



North American Society  
for the  
Sociology of Sport

November 3rd, 2023  
5:00 pm-6:15 pm (scheduled)

Present: At 6:55 pm, 97 people in the room.

---

1. F. Michelle Richardson, President, welcomes all: 5:15 pm
2. Presentation of Awards
  - a. Gary Sailes Graduate Diversity Scholarship, presented by Malcom Drewery.  
Doctoral award given to Tori A. Justin, University of Maryland  
Master's award given to Kaitlyn Seow, Queen's University

Michelle Richardson: Announcement to turn in unused drink tickets to Charles or put them onto the table.

- b. SSJ and HK Early Career Researcher Award, presented by Cheryl Cooky, with statement read from Josh Newman  
Award given to Christopher McLeod, University of Florida
    - c. SSJ Outstanding Article Award, presented by Beth Cavalier  
Honorable Mention to Jules Boykoff for "Toward a Theory of Sportwashing: Mega-events, Soft Power, and Political Conflict"  
Winners are Tricia McGuire-Adams, Janelle Joseph, Danielle Peers, Lindsay Eales, William Bridel, Chen Chen, Evelyn Hamdon, and Bethan Kingsely for "Awakening to Elsewheres: Collectively Restorying Embodied Experiences of (Be)longing"
    - d. Barbara Brown Outstanding Student Paper Award, presented by Derek Silva  
Doctoral award given to Jordan Keesler, University of Maryland, for "Phenomenological Understandings of Transness: Queering Sporting Experiences"  
Master's award given to Daniel Uy, York University, for "Pride Body: Racialized Gay and Queer Men's Physique Preparation for Canadian Pride Events"
    - e. NASSS Outstanding Book Award, presented by Jessica Siegele  
Honorable Mention to Belinda Wheaton and Holly Thorpe for *Action Sport and the Olympic Games*  
Honorable Mention to Paul Darby, James Esson, and Christian Ungruhe for *African Football Migration: Aspirations, Experiences, and Trajectories*  
Winner is Lisa Uperesa for *Gridiron Capital: How American Football Became a Samoan Game*
3. Treasurer's Report

- a. Michael Friedman: Presents total assets. In a relatively strong position, most of the money in the bank is the Wolff fund. We are down \$50k from 2022 because 2 most recent conferences lost money, \$25k each. As of this morning, membership is at 406 total. In Las Vegas we lost over \$25k with 337 registrations. We will lose money on this conference but less. We raised conference fees since 2019 and were then closer to 380 registrations. Will raise fees again for Chicago next year. A motion to increase membership dues will be coming, haven't been raised in a long time. There is no Finance Committee but thank you for recent emails to join. Will have several meetings about fiscal oversight. Eli Wolff Memorial Fund – shows amount raised.
4. Eli Wolff Memorial Fund
    - b. Brian Gearity and Michael Cottingham introduce this fund, meant to recognize Eli's impact and contributions. Gearity: There will be a future mechanism for continued fundraising. Michael: Fund to support advocacy and research and the pairing of these. Family and friends of Eli put this together as a long-term fund, will be working off interest in perpetuity. Important new funding for disability sport. Hope to bring more people into disability sport, grow the literature. Great honor for Eli, subject of future bylaw change.
    - c. Michael Friedman: NASSS is a 501c3, donations are tax deductible.
5. Service Excellence Awards, presented by Algerian Hart  
Awards to Cheryl Cooky, Bob Case, Michael Giardina
6. Proposed Bylaws Changes
    - a. Brian Gearity: Reviewing changes to the bylaws document, including formatting, edit to "emerit," eligibility criteria for holding elected office.
    - b. Faye Wachs: Do these criteria also apply to the Graduate Student Representatives?
    - c. Brian Gearity: Will clarify that these are only for non-grad student offices. [Text of bylaw change is amended, continues to review proposed changes] Past-President is added to the Eli Wolff Memorial Fund. Section 16 Policies and Procedures
    - d. Cheryl Cooky: Clarifies what the PPM is and why this bylaw change is valuable.
    - e. Brian Gearity: Asks for questions or concerns. Want to create a more formalized structure and both documents (bylaws and PPM) and available on the NASSS website. Other proposed changes to clarify the procedure for how people resign. More formatting changes. Another change adds the Eli Wolff fund as a standing committee. Here is the operating procedures document separate from the bylaws. The fund is looking to start with awards next year. The committee's work requires no financial support from NASSS but they will be fundraising. Included is a procedure for producing reports as a standing committee. In Article 8, Rules of Order, propose moving from Robert's Rules of Order to Modern Parliamentary Procedure, or Keesey, and that is all the changes.

- f. Michelle Richardson: Are there questions?
- g. Jay Laurendeau: Thank you for this. Is it possible or worthwhile to separate these changes into 2 pieces for a vote? Eli Wolff Fund seems like a significant change, while the rest is more formatting. One or the other may require more discussion.
- h. Michelle Richardson: Yes, we can bring up these 2 parts separately. Following Robert's Rules, could somebody call –
- i. Algerian Hart: It is a question of procedure. Are we continuing Robert's Rules? Then we need to call the meeting to order (6:13 pm). Question needs to be put to the floor, I move.
- j. Christine Dallaire: Seconded.
- k. Lars Dzikus: What is the question?
- l. Michelle Richardson: For there to be 2 separate votes on proposed bylaw changes, one on the Eli Wolff Fund standing committee, the other for the rest.
- m. Amanda Schweinbenz: Need to call it to the floor.
- n. Christine Vlcek: I call it to the floor.
- o. Amanda Schweinbenz: Call to order, in favor? [All are in favor]. First motion is to split changes to the bylaws.
- p. Christine Dallaire moves
- q. Christine Vlcek seconds.
- r. Vote: All in favor, no opposition, 1 abstention.
- s. Jeff Montez de Oca: Might want to split the changes for voting even more. Eli Wolff should be on its own but other changes are of different magnitudes as well. Very simple formatting is 1 thing. Another substantive change is adding the resignation language, another is switching from Robert's Rules to Keesey, maybe others. These should not be bundled into a single vote.
- t. Cheryl Cooky: moves to amend the motion, separate bylaw changes into these areas: Eli Wolff Fund, formatting, resignation, Robert's Rules, and eligibility. 5 changes.
- u. Christine Vlcek seconds
- v. Vote: All in favor, no opposition, 1 abstention
- w. Cheryl Cooky: Now we can discuss the motion on the floor, which was passing the Eli Wolff Fund change to the bylaws
- x. Michelle Richardson: There is a motion on the floor
- y. Christine Dallaire: Propose Eli Wolff chair
- z. Kay McCurdy seconds
- aa. Cheryl Cooky: In terms of the fund and documentation, for clarification, the operating code is also in the bylaws for standing committee. I Recommend editing down language for Eli Wolff Fund to be similar to other committees and put nuts and bolts into the PPM so they can change, versus being subject to bylaw change process. I don't want to vote no on this but didn't see this before the meeting.
- bb. Michelle Richardson: This meeting is where we handle business.
- cc. Amanda Schweinbenz: You can't tweak bylaws on your own.
- dd. Cheryl Cooky: Yes, and that's why some of this should be in the PPM. In bylaws, even a minor change has to go through the membership. Are we okay with that as an organization?
- ee. Michelle Richardson: This is an endowment and does not operate like any other committee.

- ff. Christine Dallaire: I get the point but this was prepared for today. Let's do this and give it a year or 2, see how it is working. Tonight's not the night to do that work.
- gg. Brian Garity: I agree, let's do the thing tonight. I can eliminate these 2 paragraphs, they are also in the operating code.
- hh. Stacey Flores: But if he deletes then that isn't what we were asked to vote on in the split?
- ii. Brian Garity: What I can delete is already restated in the operating code, wanted it to be clear.
- jj. Cheryl Cooky: I'm okay voting on it as is and figuring out changes next year, but I do thank you Christine for bringing this up.
- kk. Vote on change to bylaws establishing standing committee for Eli Wolff Fund: All in favor except 1 in opposition and 7 abstentions.
- ll. Michelle Richardson: Now on to the formatting edits
- mm. Lars Dzikus: move to approve
- nn. Letisha Brown seconds
- oo. William Bridel: please edit out binary language [this is done]
- pp. Vote on formatting changes to bylaws: All in favor, no opposition or abstention
- qq. Michelle Richardson: next are changes to eligibility for office.
- rr. Christine Dallaire moves to approve
- ss. Kasie Murphy seconds
- tt. Daniel Mann: Concern with wording because it is ambiguous about graduate students, who can't meet these criteria.
- uu. Stacey Flores: How hard is it to get people to run for office in the first place? If sometimes people run unopposed, is this not prohibitive? Can we vote for more than one person?
- vv. Michelle Richardson: An issue we want to address is that some people ran for office who have never attended the conference. We also want institutional history.
- ww. Cheryl Cooky: I appreciate the spirit of this change, but the question of difficulty getting candidates to run for office is a good one. I had planned to talk to someone, Brian or Jay, idea for advisory committee of past presidents to provide organizational history. If we don't want someone running not at all familiar with the organization, then we don't vote for that person. Elections committee needs to ensure diversity on the ballot. Ideally, we are voting for people who have served in some capacity. Is anyone here from Elections committee?
- xx. Michelle Richardson: The year we had 2 people running for President, none had ever served NASSS in any capacity or attended the conference.
- yy. Christine Dallaire: I see the point of having someone who has been a NASSS member for at least 3 years and participated in a conference. I also serve another organization and this is hard to assess, requires very clear and updated lists of membership and conference attendance. Some people are on the program but not actually here. The criteria are difficult to assess although I see the point of being a member.
- zz. Charles Crowley: At this conference, I saw people who didn't have a badge on, some didn't pick it up. We do know who attended and did not attend. These are good criteria. Some piggyback on other people to have their scholarship recognized, some want to be on a committee for P&T, but they can't just use our organization without helping our organization.

- aaa. Anna Baeth: Do we know what % of our NASSS membership would qualify under these criteria?
- bbb. Christine Dallaire: This would depend on our record keeping and I know we've changed databases over time. Also depends on how far back you look. Do we have the records to assess this?
- ccc. Stacey Flores: Point of clarification – to answer your question, why not an amendment that only the President has to have served previously? This would open opportunity for everyone else. I move to amend that the criteria apply to nominees for President only, not other board members.
- ddd. Amanda Schweinbenz seconded.
- eee. Brian Gearity gives a thumbs up.
- fff. Cheryl Cooky: President restriction or otherwise, anyone can join and be a member. Professional member cost is \$100+ dollars. Some couldn't attend the conference coming from states like CA that have passed laws restricting travel, there are other reasons why some members don't attend. Is this 3 years a concern? Is this consecutive years?
- ggg. Michelle Richardson: Yes, consecutive. However, the amendment on the floor is to apply restriction of committee service only to President and not other positions.
- hhh. Vote on amendment to apply criteria only to President: 4 opposed, 15 abstentions, all others in favor.
- iii. Christine Dallaire: I did not read this as consecutive, the language does not clearly say this. I move to add 3 "consecutive" years to the language.
- jjj. Daniel Mann seconds. Can take out brackets – point of order – if this only applies to President now.
- kkk. Umer Hussain: If consecutive, an international member could likely have visa issues, and this excludes many.
- lll. Amanda Schweinbenz: This is a good point. The organization should be inclusive and should create opportunities for remote presentation, support travel of international members.
- mmm. Umer Hussain: Not everyone was allowed to be virtual this year as well.
- nnn. Christine Dallaire: Sorry Umer, I might not have understood, I thought the language was saying that somebody has to be a member 3 consecutive years but only has to have attended the conference once.
- ooo. Michelle Richardson: What we are saying is you've been a member for 3 consecutive years and in those 3 years have attended 1 or more conference.
- ppp. Derek Silva: I appreciate the concerns raised. The motion on the floor is largely procedural, let's vote on this and then move to discussion for the next vote. The broader issue will be encapsulated in discussion on the next vote.
- qqq. Bob Case: I moderated multiple sessions, one presentation had 4 people listed but rest of the people besides 1 presenter weren't at the conference.
- rrr. Beth Cavalier: I call the question.
- sss. Michael Friedman: Seconds this.
- ttt. Jeff Montez de Oca: Don't talk over people who have the floor.
- uuu. Michelle Richardson: We can take this outside, have a conversation. The question has been called. 1 year attend conference, 3 years consecutive membership.

- vvv. Vote on amended language, so the addition of “consecutive”: 12 in opposition, 11 abstentions, all others in favor.
- www. Vote on this bylaw change for added criteria to President position: Beth Cavalier calls to question, Christine Dallaire seconds: 10 opposed, 8 abstentions, all others in favor.
- xxx. Michelle: Next up, the proposed change from Robert’s Rules to Keesey.
- yyy. Christine Dallaire moves to accept
- zzz. Anthony Weems seconds
- aaaa. Anna Baeth: Why this change? What are the benefits?
- bbbb. Brian Gearity: Robert’s Rules of Order are intense and people don’t know it. Keesey is simplified version. We use it in our college and it is less complex. 125 pages versus hundreds of pages long.
- cccc. Derek Silva: I have a concern that complexity is important. In context of this meeting now, there is a much deeper conversation in this organization about such a drastic move given governance issues.
- dddd. Daniel Mann: I agree with Derek. I’ve never heard of Keesey and I’ve been in multiple organizations. I don’t understand the differences between the two and I’d like to understand these before voting on the change.
- eeee. Cheryl Cooky: I appreciate the spirit of this bylaw change proposal. I am not familiar with Keesey, but agree that some of us are more familiar with Robert’s Rules of Order than others. Having a Parliamentarian at our meetings is very important, will help us to address that issue. Amanda is next in line to be in that role. Motion that Amanda serve as Parliamentarian [laughs; this is a joke, not really a motion]
- ffff. Algerian Hart: Table it.
- gggg. Brian Gearity: Table it, fine. I will send out information. This was not to sidestep the democratic process.
- hhhh. Michelle Richardson: We table this for the next business meeting. Next proposed change to the bylaws is Policy and Procedure for the Board, section 16.
- iiii. Christine Dallaire moves to accept
- jjjj. Christine Vlcek seconds
- kkkk. Vote: 1 abstention, no opposition, all else in favor.
- llll. Rachel Allison: We need to approve the minutes from the 2022 Business Meeting.
- mmmm. Michelle Richards: Minutes from past business meeting in Las Vegas.
- nnnn. Stacey Flores moves to accept minutes
- oooo. Christine Vlcek seconds.
- pppp. Vote on 2022 minutes: 4 abstentions, no opposition, all else in favor.

## 7. UNDRIP

- a. Vicky Parashak: Received this a month ago from the President, will provide UNDRIP background. In 2007 passed by the UN, has 46 articles, provides standards for Indigenous peoples and a framework for reconciliation. 4 countries turned it down initially, including the US and Canada, but have now endorsed it. Other organizations and provinces have endorsed it. In 2015 the Canada Truth and Reconciliation Commission has asked that UNDRIP underlie actions for reconciliation. Lays out the process leading to this resolution: first, an ad hoc committee through President. 15 members discussed how to

align with UNDRIP as NASSS. The current resolution is asking that membership endorse this, the aims of UNDRIP and to uphold these principles and promote these values. If we pass this, the organization agrees to align practices with UNDRIP articles and will form a standing committee to lay out a 5-year plan and accountability plan to bring to the membership next year. Questions? We held a roundtable and at the back of this room is a paper with questions: how might conference and policies and procedures alter if we work in alignment with articles? There are stickies for responses.

- b. Amanda Schweinbenz: Is this a motion?
- c. Michelle Richardson: Before a motion is brought, please note that the executive committee in meeting voted to back this UNDRIP resolution.
- d. Vicky Paraschak: I move that NASSS supports this resolution, commits to UNDRIP alignment.
- e. Faye Wachs seconds.
- f. Vote: All in favor, no opposition, no abstentions.

## 8. SEEDS

- a. Michelle Richardson: It is time for a discussion. Information was put out about what and why, thinking this is personal. It is not personal. It is about bylaws and accountability. Last year a bylaws change and initiative was brought to Las Vegas and had to be tabled because it had not been through DCCC, even though it had been funded. But it had not gone through proper channels. Marques Dexter, who resigned, had not shown up to NASSS conferences so SEEDS info was not brought to DCCC membership. When SEEDS was formed, they asked for 3 years of funding at \$25k. The first year during COVID was virtual, then in Montreal, then in Las Vegas.
- b. Judy Liao: Correction, did not do the program in Montreal.
- c. Michelle: Thank you, noted. In this time there have been no reports about money spent. The President-Elect asked for a budget, and we did not receive a budget until October. It was too late then because the conference budget had already been done. They did a GoFundMe. This is not personal to me, I don't know what you heard. It got personal in calling out people on the listserv like a high school Mean Girls. At NASSS we sit and have conversations, disagree respectfully. I will give you the floor to state your case.
- d. Stacey Flores: What is DCCC?
- e. Michelle Richardson: Diversity and Conference Climate Committee.
- f. Judy Liao: We needed money to make the program happen and that was the purpose of reaching out to the membership. A promise of funding was there and it did happen with membership help and generous donations from Georgia Tech. We held successful workshops, and I am humbled by the participation of speakers. Congrats to all on a successful workshop, please give a round of applause. Me and Jeff are here to summarize the program and give background on why this proposal. In the email sent out, written by a committee member, there is the justification for having SEEDS. This program helps NASSS fulfill its promise of antiracism and to create a safe space for racialized scholars. There is a clear distinction between DCCC and SEEDS and we have consulted with Malcolm. The DCCC working in the institutional aspect, the conference programming, and is diverse. SEEDS is a developmental, educational space for junior scholars who really need this resource. A preconference gives a network right away to those who may

be the only one from their institution. A bylaws change institutionalizes this program, integrates it into conference programming. It is not in the app - what does this say about our legitimacy? If a tree falls, no one hears it. Does SEEDS exist? This is why we need to put it into the bylaws. It has been hard, thanks to Charles, helped us to get a room, space, hard because the hotel contract was negotiated years ahead. This change requires us to negotiate for space for this with hotels going forward.

- g. Jeff Montez de Oca: The 2020 Executive Board was responding to what was going on at the time, not in symbolic but structural ways. This emerged from brainstorming with Algerian and Michelle, Billy Hawkins, Letisha Brown, Stanley Thangaraj, Mary McDonnell, Kathy Jamison [may have mentioned others but couldn't keep up], wanted to do something focused on mentoring. Talked to those running these kinds of mentor programs, they had all participated in or run a pre-conference event, said these were impactful and important and based on radical racial justice principles.
- h. Judy Liao: This paragraph explains the difference between DCCC and SEEDS. This program is not trying to change NASSS, that's a DCCC goal. That's why we need both, these are big jobs. The goal is to make a space for junior scholars to give them practical strategies, how to write a cover letter, how to select faculty to apply to work with, on the job market. It is a developmental and educational space. We are trying not to step on DCCC.
- i. Jeff Montez de Oca: We host a one-day event, including writing workshops. As academics the most important skill is the writing to produce publishable work. We do 2 different panels, a leadership workshop about navigating PWI and colonial academic spaces, provide an ongoing mentorship network during the year.
- j. Judy Liao: In terms of the budget, we include one night of lodging, honorariums for speakers/mentors, and meals for the day. Me and Jeff don't get paid except for sharing the meals. We pay our own lodging. The money goes to participants and mentors. Some speakers are not NASSS members and we invite them to dinner. Even if they don't come to the conference, they still have to stay in the hotel on Wednesday. Honorariums are important because they give us their time and expertise. If we invite minoritized scholars we have to give them something back for their energy and time. These are not huge sums. My friend went to a similar event and got paid \$5k. We are not doing that. 3 meals, though dinner. Some were talking with the participants until 10 pm, of course you are going to feed them. Michael mentioned the Finance Committee, on this budget we will consult with them.
- k. Amanda Schweinbenz: So you propose to host a preconference the day before, fully funded from outside sources, requiring nothing from NASSS organization?
- l. Judy Liao: The committee will have to go find external sources of funding.
- m. Jeff Montez de Oca: But we are asking NASSS to guarantee the funding for it, with the requirement that SEEDS also has to go out and seek external funding.
- n. Amanda Schweinbenz: So the concern is that we are seeing in the last 2 years we have lost \$25k at each conference and this is another cost to the membership. If there is no guarantee that the external money is there, it is asking the membership to incur more debt.
- o. Judy Liao: We included in our materials the requirement that we have to search for external funding. But membership, you have to guarantee the funding. If you are an antiracist organization, you have to put the money in.



- p. Christine Dallaire: Other organizations do a preconference. I would feel more comfortable with paying registration costs rather than honorariums but this assumes that the speakers are coming to the conference.
- q. Jeff Montez de Oca: Before we take questions, maybe we can finish our presentation and get to the bylaw changes we are suggesting.
- r. Judy Liao: 9 mentees, 3 speakers. We budgeted, at the end the cost was \$3,700. We want to cap the number of participants because most expense is lodging. Propose to cap at 15. This program would cost less than \$5k per year if we cap. Every year a less than \$5k budget is anticipated. The program has so far reached people. In 2022, we accepted some but 3 could not attend. This second year doing it in person, we have learned more, with 9 students and good chances to connect. 3 mentors this year, could not make it.
- s. Jeff Montez de Oca: First year speakers were top rate speakers, all virtual, second year fewer in person, and then 3 speakers in year 3. Great speakers, great participation. Here is who is on the organizing committee.
- t. Judy Liao: Proposed bylaw changes: make a SEEDS standing committee, plan for the committee and its responsibilities, clarify reporting structure, require committee to seek external funding. We want to create a safe space and need you to understand the purpose of this program. The Chair needs to go to the business meeting to report. Brian says we didn't give a report but we were not asked. That's why we will put it into the bylaws, that we have to give a report.
- u. Jeff Montez de Oca: First paragraph of proposed bylaws [reads these out]. Here is a picture of the Class of 2023.
- v. Michelle Richardson: First motion –
- w. Beth Cavalier: Moves to approve bylaws change for SEEDS program
- x. Letisha Brown seconds.
- y. Christine Dallaire: This is a great initiative. I am not familiar with NASSS finances. Another suggested change, I'm not comfortable consulting with the Treasurer for the budget. The budget should be developed by SEEDS and approved by the Board. Not only with the Treasurer, and that should be done way ahead of time. Of course, if the committee gets external money, great, that's more people in the program.
- z. Ellen Staurowsky: The concept is good. I am being introduced to this for the first time, because I changed institutions and NASSS emails go to my old email address. A note about the Treasurer and the fiduciary responsibility that the officers assume, I would be uncomfortable with the wording. We all want to get to the endline in terms of supporting this, and I may be misspeaking. I am supportive of this but responsibility, the President is going to bear this personally and institutionally, that should be a part of the proposal.
- aa. Judy Liao: I talked to Jeff, we can have a new amendment along those lines.
- bb. Anna Baeth: Thank you for your efforts. It is a compelling argument that you have to spend money to make money, and this program is a potential recruiting mechanism for NASSS. I have a question about the finances of NASSS writ large. Where does money come from, where is it going, and are those numbers sent out? I want information transparency, did I miss an email?
- cc. Michelle Richardson: Mentions Treasurer's report.
- dd. Jeff Montez de Oca: We are asking for a dues increase, it would be \$30 a year if we have the full 15 students and we had no other funding.

- ee. Hugo Ceron: I won the 2020 book award and participated in the 2021 SEEDS program. It is a fantastic initiative that connected me with students that I am still in contact with. We read their work, the way the program worked as mentors, we provide advice and help with finding journals. I know how hard it is to recruit racialized faculty to my own institution and I think that this program is fantastic.
- ff. Kasie Murphy: I have questions. I'm a Grad Student Rep with voting rights on the Board. Funding-wise, we are paying for rooms and in no other capacity does NASSS pay for rooms or meals or honorariums. I was part of the ISSA mentoring program and I understand the value of the program when people come early. In last year's minutes, we talked about the issue of only a very few students taking part and the concern was about extending the program to people with multiple marginalizations. We are in NOLA and I am Canadian with a travel warning for queer people as unsafe. Other programs do list other marginalizations. This should be considered.
- gg. Dan Burdsey: I reiterate comments about the value and impact and legacy of this program. I was an initial mentor in 2021 and I established with my group of 4 colleagues that I would be a mentor not just that night but as long as I could be useful. Those relationships have continued and those students publish great work, have gone on to good jobs. The program has incredible value and it does what we are here for, building capacity and community.
- hh. Daniel Mann: I echo all. I am fortunate to have incredible mentors that are invaluable and why should those in the SEEDS program not have those opportunities as well? The concerns about structure and financial responsibilities are too ambiguous.
- ii. Christina Vlcek: I have a comment about language. I support this program. The language refers to racialized students or BIPOC. In Canada someone can be BIPOC but not racialized. Can you make it racialized or BIPOC, pick one or the other?
- jj. Stacey Flores: NASSS not paying for rooms but there was a call for grad volunteers for a registration waiver of \$125, which is less than what we got for one night at the hotel.
- kk. Brian Gearity: I have a fiduciary responsibility as President-Elect. Have worked to make this happen since March, I volunteered to be a mentor, I support it as NASSS Member and President Elect. We support programs for those of marginalized identities to make NASSS a space for those without power and privilege to feel valued. In March, I reached out about planning the conference, I don't want to have this business meeting repeat what happened last year. I have to plan the conference. We had a conversation or two, and there had been a budget previously approved for \$25k over 3 years. In the bylaws, program was not set up – on track for \$1k per student, I didn't think that was fiscally responsible and wanted to bring it up. Exchanged emails and in October finally got a budget, but conference had moved forward. The conference program can be expanded to add value to NASSS, this is why I ran for President. We have UNDRIP, DCCC, and now this – I asked for reports, a budget, I didn't realize there was a prior budget until after I was elected. We've brought on a nonprofit consultant, hopefully the Board will approve an attorney for bylaw process and procedures, adopt PPM as a formal document, to provide structure and avoid these problems. History and context: bylaws, reporting, budgeting, asked but didn't get any. The current bylaws are in contradiction with aspects of the SEEDS program.
- ll. Michelle Richardson: No more questions from the floor, we are out of time in this room, The Conference Chair says we are spending money.

- mm. Cheryl Cooky: My comment is about the budget and money. You can bill it to me, I'll give the organization the money for this room. As a Board Member, what we saw in this Treasurer's report - I want you to understand how the Board operates. I don't see a budget. The Board does not see a budget. Talking about transparency with money we need to see that across the board. We don't know where we are losing the money. I advocate investing not in a lawyer, I have legal counsel at Purdue I can ask for pro bono, I want an accountant. What I don't want to happen is that the finance question, not specific to this SEEDS, to plague or distort the conversation because it has had impact to our history as an organization. We need to be on the right side of history on this. I implore membership to move this work forward but also to seek expertise in accounting and budgeting.
- nn. Michelle Richardson: The Conference Coordinator will speak to the budget.
- oo. Charles Crowley: We have a budget when we sign the contracts. How we go over, even with time, adding rooms, adding info, our luncheon. We asked for registrations and some register at the conference. 45-50 registered at this conference and now we are over budget for the luncheon. Even at the reception, we need to know our numbers the first day. I do know finance. Was looking at this, that's why I asked for the tickets back, we got charged \$1,200 because we didn't spend the minimum at our reception. We were charged for bartenders and we need to spend a minimum. We go over budget every year.
- pp. Michelle Richardson: Nobody is saying that SEEDS is not worthy. Faye had her hand up. Fiscally for NASSS it is not.
- qq. Faye Wachs: At every level I hear a lot about DEI in organizations and I see this same failure made. We bring people in but then make it impossible for them to succeed there. There is a lack of access to resources including financial resources, we have to be serious about funding this. I have privilege in academia, my parents were in teaching/professing, things that are easy for me are not easy for others and it is our obligation to close that gap.
- rr. Tricia McGuire-Adams: We need to commit to this to give people a home here, allow this society to flourish in the years to come, to put out money where our mouths are if we want to encourage people to come and feel welcome and belonging here.
- ss. Danielle McCardle: Question, funding for this, put \$5k to this that if SEEDS can't raise this then NASSS will cover that?
- tt. Jeff Montez de Oca: The funding would come from the NASSS budget and increase in fees of \$30 for professional members per person to fully fund this without external funding.
- uu. Michelle Richardson: Can I make a suggestion for funding? NASSM has a program, kind of what you are doing. If you want to participate you can pay your conference registration and then donate extra to SEEDS. Instead of NASSS can fund this then people can fund this on top of their registration fee.
- vv. Travers: No, it needs to be a line item put it down. Should come from the budget.
- ww. Michelle Richardson: Why don't we create a fund like the Eli Wolff Fund, something like that? We don't have the money. It's not that we don't want it. We can't afford it.
- xx. Amanda Schweinbenz: I make a motion to table this.
- yy. Charles Crowley: We have to get out of here we are getting charged.

- zz. Amanda Schweinbenz: The Board can develop a specific budget with more detail about how much dues will increase.
- aaa. Michelle Richardson: Where is a second? Who is paying for it?
- bbb. Judy Liao: An amendment for the budget has to be approved by the Board.
- ccc. Christine Dallaire moves to amend language so budget has to be approved by the Board.
- ddd. Christine Vlcek seconds.
- eee. VOTE on amendment: All in favor, no opposition, 5 abstentions.
- fff. Amanda Schweinbenz: Table this until we have a full clear budget.
- ggg. Brian Gearity: Seconds.
- hhh. Jen McGovern: Can we do an electronic vote before next year's meeting?
- iii. Judy Liao: Question – is there a guaranteed timeline?
- jjj. Brian Gearity: Work with me over the next few months.
- kkk. Judy Liao: We tried. We need a timeline.
- lll. Michelle Richardson: He isn't the president, he can't make a decision.
- mmm. Jeff Montez de Oca: Do we want it tabled? Let's do that.
- nnn. Amanda Schweinbenz: Brian, can we have a timeline?
- ooo. Brian Gearity: When we can meet? 60-90 days. We have to send out a bylaw change 90 days in advance. This is why I passed a bylaw change about policy and procedure, Board has power to do that, make change, entire program was done by program chair.
- ppp. Amanda Schweinbenz: Yes, we can say the next 6 months.
- qqq. Brian Gearity: Article 6, section 4 – still have concerns, multiple articles. There needs to be more robust changes to committees who are not established to do the work.
- rrr. Judy Liao: 6 months would be a little bit tight for us.
- sss. Brian Gearity: I reached out in March to work this out. We can do something with the conference, but something outside of the conference needs to be worked out but the right way.
- ttt. Jeff Montez de Oca: I don't know if this elections language allows an electronic vote on bylaws change.
- uuu. VOTE on tabling: 7 in favor, no abstentions, all others opposed.
- vvv. Brian Gearity: Point of order: Bylaw change does not meet standing committee requirements. Dismiss this motion. Cannot go forward. Does not meet operating procedures.
- www. Michelle Richardson: We cannot vote on this.
- xxx. Vicky Paraschak: I had to understand the bylaws with UNDRIP resolution, they were submitted to President and Board 90 days before and they are to give feedback. You gave a resolution and the Board was supposed to look at that – there is no point of order, the Board has made sure that concerns were raised with the group. I disagree with the fact that they can cancel this.
- yyy. Brian Gearity: It is not the Board's job to fix a bylaw proposal that is not aligned with procedures.
- zzz. Michelle Richardson: Nobody wants to work within our bylaws.
- aaaa. Christine Vlcek: What are our options?
- bbbb. Michelle Richardson: Table it or reject it.
- cccc. Christine Vlcek: Maybe a shorter timeline, 3 months? 2 months?

dddd. Judy Liao: I am sorry to have to see this.

eeee. Jeff Montez de Oca: The bylaw you just read is the one we just passed. I didn't see what you just read. I don't see that. Which one is that?

ffff. Brian Gearity: Section 16 under operating codes.

gggg. Jeff Montez de Oca: Which article?

hhhh. Brian Gearity: 6.

iiii. GENERAL CHAOS: lots of people talking over one another.

jjjj. Jay Laurendeau: How this is out of order? If this is a motion to embed this in bylaws, that's what the standing committee would have to adhere to going forward, the requirements for a standing committee?

kkkk. Michelle Richardson: We need an ombudsman.

llll. Jeff Montez de Oca: I disagree with Brian's interpretation of the bylaws. [Reads bylaws] Name of committee, plan of work, procedure for submitting reports – we said we would report to the Board on Saturdays

mmmm. Brian Gearity: You have given no detail.

nnnn. Jeff Montez de Oca: It's as clear as the other bylaws, provisions for financial support – we said the organization would support it or find external funding. I disagree with Brian.

oooo. Michelle Richardson: Nobody wants to compromise.

pppp. Mutliple people yell "Just vote!"

qqqq. Michelle Richardson: How are we going to work together? We are trying to act fiscally responsible.

rrrr. Judy Liao: It's membership's decision. Let the members vote.

ssss. Michelle Richardson: Give us a budget. You haven't done that.

tttt. Lars Dzikus: I hear a difference of opinion on interpretation of the bylaws. Can we make a motion to come to an agreement? Could I make a motion to support an interpretation, which is correct?

uuuu. Michelle Richardson: I don't think so.

vvvv. Lars Dzikus: For shits and giggles, I make a motion to support Jeff's interpretation of the bylaws.

wwww. Tori Justin: Seconded.

xxxx. Michelle: What makes one interpretation more valid than another?

yyyy. Daniel Mann: We all want SEEDS, we all support SEEDS. We've been here for 4.5 hours.

zzzz. Michelle Richardson: Money is being spent that we don't have. Let's do a 90 day timeline so that we can work out the differences. What we are trying to do is everyone is trying to get their way. Let's be collaborative, lets be scholars and figure out a way to make this work. No one is going to be 100% happy about this. Welcome to the real world. Can we do the 60-day thing. Can we table this.

aaaaa. Jeff Montez de Oca: Is a motion on the floor?

bbbbb. Michelle Richardson: I call to question.

ccccc. Beth Cavalier: Anyone can call to question.

dddd. Christine Vlcek: How many days would you agree to if we table this? Come back and vote, working with Brian.

eeee. Jeff Montez de Oca: We sent this out in March.

ffff. Brian Gearity: We no longer have quorum.

ggggg. Count in the room: 76 people

hhhhh. Aarti Ratna: Can I speak, please? I have finally gotten to speak, it's a silencing.

We no longer have quorum because of how the meeting is run. People are leaving the room and premise. If they didn't feel they had to leave to preserve themselves, we could vote. We need to look at the democratic process of giving people a voice, people left and that says something. I got driven out. I am silenced.

iiii. Michelle Richardson: You walked out. We will do the transfer of power. Thank you very much, talk to your new President.

jjjj. Brian Garity: We are going to do the work, continue the conversation, talk to me and the Board. Going forward I hope that we can reconcile. Thank you for coming to the meeting. See you tomorrow and tonight, we will talk.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:25 PM.