



AFS-USA 2010 NATIONAL VOLUNTEER ASSEMBLY

Overview

Nashville (The City of Music) Tennessee (The Volunteer State)

Attendees: NVA Delegates
Volunteer Participants
National Council Candidates
National Council Members
International Guests
AFS-USA Board of Directors
AFS-USA Staff

FRIDAY APRIL 8TH

THE MARKET PLACE

Concierge Table (compliments of the MissTennKy AT)
Partner Tables
Committees/Advisory Group Tables
Candidate Tables
Mercantile Table

ASSEMBLY WELCOME

Videos from Partners
Introduction of NC Representatives
Introduction of Partner Director/Senior Staff
Introduction of International Partners
Introduction of Board Chair
Welcome from Board Chair
Introduction of Board Members

Mary Porterfield – National Council Chair

Mike Sherman - Board Chair

**How are things changing? Will there be better
retention of volunteers and will more be brought in? Will we be able to
host more kids?**

State of the Organization
Partner/Director Welcome

Mary Porterfield
Jorge Castro - AFS-USA Partner Director

When we were together in San Antonio, I asked Jorge

to do the tango. He doesn't dance. Now, while in Nashville
he asked me to sing. I don't sing.

A story that continues from the Denver NVA is about how we are
building our house. We are now working on the landscape: our image from outside.
Our next big step is the roof on our house – which is volunteer
responsibility and accountability.

Our growth should not be
a growth imposed on the volunteers –
but a growth that comes from the volunteers.

GALATTI AWARD PRESENTATION to
CAROL ANN ZIMMERMAN

Tachi Cazal - AFS International President

12,500 parents are trusting us with their most
valuable resources – their children. Trade is aid – we don't need
money so much as resources and participants.
So that we can convince a parent, both a sending and a hosting parent –
trust us.

NC CANDIDATE INTRODUCTIONS

Nominations Committee

SATURDAY APRIL 9TH

WELCOME

Mary Porterfield

NC CANDIDATE REVIEW

Nominations Committee

Thank you for your candidacy:

Jane Howard
Frank Johnson
Al Russell
Ann Sweet

MOTIONS REVIEW

AFS Youth Service Day	Patti Davis AFS USA Staff	Mary Ann Offer World Class
Standing Committee on Diversity	Mary Ann Nation Greater Los Angeles	Marla Benik Brevard
Co-Support Payments	Dave Schrader Greater Los Angeles	Alan Levine Greater Los Angeles
Annual Team Assessment	Naomi Erickson EZ Pass	Phil Dyuff Missouri Gateway
NVA Delegate Selection	Becki Shawver Cradle of Texas	Naomi Erickson EZ Pass

MOTIONS ROUND ROBIN DISCUSSION SESSIONS

MOTIONS FLOOR DEBATE

Mary Porterfield – Parliamentarian

1. AFS YOUTH SERVICE DAY

Summary - Sharon Held – National Council

Motion Speaker - Patti Davis – AFS USA Staff

Advantages: Gains momentum, fosters volunteerism, students love the involvement, free resources available from Youth Services America Groups, engages AFS with new community groups & is now working successfully with Sponsored Programs. Drawbacks: Date is a busy time of year, not enough local vols available & can be overridden by other national days of service. Resources: National Youth Service Day resources are available for free & community service oriented groups, host sibs, AFS students themselves, high school clubs & retirement communities can all get involved.

Commentator - Claire Gunter – SF Bay Area

What is the duration of the commitment? Could become an annual tradition with momentum gaining year by year. How would success be measured? No discrete answer but considers new vols being recruited & new partnerships with local organizations.

Commentator – Marla Benik – Florida

Declaring support since service among students is so big, we're missing a huge community of service oriented kids within the school communities. We need to participate in this national movement.

Commentator – Becky Deignan – Northern Illinois

Declaring support as this is easy to implement, though not required. Community building connections & visibility by working with the hosted students themselves. View it as an outreach program.

Commentator – Tracy Smith – Fort Bend Chapter

Would this be a requirement? AFS adopts on a national level with local chapters adopting this to the best of their ability. It is not mandatory.

2. COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY

Summary – Elizabeth Leatham – National Council

Regarding the word "diversity", should it be "inclusion"? There is enthusiasm for a baseline study not necessarily invented as we could utilize existing data resources.

Speaker – Mary Ann Nation – Greater Los Angeles

Commentator – Sally Ann Wells – Columbia Pacific

We have to vote for this. This is what we are all about. This reaches new communities, expands the vol base & expands our potential for hosting.

Commentator – Brian Quinn – Greater Puget Sound

Clarify committee's goal after gathering data as this covers everything from ethnicity to affordability. It will specifically provide benchmark data in order to prioritize our markets.

Commentator – Tracy Smith – Fort Bend

Do we need another committee; we don't want AFS to be top-heavy. "Inclusion" should cover all groups by expanding promotion & name-recognition & visibility. Make programs more flexible, more marketable, and less expensive. Embed this within hosting & sending overall.

Commentator – Ruth Glastock, - Georgia

This is an opportunity for a fresh set of eyes to look at marketing to groups that we may not be targeting today. Personally, this is already within our mission, but we would benefit from comparing study data to the mission. If there is a passion to study the data, benchmark & produce recommendations for use within the pillars.

Commentator – Esra Kucukciftci – National Council

All Committees/Advisory Groups have work plans & goals & move forward with their charges. This will make it official that AFS as an organization is accountable for its mission. This won't happen on its own or it would have within the last 60 years.

Commentator – Carol Barreau – Carolinas

The Department of State may limit host families so we should have a data study in light of regulatory changes. Also, "diversity" speaks more clearly as a committee name than "inclusion".

3. CO-SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Summary – Mary Porterfield – National Council Chair

Motion is to convert current flat fee for co-support payments into a % of the transfer price. Therefore, if transfer price increases, co-support payments could increase as well. Need to find the research, analyze & assess current use of co-support payments to help us be informed for further decisions regarding increases. Variety of uses & needs for co-support payments exist across the country within the context of cost of living, quality of programs, etc. Survey will help gather information. Additional note that delegates want more financial information in general.

Speaker – Dave Schrader – Greater Los Angeles

Commentator – Chana Hayes – Capitol

NC is setting the %. If this is done, would it be immutable or could it change. NC can do whatever they want to, when they want to. If switch is made from flat fee, will we see a higher dollar amount?

Commentator – Deb Dahlberg – National Council

This change acknowledges what is best for the organization.

Commentator – Jose Ruiz-Salas – Sierra San Joaquin

The authority of the NC to set the co-support payments is in the bylaws which is why it is a % & not a specific amount.

Commentator – Claire Gunter – SF Bay

Supports the % approach so that kids being sent today receive the same quality program as those that went 5 years ago.

Commentator – Greg Rowe – SF Bay

Shifting to a % may not see increased co-support payments.

Commentator – Susan Rowley – National Council

Under the Financial section of the bylaws, it states that the NC approves co-support amounts annually. The NC does not set them.

Commentator – Alan Levine – Greater LA

Our reputation is based on those students being hosted here. The last event for them is closing orientations & when you get to the end of the year, we're out of money. We should be able to provide a better send-off.

Commentator – Jim Collins – Steinbeck Coast

Who sets the rates? Amount is proposed by Vol Structure Committee to the NC for approval.

Commentator – Naomi Erickson – EZ Pass

If NC approves, could we build in a threshold below which the % does not go so that we don't end up with less money than the current system provides? This could be an amendment.

4. ANNUAL TEAM ASSESSMENT

Summary – Esra Kucukciftci – National Council

Emphasized motion should not be worded as a compliance-driven item, but also for the safety of participants & for the promise to partners & there should be a verbiage change to reflect. PROS: Vols believe that the tool was critical to achieve compliance & compliance is critical to our industry. What gets measured, gets managed. Tool can uncover problems & help divert resource allocations to the problem. Also a way to celebrate things going right. Suggested that the metrics within the proposal were inclusive & encouraged vol accountability. CONS: Should not be punitive. Exceptional situations not factored in. Suggest that implementation be staggered. Chapters will start assessments in 2010-2011, establishing a baseline for the first year. Suggest use of a weighted average.

Motion Speaker – Naomi Erickson – EZ Pass

Commentator – Wendy Taylor – Georgia

Wanted to know about the 90% & does it make sense? The 90% does make sense in that it is like an "A" grade & can also be a warning indicator if score falls below. Could different categories have different percent? Generally compliance is an on-off switch, you're either compliant or you're not. Keri Dooley replies: The 90% relates to the annual audit of several critical elements where we must attain 90% in order to remain listed with CSJET for our designation as a J-1 sponsored program issuer as regulated by Department of State, who has regulations governing compliance thresholds. So CSJET certification is dependent upon our ability to be a designated sponsor.

Commentator – Patti Davis – Inbound Sponsored Programs

If no punitive language & if failing & assessments are indicative of that, what are the repercussions? Esra Kucukciftci replies: Clarification is to have stages of infraction that commence with not being punitive but may end up with that language if variances are not cured.

Commentator – Becki Shawver – Cradle of Texas

If you don't come into compliance by stage 3, it can be punitive. Intent is to help you get into compliance.

Commentator - Jose Ruiz-Salas – Sierra San Joaquin

Issue is how you frame it. Could change from punitive language to "student safety rating" for example.

Commentator – Chana Hayes – Capitol

One of the committee's initial steps was to gather information on what the regulations were & their source. This is out on the WIKI.

Commentator – Dave Schrader – Greater LA

Referring to a column in the background paper called 2010 Baseline. Who sets this growth in sending numbers? Damian Pisanelli replies: This is not a goal, it is actual amount measured by VOL Development staff based on statistics within GL, what your AT

actually did. Would a negative goal be allowed in order to reallocate resources within a team?

Commentator – Jim Dooley – San Diego

Quality of performance & quantity of participants. Quality is of paramount importance. Target numbers must be achievable in order for compliance to be achievable. Goals are part of a qualitative assessment which is not part of compliance issues (qualitative assessment is done every 3 years).

Compliance – Deb Maly – Milwaukee

In support of this motion because we cannot continue to do business at our current levels. We can no longer postpone or delay this process because we are fearful of being accountable.

5. NVA DELEGATE SELECTION

Summary – Susan Rowley – NC

Since this motion could result in a change to bylaws, 60 votes in favor must be garnered representing

2/3 majority. (All other motions carry with a simple majority.)

Options within this motion:

a. One delegate per active chartered chapter sending/hosting 1 student per year (est. 231 delegates)

b. One delegate per 360 participant months (est. 88 delegates)

c. One delegate per 40 participants hosted/sent per AT/UC (est. 94 delegates & is current arrangement)

Conclusion is that one size does not fit all. Suggestions of alternate methods received. Length of program does not necessarily reflect amount of work or success of program. Questions included which proposal would encourage growth most? How to capitalize on the motivational potential of the NVA?

Motion Speaker – Becki Shawver – Cradle of Texas

Commentator – Esra Kucukciftci – National Council

Consider numbers that reflect amount of work/quality of program, because of the structure of AT/UC support provided to vols. Susan Rowley replies: Particular to participant months in terms of the energy it takes to send a student abroad isn't proportional to the length of the program so length of program not a fair reflection.

Commentator – Claire Gunter – SF Bay

Option #2 seems punitive towards AT's with certain recruitment capabilities or targets.

Option #3 provides motivational growth to smaller chapters.

Commentator – Jim Dooley – San Diego

Motivational encouragement a good goal. Option #1 not good because incentive is bureaucratic – encouraged to create more chapters.

Commentator – Alan Levine – Great LA

Very moved by comments that Option #1 is too unwieldy, Option #2 too difficult to work with & Option #3 is good with minor changes.

Commentator – Jose Ruiz-Salas – Sierra San Joaquin

If none of the options receive 2/3 of the vote, bylaws state that current option applies.

Commentator – Cindy Clemons – Baltimore

How are the budget dollars divided up? Send back for more study due to number of amendments.

Commentator – Anne Marie Perry – Mass Bay

If we act on a motion & do not amend it, do we have the option of re-presenting one of the options with modifications after we have voted? Mary Porterfield replies: Related to this option only since it is a bylaw change, you can amend but you cannot introduce new items.

Commentator – Becky Deignan – Northern Illinois

Option #1 does expand the number of participants but at increased cost to the organization. Option #3 if amended to allow for increased participation would be a good thing.

AMENDMENT PROCESS

Only delegates can propose amendments & seconds must also come from delegates. Non-delegates must find a delegate sponsor if they wish to make an amendment. Amendments themselves can be amended but cannot be made "stronger" in their intent. For each motion, estimated amendments at this time are:

AFS Youth Service Day	1 amendment
Standing Committee on Diversity	1 amendment
Co-Support Payments	3 amendments
Annual Team Assessment	2 amendments
NVA Delegate Selection	7 amendments

BALLOT ELECTION OF NC MEMBERS & 2011 NVA LOCATION VOTE

SUNDAY APRIL 11TH

National Council INDUCTION CEREMONY

Congratulations to:

Jane Howard, Frank Johnson & Al Russell as new NC members
Ann Sweet as NC alternate
St. Louis as 2011 NVA site

MOTIONS FLOOR DEBATE & VOTE

Sandy Hadley-White is assisting Mary Porterfield as parliamentarian.

1. STANDING COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY

No amendments.

APPROVED MOTION: *Create a standing committee on diversity that will be responsible for the implementation, monitoring & evaluation of diversity initiatives across the organization. The committee will focus on diversity of sending students, hosting families & volunteers, as well as the impact of organizational policies & practices on diversity.*

2. CO-SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Amendment #1: Addresses decrease in time with kids & an increase in in-kind contributions. Investigate viability of providing more funds.

Submitted by: Becky Deignan – Northern Illinois

Supported by: Holly Dowe – World Flags

Supported by: Mary Ann Offer – World Class

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

Amendment #2: Necessary to ensure a safety net so that co-support payments do not fall below current thresholds.

Submitted by: Deb Maly – Milwaukee

Supported by: Karen Barnes – Milwaukee

Supported by: Naomi Erikson – EZ Pass

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment #3: Mary Porterfield comments: First part of this amendment is a change to the background paper language & not to the motion itself. Second part of this amendment does in fact amend the motion.

Submitted by: Greg Rowe – SF Bay

Supported by: Lynn Stoddard – Friends Across New England

Supported by: Tyler Kueffner – Oahu

Amendment sponsor requests a split into #3A (strike phrase) & #3B (add sentence)

AMENDMENT #3A DEFEATED

AMENDMENT #3B DEFEATED

APPROVED MOTION: *The co-support payment policy should be changed as soon as feasible from a flat fee structure to a percentage (%) of the average program or transfer fees. The percentage must ensure that the co-support payment does not drop below the current flat-fee dollar amount. This would require the National Council to change the co-support payment to a percentage of program and transfer fees. Once a percentage approach is in place, the co-support payment automatically adjusts without the need for any further motions to the National Council. Note: we recommend implementing this in the simplest possible way to avoid accounting complications. For sent students, we propose that the co-support payment should be a percentage of the average program fee for each of the program durations (summer, semester, and year). For hosted students, we propose that the co-support percentage should be based on the average transfer fee for that student's program (semester, year).*

3. AFS YOUTH SERVICE DAY

No amendments.

APPROVED MOTION: *The AFS Service Workgroup moves to adopt AFS Youth Service Day & Picnic as an annual national event to fall on the Saturday of Global Your Service Weekend with the purpose of raising visibility for AFS locally; building bridges to the community; fostering relationships among AFS constituents & revitalizing the local AFS network.*

4. NVA DELEGATE SELECTION

Options are:

a. One delegate per active chartered chapter sending/hosting 1 student per year (est. 231 delegates)

b. One delegate per 360 participant months (est. 88 delegates)

c. One delegate per 40 participants hosted/sent per AT/UC (est. 94 delegates & is current arrangement)

Amendment #1 to Option #3: Increase number of at-large delegates by 10 slots.

Submitted by: Abby Munro-Proulx – NW California

Supported by: Cindy Clemens – Baltimore

Supported by: Becky Deignan – Northern Illinois

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment #2 to Option #3: Funded at-large delegates opened to all by application.

Submitted by: Alan Levine – Greater LA

Supported by: Nancy Deitrick – Susquehanna Valley

Supported by: Becki Shawver – Cradle of Texas

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

Amendment #3 to Option #3: This is a substitute amendment replacing Amendment #1. Four week confirmation timeframe by AT then unfilled delegate slots are provided to unrepresented volunteer groups.

Submitted by: Claire Gunter – SF Bay

Supported by: Greg Rowe – SF Bay

Supported by: Kathleen McNabb – Silver & Gold

AMENDMENT CARRIED AS SOLE AMENDMENT TO OPTION #3

OPTION #3 APPROVED MOTION: *The Volunteer Structure Committee moves that approval of one of the three options for selecting NVA delegates be accepted & that the option selected benefit the whole of AFS-USA & not a specific type of team.*

5. ANNUAL TEAM ASSESSMENT

Amendment #1A: Healthy teams hit 90% or higher in each criterion & is in compliance. Provisional teams fall below 90%.

Submitted by: Naomi Erickson – EZ Pass

Supported by: Karen Barnes - Milwaukee

Supported by: Deb Maly – Milwaukee

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment #1B: Provisional teams fall below 90% in “any” criterion.

Submitted by: Naomi Erickson – EZ Pass

Supported by: Karen Barnes – Milwaukee

Supported by: Deb Maly – Milwaukee

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment #2: Remove words “total score” from the amendment & specify 90% on each & every criterion in order to match the CSIET specified standards.

Submitted by: Becky Deignan – Northern Illinois

Supported by: Mary Ann Offer – World Class

Supported by: Holly Dowe – World Flags

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

Amendment #3: General contact not documented in GL (as not tied to a participant).

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

APPROVED MOTION: *The Volunteer Structure Committee moves that the Team Assessment Tool be accepted as presented.*

GUEST SPEAKERS

RECOGNITION OF OUTGOING National Council MEMBERS

With gratitude to:

Damian Pisanelli

Susan Rowley

There is unity – between you
and I – as we
are in the same spirit.

CLOSING REMARKS:

Mary Porterfield, National Council Chair

The assembly adjourned at:

1:30pm

This overview respectfully submitted by: Annie Stewart