

ISCYPAA Advisory Meeting

Date: March 29, 2024

Time: After Main Speaker

Zoom ID: 858 068 6515

Password: iscytaa

**Attendance/Introductions:**

James P - chair

Michelle D - TS

Jeanette R - cochair

James R - treasurer

Bill S - outreach

Rian - TS

Megan G - archives

Ryan M - TS

Meg B -

Savannah P - secretary

Brian M - TS

Tim H - webmaster

Mike - TS

Tara (remote) - hotel

**Guests:**

None

**Anniversary & Birthdays & Announcements:**

- Jeanette and James are having a baby!
- Megan and Tim both got promoted
- Brian turned 35 (by not dying)

**Prayer:**

**Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

- Savannah - so moved (minutes from 3.12.24)
  - Brian - seconds
  - Motion passes

**Reports:**

- Chairperson (James P.)
  - Schedule for this weekend:
    - Saturday:
      - \*9am- Bid Presentations
      - \*2pm- Open Deliberations
      - \*Immediately after speaker- Meeting with host/bids/tokens
    - Sunday:
      - \*12pm- Wrap-up meeting w/ Host

- Co-Chairperson (Jeanette):
  - Reached out to Rockford bid for bid packet and did not hear back
    - Tim: I talked to Ralphie - he said he just got hotel contracts today, told him to send them in but it is too late to consider being rewarded the conference
  
- Secretary (Savannah):
  - No report
  
- Treasurer (James R.)
  - As of 03/12/2024 - beginning balance is \$23,024.90.
  - On Mar 14 - check contribution for \$1,368.30
  - As of 03/29/2024 - ending balance is \$24,393.20.
  - James held a sub-committee on Dec 14th, 2023, 8-9pm, regarding making bid seed money indefinite moving forward - cover in old business.
  
- Hotel (Tara):
  - Gave feedback to Prairypaa bid on their hotel contracts submitted the week before the bid packets were due.
    - Jeanette: what feedback was given and did they take it into account?
      - Tara - just opinion on the hotel contracts; they explained some things, but the contracts remained the same; they added a chart in their bid book to explain some things in response to feedback
      - Brian - feedback on the budget and some questions
      - Tim - same thing
    - James comment: I reached out to all of the bids a month ago letting them know they could submit their stuff early; get graded on your work early before it is turned in
    - All - thanks for creating the hotels cheat sheet
  
- Outreach (Bill):
  - Question for the group: on Saturday could someone tell the token bids to reach out directly to me; I will take down notes and contact info for token bids
  - Token bids will meet on the stairs to nowhere an hour after the next host committee is announced
  
- Archives (Megan):
  - No report
  
- Webmaster (Tim):
  - No report
  
- Trusted Servants (Brian, Mike, Meg, Rian, Ryan, and Michelle):

- No report

#### New Positions:

- None

#### Old Business

- Seed Money permanent (James R.)
  - Currently: \$150 per bid in seed money; had 3 bids take advantage of that in 2024
  - Has been well-received from the bids. Going into it, what would we need to change in terms of our literature to make that effect permanent?
    - Current language in Bid Requirements:
      - Requirement 6. Bidders must agree to turn over their profits to the Advisory Council (less a max of \$150 turnover) within 30 days of the close of the conference at which they are bidding.
    - Suggested update to language in Bid Requirement #6:
      - Change to “6. Bidders must agree to turn over **all remaining funds** to the Advisory Council within 30 days of the close of the conference at which they are bidding.”
    - Current language in Helpful Hint #6:
      - 6. After the conference at which you are bidding, all leftover funds (less the carry over allowed in requirements) must be turned over to the Advisory Council. See the bylaws in the Advisory Committee packet to find out how excess funds are distributed. Please act responsibly.
    - Suggested update to Helpful Hint #6:
      - New: After the conference at which you are bidding, all **remaining funds** (must be turned over to the Advisory Council. See the bylaws in the Advisory Committee packet to find out how excess funds are distributed. Please act responsibly.
    - Add Helpful Hint # 7 which shifts everything down by a number: “Advisory makes available \$150 seed money to any bid – wherever possible, the expectation is this amount is returned to advisory council along with all remaining funds at end of bidding year.”
  - Language in the Advisory Packet will need to be updated to account for the bid seed money in the prudent reserve

#### 4. Prudent Reserve

- a. The Council shall maintain a Prudent Reserve of \$28,000 after seed money is returned following the close of the Conference, broken down as follows:
  - \$3,000 (Host Seed Money)
  - \$5,000 (2-yr Advisory Business Expenses/**Bid Seed Money**)
  - \$20,000 (Emergency Expenses)

### **Prudent Reserve Total - \$28,000.00**

b. If a Host Committee were ever to default or fold due to financial failure, the Council shall use their emergency funds to plan a conference.

c. These reserve funds are arbitrary figures based on current economic conditions and can be altered by a simple majority vote of the quorum. The business expenses should total the needs for 2 consecutive years and emergency funds for one conference which nets a negative balance.

- Megan motions: To update bid requirement 6 to, “6. Bidders must agree to turn over **all remaining funds** to the Advisory Council within 30 days of the close of the conference at which they are bidding.”; to update helpful hint #6 to, “After the conference at which you are bidding, all **remaining** funds (must be turned over to the Advisory Council. See the bylaws in the Advisory Committee packet to find out how excess funds are distributed. Please act responsibly.”; to add new helpful hint #7, which shifts everything down by a number, “Advisory makes available \$150 seed money to any bid – wherever possible, the expectation is this amount is returned to advisory council along with all remaining funds at end of bidding year.”; and, in the Advisory Packet, update requirement #4 to “4. Prudent Reserve

a. The Council shall maintain a Prudent Reserve of \$28,000 after seed money is returned following the close of the Conference, broken down as follows:

- \$3,000 (Host Seed Money)
- \$5,000 (2-yr Advisory Business Expenses/**Bid Seed Money**)
- \$20,000 (Emergency Expenses)

### **Prudent Reserve Total - \$28,000.00**

b. If a Host Committee were ever to default or fold due to financial failure, the Council shall use their emergency funds to plan a conference.


c. These reserve funds are arbitrary figures based on current economic conditions and can be altered by a simple majority vote of the quorum. The business expenses should total the needs for 2 consecutive years and emergency funds for one conference which nets a negative balance.”

which adds a ‘ / ’ and three words.

- Rian - seconds
- No discussion
- Voting: Motion PASSES unanimously

- Savannah will update the Bid Packet and Advisory Packet with the abovementioned language by tomorrow, Saturday March 30th, 2024.

## New Business

- Voting on the hotel contract should be  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the entire committee, not present quorum. (James)
  - This feels like a loophole that just slipped through the cracks. I think it should be blatantly obviously to the entire committee that you should have  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the ENTIRE committee to vote on a hotel contract
  - Tim motions: To add “including the Hotel contract” to the end of Advisory Packet, Operating Procedures #3.a.
    - Language: “3. Financial transactions
      - a. No member of the Council shall incur expenses in the name of the Council without first receiving a 2/3’s majority approval from the full Council (an exception for postage and copies will be made), **including the Hotel contract.**
        - Seconded
        - **Voting:** Motion passes unanimously
- Adding a hotel contract negotiation guide to the bid packets (Tara)
  - Information from the slideshow that is provided at ISCYPAA info sessions.
  - Add language to the end of Bid Requirement #2 and Helpful Hint #2
    - Bid Requirement 2. Bidders must have a contract from at least one hotel. This contract must include the dates of availability for the banquet and meeting rooms and proof that the hotel will not require a minimum number of attendees. \*\*\*Experience has shown us that securing more than one hotel bid strengthens our ability to negotiate with the primary hotel (**See Appendix: Hotel Negotiation Guide attachment for additional guidance**).
    - Helpful Hint 2. No group should be discouraged from bidding because their town cannot support two hotels. We understand that Illinois is home to many towns of different sizes. Try your best to find two hotels but if they don’t exist, the Advisory Council will not hold it against you. Negotiating with hotels can be quite an ordeal, especially if no one on your committee has experience in this. The Advisory Council can be extremely helpful with this, so please ask for help if you need it (**See Appendix: Hotel Negotiation Guide for additional guidance**).
    -  **Hotel Contract Negotiation Guide**
- Discussion - edits to the Hotel Negotiation Guide

- Tim motions: Add the Hotel Negotiation Guide as an appendix to the bid packet and refer to it in bid requirement #2 and helpful hints #2.
  - Seconded, Brian
  - Voting, 12 in favor, 1 abstention, motion carries
  
- Registration “system”: Instead of Host handling all registrations where it would go through the system Advisory set up, intended to maintain the data with a central email, to get rid of this system and have a responsible person maintain an email list that is the job of the webmaster at the end of the conference to go to the Registration Chair and get all of the emails.
  - James: we had added the suggestion that Host use the registration system, it is not a requirement; the second part of Tim’s suggestion is a literature change, which would alter a job description
  - Michelle: I don’t want to get emails from ISCYPAA about upcoming conferences; do people have to agree to have their email addresses?
    - James: this is a separate topic, the discussion is regarding whether or not we have the next Host use the registration system or not
    - Michelle: If they didn’t use it this year and we suggested it, why...
      - They did use it and they hated it
      - Why do we need a literature change?
      - It’s not a lit change, Tim just wants a vote to get rid of the system
  - Megan - from what I’ve seen, the bid that used it last year, Registration info was lost and it was a hassle to get it fixed
    - Tim: If we had to set up a system, we could put a Square system together for virtual registrations and just hand it over to Host to connect a bank account
  - Jeanette - Is the issue of data loss or of manual work causing data to be missing or did something else have to be restored?
    - Tim - there were also issues of payments not going through and updates to registration prices
    - Jeanette - can we allow Host to manage the system themselves for these types of changes?
    - Tim - if Host had managed the system as it was, there were a lot of opportunities to break the system (clusterfuck)
    - Jeanette - So it is possible for host to manage the system, it is just hard to understand how to use
  - Tim/James - in lieu of the current system, the new Host committee can be given a new Square account that will collect their registration data, and alternatively, they can also use paper forms for manual entries/cash transactions

- Brian - for cash regs, we had the registrants fill out the form in square and hand us cash for the transaction
- Jeanette - we can at least show this as an option to the new Host but not state that we are going to manage it
  - Tim - nothing outside of providing them the link/explaining the options
- Ryan - last year, when Host won, I thought it was just a barcode thing
- Tim- I'm talking about setting up a Square marketplace that Host can manage
- James - Are we prepared to have the Webmaster and Treasurer decide what we suggest to the new Host Committee?
  - Yes

Rockford's last minute submission of a bid packet:

Meg - eligible means? - will not get host, but could potentially present

Bill - they still let us bid, yes they should be eligible because it is easier for them to get feedback

Ryan - no but allow to present

Jeanette - any bid can submit a packet and still; be 'eligible'; the submission portion is not listed as a numbered requirement; let god speak; they could be late but still meet every other requirement

Tim - ditto Jeanette; I would hate, especially for an area that we struggled with, they broke off and started their own conference a couple of years ago - we should consider it and whether or not people thought they were late

Savannah - no

Meg - gut reaction was accept them and give them the opp to have the experience, do I think they'd be the one we choose, probably not but in the spirit of excitement and camaraderie, welcome them

James - I think 'eligible' is wrong, it should be 'considered'; my opinion is we don't consider them, let them present but they don't get considered for next year

Tara - it says in our literature what to do in this situation; the case with Prairypaa with the ages falls into the existing requirements

Jeanette - my point was that of the other 11 requirements, I believe some of the other packets don't meet all of these requirements, so would we consider them ineligible as well or what; they should be considered and should be eligible - the timing is just a requirement was not met; giving them a shot is in the best interest of the conference

Tim - "what was the intention behind" - the intention of putting this part into the packet.. At one point there were 7 or 8 bids and it was unreasonable to have advisory come in on a Friday night and look at all of them with no sight prior... we have 3. At the end, it says "make sure all 11 requirements are included in the bid packet"

Rian - they should be able to present and go through the motions and I don't necessarily think that we have to make a decision right now on whether they are eligible... we should consider them and let them present just to be a part of it and the decision is ultimately up to the process we go through

Mike - we have these things written out so its not just total chaos but I don't believe that taking this position to be god and rule small matters in the grand scheme of things... if this goes to a vote, our vote will determine if they should be considered. Is it really our job to consider who is eligible to want a conference in their area? It would be too much of us to demand this specific thing or be like "you're out"

Michelle - selecting the next host comm is only a part of our job as advisory, and ensuring the wellbeing of ISCYPAA is an overarching thing; and telling a group that has passion that they don't qualify would be beneficial to ISCYPAA as a whole; it sounds like Rockford would benefit from our feedback, guidance and experience.

Brian - there is an unfair advantage to give consideration to someone who submitted last minute to someone who submitted on time, but I think we can still give them feedback; we are selecting someone to host a conference that is in the 10s of thousands of dollars, esp with dates for deposits and contracts and showing up on time - this doesn't show that to me, it is there so we can look at the bid and provide feedback and demonstrate that you've thought ahead I would not consider this meeting the requirements on time and their bid packet doesn't meet req number 5 about financial autonomy

Bill - question: if we have a motion to approve their consideration, how would that vote accomplish the decision

By default, it would be 51% of quorum

Bill motions to consider Rockford along with the other 2 bids.

- Seconded, Jeanette
- Bill - Rockford has a population area that is bigger than some states.
- Voting - 9 in favor, 4 against
  - Minority opinion:
    - Savannah - I reiterate what I said already
    - Brian - I don't know how they would feel if we said we're not considering them; but if we say we're not considering but will give you this specific feedback and encourage you to continue bidding. The submission deadline is in bold type in the bid requirements.
    - Tara, Megan - no additional opinions
  - Do any votes change? Yes
- Ryan: What other requirements did they not meet?
  - Brian: 5, which does not demonstrate financial autonomy
- Rian - to clarify what I said - what happened over here is the friends of the person who submitted the bid packet and I said we'll look at it but they can't be considered for host; he came back and brought the bid packet and I said we'll look at it and said it's too late to be considered. Just us considering them and putting in a vote is just letting them do their thing/going through the motions. I feel like this point is moot.
- James R - I was conflicted and thought that voting yes was not liking the feeling of desperation. If we had 6 completed bid packets submitted on time, it would be a hard no. With the situation we're in, I just want that extra bid.



- Tim - the whole part about not meeting req 5 has nothing to do with this conversation and to preemptively take them off the board... let's just consider it and go from there
- Michelle - Prairypaa req 4 was not met and we're still going to consider them. Convo has spiraled into semantics. There are different minds on this committee, regardless of whether they meet all the requirements, it will shake out in our group conscience anyway.
- Jeanette - what message does it send to the other bids who did submit on time to spend the bulk of our deliberations on the people who did not; we can give them the feedback about submission; I am on the fence now - on the one side, there really are 12 requirements, just not numbered, we also don't want to water down are reqs and make it a free-for-all.
- Bill - in the post-covid era we have had swisypaa and chicago and chicago is the only one that made it and I would rather encourage more bids to participate and if we care about the vote and future of iscypaa I think the clear vote is yes
- James P - in one way, I'm very black and white and on the other hand let's just go through the motions... very conflicted.. You can express your opinion on their eligibility in your vote but the last thing that I say, is what message are we sending to the other bids
- Michelle - call to vote
- Re-vote: 7 in favor; motion carries

Announcements

Meeting closing time: