

RMATA, INC.  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
CONFERENCE CALL  
8:30 PM MST  
OCTOBER 27, 1992

IN ATTENDANCE:

Bill Lyons	District Director/President
Scott Linaker	Secretary/Treasurer
Rick Ball	Consultant
Dan Libera	Parliamentarian
Matt Webber	President AZ
Mike Keirns	President CO
T J Byrne	President UT
Bart Peterson	President WY

1. CALL TO ORDER: Bill called the meeting to order.
2. GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE SURVEY: Key issues, concerns and recommendations.

RICK BALL:

Mike Nesbitt was told consistently, there is no plan or intent to change district boundaries, to break up the districts, or to change the governance structure; and right off the bat you have 15 questions devoted to the issue of should we totally revamp the district structure, including boundaries, membership, dues, control over finances, etc. It is obvious to me from that that someone who has been a party to putting together this questionnaire wonders whether the district structure ought to be modified. And I would have to say that that didn't just come to mind of a group of randomly selected people to look at governance, there had to have been a question raised by the President or member of the Board or the national office or somebody.

There are reasonably, straightforward answers that can be given to those issues and there is probably value in there being a good degree of consistency in what comes out of the governing group from District 7. Not that we ought to tailor make our answers and everybody be identical about them, but I think for us to have some discussion about it, see where everybody stands and see whether there is a way of responding that presents a united front kind of a situation.

On the state issue, I think that probably with District 10 we share something that is very unique and I doubt as well as appreciated by most of the members in terms of having states where the numbers of certified members are very small and where the state organization is not for many years going to have a great deal of viability from the standpoint of its financial capabilities or its ability to influence people outside the

profession. And I think it would be useful again to be very sensitive to that as a district. Even in Colorado where you've got the highest number of members in the district and in New Mexico where you've got licensure, we need to realize that in Wyoming you've got a situation of 14 Certified Athletic Trainers. In Montana there isn't a lot more than that. And we need to let this group know how unique that is and how you can't design NATA relationship with state groups having in mind Pennsylvania, Indiana or Texas, because it isn't that way out here. So those are two district issues that I think come up.

T J BYRNE:

I thought there was no specific plan by NATA to change district organizations, but this survey shows a considerable amount of time spent on raising those questions about changing boundaries, dues, membership and questions related to those issues.

BART PETERSON:

I have a question concerning NATA pursuing possible litigation against those who do not follow the By-Laws , etc.. It seems to me they are putting in the rule now and taking care of business, so that we can make it work for us. It seems they want to legislate against what we are already doing, to prosecute the district to get us to come into line for whatever they want. (See question 5 under District Issues). It seems like NATA is trying to set up a monopoly.

MIKE KEIRNS:

I have the same concerns, but I think it is good they are asking our opinions. I have a big concern concerning the representation issue, the composition of the Board and the proportional representation of the membership.

RICK BALL:

Do all of you read the proportional representation as relating to population or to specialty focus area.

All agree proportional representation as relating to population.

MATT WEBBER:

The district changes are a concern and I have a concern in the more populous districts being under represented. A House of Delegates and the sharing powers of the Board, etc., may require us to make a compromise in these areas. There are those who want district change.

How can we influence change and still maintain district structure and independence, as well as state structure and independence.

What would NATA do to get districts and states to comply?

RICK BALL:

Does anybody know, from interacting with people in other districts (more populous districts) of particular areas in which those people feel that their best interests have been disregarded because of this wide diversity in proportional representation, where the decision of the organization as it relates to members have been weighted in favor of those of us in the less populous districts?

MATT WEBBER:

I get the general feeling that it's just not right, I have no specific examples, just the feeling it not the right way to do it.

BILL LYONS:

No, I've heard more about the focus of practice representation.

RICK BALL:

I believe that our focus of practice is not as well represented as theirs is, but I think it is only coincidentally a geographic thing.

DAN LIBERA:

I can't recall an issue or vote related to geographic or district voting, but there has been this sentiment out of District 4 that we have this larger percentage of the membership and only get one vote. I know of no specific cases where the one vote has hurt District 4, but I think the perception is there.

RICK BALL:

Is the location of the national office perceived to be something that was pulled into a smaller district because the small districts rallied for it?

MATT WEBBER:

I don't think so, I think the location was based more on price and location, etc..

DAN LIBERA:

I have a question about excluding districts if they are not abiding by NATA guidelines.

RICK BALL:

Redistricting issues concerning RMATA, INC.: Be clear how RMATA wants to proceed with our organization, regardless of what NATA does.

How we would like to enlist membership support for proceeding, regardless of what NATA does. Our response and stance should not be interpreted as a mutiny.

Regardless of what NATA does, there still can exist an RMATA, INC., in its current structure and operations. There is no inconsistency with the current RMATA structure and NATA restructuring if some states are aligned with other states to form new districts.

We need to make our decision on the notion that let NATA do whatever it wants to do and hold RMATA intact and enlist RMATA member support in holding RMATA intact, and not see the NATA action as being an inconsistency between paid supported membership in NATA and whatever new district it might come up with, and continuing to be paid supporting members of RMATA.

Once that conclusion has been reached the message that is sent to NATA in the form of a response to this question should be; WE SUPPORT THE NATA, WE SUPPORT IT BEING THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION TO PROVIDE THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE LEVEL OF SERVICE AND SUPPORT TO ITS MEMBERS, AND WE SUPPORT IT HAVING SUCH REGIONAL AND STATE LEVEL RELATIONSHIPS TO ACHIEVE THAT OUTCOME. WE FEEL THAT BY MAINTAINING OUR CURRENT DISTRICT STRUCTURE THE WAY IT IS, WE CAN BEST ACHIEVE THAT IN THIS FIVE STATE AREA. IF YOU CHOOSE TO DO OTHERWISE AS LONG AS YOU ARE FULFILLING THOSE ENDS, WE WILL SUPPORT YOU, BUT WE PROBABLY WILL CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN THIS FIVE STATE REGIONAL ATHLETIC TRAINERS' ASSOCIATION.

With regard to the question: Are they (NATA) going to come after us? There is a four or five year old resolution of the NATA BOD that speaks very strongly to the issue that the NATA not violate anti-trust laws. I am not very well versed on anti-trust laws but there is one thing I am very clear about; If NATA were to say to you, if you are going to belong to the RMATA, which is not a part of the NATA recognized district structure, you can not be a member of NATA. That is a antitrust violation, without question! And I don't believe that the national organization is going to take that direction.

We don't need to feel, other than at an emotional level with some individuals, that we're setting ourselves up for a confrontational battle with the national organization if we adopt the policy there will be an RMATA, regardless of what is the outcome of this governance revision. There will be an RMATA structured and operated in a way that it is currently structured and operated, with the possible exception that it will not select a Director to the NATA BOD. and it will not participate with the NATA as it has in the

past in the dues collection process.

MIKE KEIRNS:

We might come to the decision that we would have to remain as RMATA separate from NATA, but it needs to be presented to the national office, in response to this survey, simply because it might be seen as a confrontational challenge.

RICK BALL:

That's a decision we need to come to. And I wonder if it might be usefully influential to them to leave it alone and accept it as it is if we let them know; regardless of what you do, we probably will continue as a viable organization, that doesn't mean we won't support yours.

MIKE KEIRNS:

Hopefully they will interpret our inferences in our answers that we are leaning in that direction, this is our purpose.

BART PETERSON:

I would hope that they would let each district and state choose their own structure, etc., and make revisions only where needed. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!

T J BYRNE:

What is the motive for this survey?

BILL LYONS:

It goes back to the long range plan.

T J BYRNE:

If this is an issue of efficiency to improve NATA, great. I hope we are not being overly paranoid trying to think that someone is trying to steal our thunder or disrupt our organization.

RICK BALL:

Some of this grows out of our training in the American constitutional way. There is a certain, right approach to representation, to the selection of leaders and so forth, and that the structure that exists now is one that was created when the organization was entirely different in all respects than it is now, and it ought to be looked at. In part this is

prompted by what two or three people have eluded to, that without any real specific focus on a particular issue, that would have been resolved differently had the governance been different, the people in the more populous districts think that it is supposed to be one man one vote. And those guys out in the west out vote us three to one. And we ought to change that, because it's the American way.

There is some underlying resentment toward this district, for the very aggressive, vocal stance it has taken for a number of years, for the way it has been successful in influencing the thinking and direction of the NATA, and particularly as compared with some of the more populous districts that sat silently by and accepted whatever happened. Some people who have had some input into how to structure this are aware of that and want to have it looked at.

There are some in the more populous states who see how strong their state organizations are, who really would prefer to see athletic trainers in their state deal with a state organization and not have to deal with a regional organization, not have to take into consideration what is going on next door, and who believe that maybe the district structure is out moded and one of those people is your President, Dennis Miller.

He is not sure that the district structure still has a value as compared with going to state by state representation with a direct connection between NATA and that state organization, who obviously have closer contact with its members than does a district organization. It's a combination of things, there is no sinister evil or underlying motive.

There is no negative connotation to any of this, Dennis Miller's heart is in the right place. I have tremendous respect for Dennis Miller, he will be a great President of the NATA. I have great respect for Jim Booher and Kent Falb, and Bill Chambers brings in an older perspective, an interesting perspective. These people are not anyone's pawn or puppet. They are not operating with a hidden agenda.

Maybe some things were said to Mike Nesbitt to get him to fall in line and to reassure him. And maybe they were different than what people have in mind concerning future district structuring. There is no negative connotation to any of this.

MATT WEBBER:

Bill, will we have or have options concerning future governance by the district meeting.

BILL LYONS:

Yes.

RICK BALL:

We have been privy to all that was done to Mike Nesbitt over his term.

There is an NATA Board resolution that states: District Directors will go to their membership to determine how to vote on key issues concerning NATA.

RMATA, INC. has been accused of violating NATA Constitution and By-Laws by our creation and adoption of a mission statement, which speaks to autonomy. The NATA constitution and several NATA Board resolutions make it very clear that what we did is at least appropriate and may be required. There is a specific NATA Board resolution that says each of the districts shall be financially independent and responsible for its own financial liabilities. That is all autonomy means.

I will address this issue with Dennis Miller and try to get information from him as to why we should change. From the Constitution, the By-Laws, and Board resolution in effect at the time we created RMATA, INC., we were acting appropriately. And one could view it as being a mandate to create their independent business structure.

BART PETERSON:

I have some concerns with the issue of state representation, with the money needed for this, and with the bureaucracy created over this issue of governance restructuring.

RICK BALL:

Proportional representation would require more than one state one vote, but would require 100 to 200 representatives creating a large house of delegates.

MIKE KEIRNS:

The APTA House of Delegates is a political mess. I think that the Colorado athletic trainers look to the district level for a voice to the national level. PT's have more of a state alliance. I feel we must have the best governance for the future of the NATA.

## 2. SEARCH FOR NEW EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:

The search is progressing very well. The search is on a national scale. There were 350 applicants (Alan Smith asked someone if he should re-apply). No, MR. SMITH DID NOT RE-APPLY! These original applicants were narrowed down to 15, of which 3 were ATC'S. These 15 were narrowed to 6 and now there are 3. The NATA BOD will go to Dallas on Dec. 5, 1992 to interview those remaining three. We will be informed of who those final three are before the selection committee makes its final decision.

## 3. AATA LITIGATION:

NATA brought suit against AATA over credentialing. AATA almost rolled over and died, but is still caring on business as usual. NATA is negotiating a strong settlement to protect the trademark and the credentials (A.T.,C.). The settlement will go to court and we will get a judgement that will find AATA's use of ATC to be in violation. The judgement will also state the future violations and penalties thereof.

Negotiations are progressing on a week to week basis.

4. NATA FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT:

The finance committee, of which Mike is still a part of, has revised the 1993 budget and continues to put into place necessary controls.

5. NATA CONVENTION:

Dave Burton of the University of Colorado will be the CoChair along with Joe Godek for the 1993 convention. Dave will then become the Chair for the 1994 convention.

6. COMMITTEES:

Several members of some committees have resigned. To assist Bill in the appointment process, each State President should send him a list consisting of your state officers as well as a list of 10 people who would be interested in serving on a committee.

7. RMATA FINANCIAL REPORT:

All monies, save \$159.13, have been sent to AZ and deposited in the First Interstate Bank of Arizona. As of the date of this report, the checking account balance stands at \$10,385.81 and the Market Interest Account balance stands at \$16,558.75.

8. RMATA 9th ANNUAL CLINICAL SYMPOSIUM:

Progress report by T J Byrne.

Gaye Merrill is the Co-Chair for this meeting along with Ben Davidson. Gaye is the Assistant Athletic Trainer at BYU. Look for her telephone number in the next newsletter.

The main focus of the clinical session will be the low back. There will be an AIDS update and of course Gatorade will give their presentation. Eleven speakers have agreed to speak at the symposium and the Keynote speaker will be Lonnie Paulos, M.D.. The Salt Lake City Hilton will serve as the host site from March 18, 1993 through March 21, 1993.

If anyone has a Student Athletic Trainer who would like to speak to the student membership, please have them get in touch with Gaye Merrill at BYU.

9. MEETING ADJOURNED:

MOTION: AZ

SECOND: UT

CARRIED: 6 - 0