

## MAP/NNECAPA Organizational Structure Meeting 11/3/17

### Attendees:

Sarah Marchant  
Carol Eyerman  
Samantha Horn  
Scott Hastings  
Anna Breinrich  
Jane Lafleur  
Jeremy Gabrielson  
Jim Fischer  
Lynne Seeley  
Amanda Bunker  
Arrived mid-way through meeting: Maureen O'Meara

Sarah Marchant presented a slideshow that recapped the summary materials that were distributed before the meeting (see white paper)

### Examples of other states:

- SNECAPA – just collaborate on a conference
- Montana/Idaho/Dakotas – structured like us but thinking of becoming sections
- Others are state-level chapters or multi state chapters with sections

Have there been NNECAPA board members from eastern Maine? Geography is a struggle with 3-state organizations, especially when the meetings are far from some parts of the region.

NNECAPA has substantial funds and is having trouble getting it to state associations effectively. NNECAPA is about 350 members currently, 66% are NNECAPA only members. In Maine, about 1/3 of members are MAP only, 1/3 are NNECAPA only, and 1/3 are both.

The group reviewed the budget and how services would be provided. Membership services and the web page would be hosted by APA for NNECAPA and state associations. The task force has received quotes for the bookkeeping functions and conference planning – it would be about \$14k annually.

The first few years would be a flat membership fee. \$75 is proposed for the first year. In general, NNECAPA members would be paying less, MAP-only members would be paying more. (The MAP fee is currently \$50.) We could do organizational memberships that would cover all planners in the organization. This may have to go through a separate financial management path, although APA may eventually agree to administer it. There was some interest in pursuing organizational memberships.

Carol read several comments from the MAP list serv. They were generally in support of option 3.

An attendee noted that loss of state level autonomy was one of the “cons” of option 3, and asked what that meant. Answers were: loss of flexibility in administration; reporting requirements to APA; can't set NNECAPA dues; if use APA website, have to use their general branding strategy.

Money will come from NNECAPA to sections, not the other way around. Sections keep their reserves – everyone starts with what they have.

Maine section would have the option to do our own awards.

The bylaws will determine how the three states are represented at NNECAPA board.

Attendees discussed whether the finances and voting should be divided evenly among state or be based on the number of members.

NNECAPA would budget for one combined newsletter per quarter, but sections could do their own newsletter if they want. But there are state columns in the NNECAPA newsletter already that could be expanded.

The state mission can continue in sections, but APA's mission will come down to NNECAPA.

Where does social media end up? MAP could keep doing what we're doing until we assimilate and see how it goes and then choose what we want to give up and not continue to do. We can still manage content production – either by volunteers or paying someone – it's up to each section.

It would be helpful to reach out to members about would they be willing to continue participating if this change occurs. But we should put a recommendation out there for people to consider. The group feels that it's a good next step to put together bylaws and then get more reaction based on bylaws, dues, how workload is distributed, and if we have autonomy in important areas.

The task force could use one more member from Maine because we don't have a treasurer.

Next steps: The white paper will be updated, then bylaws will be drafted, then run by task force members before going out to general membership. A participant suggested that the white paper should contain a timeline of all steps that need to happen to effect the transition.