to bring in someone new. President Fresh said that we thought about that situation, too, and they might consider Bell as a consultant or volunteer. Smith said that she has been in Bell's situation and that it takes more than 60-90 days to find a position. Lonabocker said that Bell was elected by the membership and we should find a way to keep her. Plante reviewed the constitution. She indicated that Bell brings expertise. Anderson suggested that we leave the personalities out of it. President Fresh said that this will potentially become an issue in April. He suggested again that we could consider hiring her as a consultant. Plante indicated that Bell was a voting member when she was elected to the BOD, the BOD in its best judgment is to continue Bell for the remaining of her term, then we take exception. Anderson emphasized that we either are or not a voting member. The nine of us have to decide and take a vote. Bell then would not vote and go with eight and Bell would abstain. Plante suggested that we put our vote with what Gonzaga sends in as the membership. Smith suggested that the Constitution needs to be reviewed for a change to cover this situation in the future. More discussion continued on this issue.

M/S/Passed Lonabocker/Guerrero 6/2/1 To make an exception to the Constitution and continue Bell as Secretary-Treasurer on the BOD through the end of her term due to the financial situation.

Smith brought up to review the Constitution for a permanent change to cover this type of situation in the future. Plante said that this is an exception to policy. Anderson emphasized that the BOD did not have the power to take this action. President Fresh said due to the exception, we have waived the Constitution. President Fresh emphasized we have a workable process. Becraft said this has come up in past times and we have not dealt with procedures of maintaining membership during times of unemployment so they can maintain their membership. Some other associations give a reasonable amount of time, such as six months.

Russian Project Proposal
(Strategic Plan-See Agenda for Lengthy Listing)
Agenda Item 17

Johnson asked Gloria Nathanson and Bill Paver to chair this project. At the heart of this is the traditional PIER workshop where we have Russians and Americans meeting. There is a series of four meetings. One took place at AACRAO, the second is in Barcelona at EAIE, a third is in Washington, D.C. to coincide with NAFSA's 50th anniversary and the final meeting would be in New York. The final product would be not only a written report that the Russians have volunteered to underwrite, but it will be produced in CD format in both Russian and English. What Johnson is asking for is $5000 of seed money. He has a list of possible donors but he wanted to give AACRAO the first chance, such as TOEFL, GMAT, MCAT, ETS subsidiary companies, faculty and student exchanges. Smith suggested that we make a list. Johnson needs a commitment; he does not have to have money yet! All we need is something on AACRAO letterhead.

M/S/Tabled Johnson/Smith To get $5000 from AACRAO to fund this project. No vote was taken. Weese and Lonabocker acted to table this motion.

Task Force Reports
(Strategic Plan-Refer to Agenda for lengthy listing)
Agenda Item 18 c and d

Agenda 18 c. Plante reported on a distance learning/virtual learning publication and that a possible source of revenue might be a corporate member or members who also must adapt their systems/products to meet the emerging practices in distance learning. Smith indicated that this and some others need to go under another publication discussion.

Agenda 18 d. Plante suggested a scheduled preconference workshop or double session at the Annual Meeting to present the Distance Education/Virtual Learning publication. Plante will send a form in.

President Fresh adjourned the BOD meeting at 4:31 p.m. and moved into executive session.

President Fresh called the BOD meeting to order at 8:05 a.m., Sunday, July 13, 1997 with all BOD and National Office executives present.

Annual Meeting Program Update
(Strategic Plan A.I. d)
Agenda Item 8

Anderson reported on the status of his meeting with the Chicago LAC. There are 22 sessions per slot; subtract one out for vendor track leaving 21 sessions for a total of 210. He said that taking out Sunday morning and then only two workshops were talked about on Saturday afternoon making Monday morning a big morning adding an 11th session from 10:30 to 11:45. There would not be a plenary session on Monday morning. The international folks do not want to call their session a plenary; they want to open it up. We would go with pocket programs which would be reorganized so that it would be easier to read and follow. Anderson spoke to a suggestion on breaks, the first one Monday, two on Tuesday and Wednesday would be normal half hour with 1:15 to 2:30 and 3:15 to 4:30 on Tuesday. The committee did not address when the town meeting would be. Swanson loaded up front so that the town meeting cannot be in conflict with anything. Smith asked that two plenaries be eliminated. Swanson offered that a plenary rises it to a bigger level. President Fresh asked if there was a general theme for the conference? Anderson answered negative. Johnson wants to highlight study abroad but we do not want to alienate our guests by only highlighting study abroad. Johnson said that calling it a mini plenary would diminish it. Sunday is the same with a keynote, Monday morning is the same; and Sunday afternoon is the same. Swanson said that the program committee not only are they taking their jobs very seriously, they are making the chairs take their jobs serious. He says that this is different from other years he has worked on this. They intend to follow up as soon as we can finalize this. Anderson said that we may have a few small problems. Student-Right-To-Know may take up big room. Anderson reminded us that it is the BOD's town meeting. State and regionals are Monday night. Guerrero emphasized to not have it conflict with the caucuses. Swanson said that we could have a roundtable on Wednesday. Anderson stressed to have strong sessions on Thursday. Lonabocker suggested to schedule Leroy Rooker on Thursday.

Anderson expressed a fee concern in attracting high school and affiliates and that the $30 fee be per high school and not by person. High School Issues Committee is getting aggressive and wants to include as many persons in the surrounding area as possible.

Swanson suggested a premeeting either with VP or National Office and they would also like some time with chairs informal on Sunday morning before the committee meeting stuff in the afternoon.

Plante identified some issues again,

1. revised break times,
2. exhibits hours, and
3. Monday set up versus weekend, what about the Friday set up?

Becraft indicated our costs are dressage, otherwise it is the vendors that incur the cost. Plante asked what did we think should go to the corporate advisory group? If someone brings in the boxes, we will be charged?

The National Office and LAC are to resolve where the registration area is to be. The Early Bird deadline will be moved to March 1. The programs will be out in December. Becraft said we need to find out where our members are with regard to Web before making a decision to put the program on the Web without full printing of the program. Lonabocker said that other organizations just print one line titles. Swanson cautioned about publications on the Web because in doing so we would need to know what members' capabilities are.

Anita Ziern-Amptman at St. Louis University is going to chair the Annual Meeting Evaluation Committee and work closely with the Program Committee. He has contacted NOS to assist with scanning. Charlotte has appointed Annie Belton at SC State to be responsible for the evaluations. LAC staff is to support the evaluation room by staffing it, but is to have a person hooked into the Program Committee who wants input to the Evaluation Committee. Becraft said that we are talking about shifting the whole thing as part of the LAC and would have a chair. President Fresh said that this person could be on the Program Committee as well as chairing the Committee on the LAO so there would be some liaison and could pick up earlier what is going on. What is the Program Committee rotation? Anderson responded that the president appointed these by Christmas. Smith asked aren't the appointments made by the vice presidents? Anderson observed that this process was all screwed up last year. He would like to have the vice presidents identify the program committee people. It should be part of the part of the committee appointment process and there needs to be continuity. There should be overlap of the vice president term for continuity provided they do their job. Anderson wants the new president-elect to know who they are working with early in the process. Anderson asked that each vice president identify his/her program chair by Christmas

Registration Fee. The registration fee for the Annual Meeting has budget implications.

M/S/Passed Plante/Lonabocker 9/0/0 To set the base rate for registration at $200.

Smith asked to leave the budget number at 1900 so we might have a windfall. Anderson asked about the number target? Balazs reported that it was 1800 in Indy. The target is 2700 and we will stick with that. Balazs will send info.

Reverse College Fair. Johnson clarified that the Reverse College Fair should be renamed Embassy Recruitment Fair. Embassy representatives would set up tables/booths to discuss with college representatives the placement of students at their institutions. He has no formal proposal at this time. The logistical details are both numerous and complex. He seeks only encouragement to explore the possibility of organizing such a fair.

President Fresh mentioned to allow them to be vendors. Johnson thought this was a good idea but we would have to have a reduced fee. This may bring in high school counselors. This is why he thought this should be a pre conference workshop.

M/S/Passed Plante/Johnson 6/0/3 To offer an embassy recruitment fair on Tuesday with the embassies being charged an appropriate fee that is revenue profitable.

Smith said that what is missing is the structure for a process. Is it doable? Is it profitable? Registration Target. Anderson asked to revisit the 2700 target. It must be too high. We are concerned about the number of persons paying. The figure at Salt Lake City was 2151 and the full paid registration count was 1725. President Fresh asked what the issue is? Plante said that we usually guess right with the first number. Plante said that she thought 2700 is doable. Johnson said that Easter is coming back to haunt us. Spring breaks are ABOUT THAT TIME as well.

International Association Affiliation
(Strategic Plan C.VII.b,d)
Agenda Item 16

Johnson has no proposal on this.

M/S/Passed Johnson/Weese 8/1/0 To refer this topic to the membership committee and Johnson be available for consultation.

Wakefield asked if the membership committee is going to do the work or will they just do the identification and then the National Office will do the follow up? When she talked with the chair of the membership committee, she was not in favor of expanding the membership committee. Plante said that she thought the membership committee would not have enough info on this topic. Is there a time frame for this? President Fresh asked Becraft to let us know via listserv. Johnson will write something up for December meeting.

Russian Project Proposal
(Revisited from Earlier Deferral)
Agenda Item 17

Johnson reported that they were busy at SLC. They have also been going through George Fletcher; whether to go through the council is another thing. It will be funded by the private sector. It did not get sent that direction. Wakefield said that there are publications for international issue coming out of so many venues and she thinks there needs to be one central oversight group whether OIES or PIER.

List of Credential Evaluation Services
(Strategic Plan C.VIII.b,d)
Agenda Item 19

Johnson reviewed the position on the list of credential evaluation services. NACES business is interrelated with a letter he drafted for Plante to respond about their concern that OIES is competing and taking business away from them. That is not this agenda item. They are integrally linked. They are pulling a Tanner letter written four years ago out of context. Becraft said there is continuity with Tanner on board. Johnson said that AACRAO has been too complacent and we will pay for it. Balazs said that when we built the business plan for OIES, we were to limit activity. Don't do that with a business venture. It is a big mistake. Johnson's agenda deals as to whether or not we maintain a list of others who do this service. A lot of people do not even need an evaluation. Johnson referred to E-1674 mail. Becraft asked what do we tell people that call? We have to have an answer. He sat in with Steve Hunt of USNEI (U.W. Network on Education Information). The out now may be to link this to their web page.

M/S/Passed Johnson/Plante 9/0/0 To accept Johnson's resolution that AACRAO do away with issuing a list of evaluation services.

Balazs will provide a business plan for the December meeting. President Fresh dismissed for a break at 9:56 a.m. and reconvened at 10:12 a.m.

Publications Advisory Board
(Strategic Plan A.I.i)
Agenda Item 21

Smith reported that PAB met the end of June and she summarized the Minutes that Swanson took at that meeting. There was a lengthy discussion about the roles and responsibilities of PAB especially in light of the changes in the staffing in the National Office. Part of the discussion took place because of some discussion in April about who really does approve publications and how does that affect getting support from corporate members. The PAB clearly understands that are other avenues in which all this comes through but they asked for a one or two page template that they get an opportunity to review. They have reviewed goals and objectives and have rewritten them. Smith talked about the cookbook and PAB thought it would be a lot of work and the cost would be high. She knows that the cookbook was BOD action. Johnson offered that with all the other things the membership might view a cookbook as frivolous project. Smith said that we have a corporate member on the PAB and the member brought a draft proposal to the table that there be a new form for which we handle the marketing, inventory, and sales. Smith agrees with the concept. Her hesitancy is that it needs to be an RFP. The concept trying to bring all this under an umbrella and how long we keep them in line is a good premise. It needs more work before we can bring action to the BOD. She believes that it is the National Office responsibility to do the marketing plan; it is not the PAB's responsibility. We clearly need to have prominence in the publication's arena. Wakefield commended PAB for their work. They take their job seriously; they are not afraid to question and not afraid to come up with answers. Our marketing has not been as efficient as it should be. The publication staff is getting smaller. The publication staff is trying to go more electronic. It is part of the publication effort and PAB has to be a part of that too. This was an opportunity to explore another avenue. President Fresh asked Smith if there is more effort to put publications on the Web. Smith responded that PAB understands that they could not just look at paper publications. The one piece that she thinks will be moving to the Web is conference papers; this is a very good test for that. Smith recommended the conference papers to be first on the Web. There is no need for BOD action on this recommendation. BOD action is required with what came from C&U committee which met at the same time as PAB. Four recommendations were made for the BOD. PAB agreed with the recommendations. They are as follows: 1) Change the name of the committee from College and University Advisory Committee to College and University Editorial Board.

M/S/Passed Plante/Weese 9/0/0 That College and University Advisory Committee be renamed College and University Editorial Board.

2) To eliminate the Article of the Year Award for feature articles in each issue of C&U.

M/S/Passed Plante/Smith 9/0/0 To eliminate the Article of the Year Award.

3) Advertising and continuation of extending vendor advertising and for the National Office to develop advertising to solicit articles. Smith says that she thinks that the advertising requests could come from calls for papers, such as in The Chronicle of Higher Education, NetNews, etc. The advertising requests come from the marketing process that should transpire from the National Office. Plante suggested that the National Office write to departments in higher education administration. Johnson suggested soliciting abstracts. Weese asked is there a list of hot issues on the Web that need authors? Wakefield responded "yes" but we need to educate the committee that they need to be responsible for looking at what we have done and let us know how to go further. They need to think of things too and feed the National Office with suggestions. Smith will use this discussion as information. 4) Modification of basic format for C&U. We are proposing this as long as there are no negative cost effects. The most important thing other than the format change is to identify College and University as "The Journal of the Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers." and that the cover be the same and consistent with each issue. The C&U logo is very good.

M/S/Passed Plante/Guerrero 9/0/0 To incorporate "The Journal of American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers" into the logo of C&U.

Scholarship Fundraising
(Strategic Plan C.VII.a;C.X.b)
Agenda Item 22

Smith reminded the BOD that an endowment fund was approved in April. She distributed a handout identifying the "scholarship endowment funding plan." We are sitting with $49,000 in the endowment fund, including the Connor Fund. Scholarship endowment funding plan to board included:

1. Will continue voluntary giving from Annual Meeting registration of $5.
2. Increase exhibitor's fee by $100 and credit to endowment. No, but do a solicitation to the corporate members vendors who come year after year as a tax deductible contribution.
3. Initiate a scholarship campaign. Smith would like to come in December with a plan to set some goals for Chicago and Charlotte and that a goal be $100,000 by Charlotte. We agree with premise with #3. Becraft strongly encouraged contacting the past presidents. Smith said that some members said to forget the keynote just bring up the scholarship recipients because that is the most excited thing. Plante observed that when members come back from other conferences they have all kinds of stuff with logos from those conferences like plastic and leather goods.
4. Each year, all unexpended budgets allocated to the Annual Meeting Scholarship Committee revert to the endowment. In light of the financial crisis, this was not considered.
5. Each year, 5% of all expended budget allocated to the Professional Activities Committees revert to the endowment. Again in light of the financial crisis, this was not considered.

6. Consider establishing a regional/state association annual meeting scholarship fundraising competition. No action.
7. Identify and pursue national corporations as a source of endowment funding. No action.

Smith emphasized that these are all pieces of a bigger plan that needs to be developed. Johnson said that relating this to the endowment is an asset and he thinks the scholarships are wonderful.

Standards Development in Higher Education
(Strategic Plan 3.11. a,b; 3.IV.a,b)
Agenda Item 23

Becraft reported they want to move aggressively forward to develop this. The Council for the Advancement of Standards came out of student affairs and they want to incorporate admissions and registrars. The standards are being revised and reissued soon. We are encouraged to market these publications to our members. Single standard publications for just registrars and admission officers are being developed. The CAS Board would like some feedback from the Association on what they are doing and what is their role in the standards setting area. Becraft asked if there is anything else that he should bring back to the CAS Board? Becraft now participates in two groups on bench marking, NACUBO and the bench marking interest group. Both of these are to try to develop performance benchmarks. NACUBO is related to the bottom line. Becraft says that he thinks that we need to be doing this for registrar and admissions officers. Do we need to invite either an existing committee to take on this? This was deferred for future review.

Surveys
(Strategic Plan A.I.b)
Agenda Item 24

Becraft sought advice and direction about the plethora of AACRAO surveys that have been suggested or requested, for example, the Task Force 2000 survey, the community college issues committee has one, virtual learning is talking about a survey, professional development, membership survey, etc. Do we just let people go off on their own with the surveys? Wakefield suggested they should go to the appropriate chairs. Bell asked about the financial implications of the surveys? Fresh asked about the current process for review of surveys? Becraft responded that there is none. (Johnson departed to catch a plane.)

M/S/Passed Weese/Plante 6/0/0 That there be a process established whereby all surveys get clearance through National Office, including proposals and funding sources, before they are released.

Request for seed money for the Russian project. Johnson had requested $5000 seed money for the Russian project. Bell identified that we have only $4625. Balazs indicated that after earlier discussion we have no contingency money. Plante suggested that we fund $2000 with the possibility of more funding later.

M/S/Passed Smith/Plante 6/0/0 To fund an initial grant of $2000 for the Russian project.

"Planning and Assessment of New Ventures" Handout." President Fresh returned to info about how the BOD makes decisions and he said that we necessarily do not have to arrive at closure. He distributed a handout as to his thinking that came about summits and the contract signing date is the date of no return. Smith said that we need something now! Becraft said that we need to take off the rose colored glasses; we need to become realistic in what is possible, perhaps with focus groups, phone surveys, and determine how much people will pay. Balazs needs to provide scenarios. There needs to be setting of a process of decision making and how we do "process" new ideas, etc. and make decisions. An example is that we did not have a point of no return with the summits after the contracts were signed. The vice president for development in the proposed restructuring will address this issue. We need to do market research before we take on projects. We need a better sense of reality of what break- even is. The way we operate now is we need the money generated from fees to pay expenses. We need a way to fund these projects before the fees come in. We should have more business development. Smith said that there are a lot of entities out there with big bucks and somehow we should be contacting them, such as nonaccredited corporate universities. We need a business development officer on staff to do that. President Fresh asked Becraft to give feedback to regularize and formalize the decision making process either by E-mail or by the December meeting. A motion was made to adjourn. President Fresh adjourned the July 1997 BOD meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Cordially Submitted by,

Melanie Moore Bell
Secretary-Treasurer