

by Carrol McCracken

1. **Welcome and Call to Order:** Meeting was called to Order at 9:05 a.m., PST by IGC Vice President, Sharon Slauenwhite, presiding. Agenda has been emailed out along with link for the call.
2. **Roll Call:** There was a roll call /introduction of all members on the conference call. They included:
 - Region 1 Representative Ray Mehler, Region 1 Secretary/Treasurer
 - Region 2 Representative Kim Heibert, President Chapter 36
 - Region 3 Representative Carrol McCracken, Region 3 Secretary/Treasurer
 - Region 4, Ross Greene, Region 4
 - Region 5 Representative Pat Petitto, Past Int. Pres. & Advisory Council
 - Region 6 Representative Matt Harris, Region 6 Secretary/Treasurer
 - Region 7 Representative David Whitlock, Chapter 45, PDC Chair
 - Region 8 Representative James Hardy, Region 8 Vice Chair
 - Region 9 Representative Tony Pollack
 - Region 10 Representative, Jenna Wood arrived later on the call

International Executive Committee:

Sharon Slauenwhite, Int. Vice President IEC Liaison/Chair
Mark Rieck, CEO

3. **Approval of Minutes:** Carrol McCracken reported the December 19, 2018 minutes were emailed out and there was only one correction. R 1, Ray made a motion to approve the minutes, R 6, Matt seconded. Motion passed
4. **Communications/Feedback from Regions:** Feedback from any of the regions about the GTF project:

R1- Ray, Their region had a meeting this last Monday, with 11 of 13 chapters represented, mostly presidents. Meeting was successful. Had a few comments and questions:

- What sort of issues are the international chapters and members at large having?
- IEC question that isn't meant to be defensive - Current governance has worked so far, so wonder why IEC feels it needs to change? Why reexamine?
- IEC had stated growth and development in North American was past focus, what has changed?
- One chapter requested a condensed summary for their review.
- Ray will email a list of concerns and questions to Sharon.

R2 -Kim, They haven't had a formal meeting yet, but may organize one in a few weeks. Feedback this past month has been members wanting to know where they can get all of

the documents. Now all of the documents are on the Member Network. They want to have emails giving updates. Can we do this or wait until minutes are approved.

Decision was to wait until approved minutes are available.

R3 – Carrol, We haven't had a formal meeting yet, but do cover the progress in monthly conference calls for the region leadership. Two people have wondered why we aren't working quicker on this, but he had explained our region wanted a fresh start and we needed to cover past actions.

R4 – Ross, Will check on having a devoted section to the region forum for discussion. There haven't been any questions for the chapters yet.

R5 – Pat, no questions. Their region chair has asked for ad hoc region committee volunteers. This will be done soon and may have representatives from each chapter. They have some, but not all. Will have a conference call soon. Email feedback so far shows consensus that current system is working, needs tweaks and shouldn't be thrown out. They want to protect what is working while being progressive and forward thinking for the benefit of the members.

R6-Matt, Has been in contact with Region Chairs, Vice Chairs and region presidents, and no questions or comments currently. Will expect feedback from Region Forum. May have a report in March.

Sharon S. – We can create consistent talking points to present to all upcoming forums. This may be a one page synopsis. Will be on the agenda for the next meeting. Kim added it may be beneficial if we had an action plan for feedback and questions we may want to ask our membership.

R7 - David, Spring Forum is March 8 (first one). Region and Chapter leadership is fully informed through region officers and member network. Echoed that many of us weren't involved in earlier meetings, which has been received well.

R8 -James, Minutes have been forwarded, and not much dialog as it is still early. Does like designating time at the spring forum for discussion.

R9 – Tony. No region subcommittees, everyone is receiving minutes we forward. Not a lot of discussion at chapter meetings so far, except for speed and wanting quick recommendations. They are happy that it is being reviewed.

R10 – Jenna. Different situation. Their region seemed informed before this process. That has made their region more trusting in the process, which has led to more questions on progress. Explained they have new members which need to get up to speed. Their region is wants to go through governance review. She did say that this task force is a priority for her, but not for the region. They have more concerns about how to increase course attendance.

Mark R. – No report

- 5. Discussion of Governance Project Overview:** Sharon S. – Document prepared by consultant for this project. Four keys to success identified are for broad use, not just our project. Sharon went over them, and the group feeling was they were useful. R1, Ray added model was a sound one, but there was a flaw in execution. four keys. R3, Carrol added similar statement about flawed execution. R2, Kim agreed with both comments. Process may not be flawed, but remodeling governance was communicated as forced.

Sharon mentioned this document was focus for preparations for design of the project. Membership perspective was heard along with leaders including Imagineering Session.

Mark R. thought the document was well founded. Governance Project Overview is something we need to make available all of the time. Communication issues have been discussed since 2008. Should we be governing the association or governing the profession. May not be active in the profession. How do we provide leadership development? The project may have been too aggressive, it is a tough balance. It will be up to 202 people if we want to make changes. We didn't do a statistical analysis, but the organization hasn't grown in at least 20 years. We shouldn't have growth for growth's sake. Is this 100 market penetration for the IRWA and if so, is it ok? If so do we need to focus on the industry or the benefit of our member's needs.

R 5, Pat – Without past involvement, the feeling is that while people knew a project was going on, but the communication failed because of changes in leadership of the project, along with some people only being involved because they heard it at the conference.

R8, James – Was fortunate to be involved in some meetings, but not all, and it seems like the topics varied, or the project wasn't consistent

Sharon added that the meeting in Phoenix had multiple purposes. Messages from various meetings lead to identification of communication from broad group. Communication, Representation and Leadership Development were major goals. Understands that efforts to include many voices coming in and out of the project, led to a disjointed/lack of consistency project.

R7, David – Item 3, a case for change must be adequately articulated, and it wasn't done. The result was a question of why we were moving on which turned into a lack of trust. We have heard that from a number of people. The document Mark R referenced is the governance project overview is a confusing document, with different meetings with different names, parties called by different names. A newcomer would wonder what is going on. As the document goes on, never has he seen to date, what the strategic plan, goals and accomplishments are or should be. If you want to make changes, we need to have evaluation.

Sharon S. said IEC has done some of this work, but it may not be out for discussion. Mark R. agreed. She expects it will be shared with the IEC.

R7 David said it has to come out for membership and leadership to be actively involved and have evaluations.

R5, Pat – It has been suggested we identify problems and solutions. People need to understand the problems.

And

Discussion of IRWA Design Sessions Summary 05.16.17 Document:

Sharon S. said this was the outcome of the Chicago IEC meeting. Good document showing specific objectives and obstacles produced from the project. IGC leaders had an update by a conference call. June IGC meeting made the decision to go forward with the plan by Tecker and the Imagineering session.

Project had to meet goals of all its members. IGC June meeting outcome was a desire to remain open to all possibilities, not just stay the same. They wanted to be open to possibilities which may make the organization better. Process was to involve leadership and membership. Some regions had some great comments. Region 1 wanted a clean slate approach to new opportunities for bettering the organization. Region 9 had similar feelings. Region 6 had expressed concerns about the consultant. They wondered about retention after change.

Any comments or questions about design session summary document?

R10, Jenna – Their region isn't ok. They have dying chapters, trust is down, volunteerisms is down, so that is why they wanted to look into this.

- 6. Next Meeting:** Agenda Item: Alaska Conference Leadership Workshop (Imagineering Our Future) and plan that came from it.

We will flag items of concern. Process may not have been as flawed as the model communication or method.

Carrol McCracken mentioned the conflict between initial minutes versus the Terms of Reference for meeting date. The November minutes specifically said the 4th Wednesday of the month. There was a motion by Carrol to correct the Terms of Reference to say the 4th Wednesday. Ray 2nd, Motion carried. There will be a posting of the corrected Terms of Reference.

Next meeting is February 27, 2019, 9:00 a.m. PST.

Email Sharon with any questions or items for the agenda.

- 7. Adjournment:** The meeting concluded at approximately 10:02 a.m., PST