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These are the notes that were captured during the actual delegate discussions at the HOD meeting and have not been edited.

REPORT OUTS/SUMMARIES

Issue 1: Term Limits

TABLE 1:

Issue 1: Term Limits
Yes. At least a 3 year term for someone to sit out

TABLE 2:

Issue 1: Term Limits
Consensus: 1 year break after (2) 3-year terms with possibility to override term limit if lack of candidate interest
Rationale: 2 terms allows time to get acquitted to position and make progress and still bringing in fresh views and ideas. Possibility to override terms needed to ensure positions are filled with candidates desiring to be in the positions.

TABLE 3:

Issue 1: Term Limits

*An appeal process would need to be set in place in case an affiliate or DPG is having trouble finding a delegate.
*On application for all HOD positions, add, “When was the last year you served as a delegate?”

TABLE 4:

Issue 1: Term Limits
We reached consensus on the issue of term limits, the majority supported 1 year term limit (4 voted in favor) while some supported 3 year term limits (3 voted in favor). Majority support to 1 year as this was more realistic for smaller states or groups who may not have individuals wanting to step into leadership positions

TABLE 5:

Issue 1: Term Limits
There needs to be a break long enough to encourage others to try for these opportunities. A minimum of two years would be preferable but there may be benefits for a longer break, up to three years.

TABLE 6:

Issue 1: Term Limits
YES-1 year: helps to engage new members in HOD

TABLE 7:  
Issue 1: Term Limits  
Two terms for three years with a one year break  
Rationale:  
Group favored the one year break with some amendments:  
Addendum:  
1. May need to have an exception in those affiliates where the leadership pool is so small and there aren’t candidates to serve in a delegate role.  
2. If going from an affiliate to a DPG delegate, remove the 1 year term

TABLE 8:  
Issue 1: Term Limits  
No summary, see full dialogue below

TABLE 9:  
Issue 1: Term Limits  
No summary, see full dialogue below

TABLE 10:  
Issue 1: Term Limits  
We preferred to defer until more data is available regarding the number of delegates and number of terms served and would this cause an issue for smaller organizational units being able to obtain candidates for delegate positions.

TABLE 11:  
Issue 1: Term Limits  
Option 3: 3 years

TABLE 12:  
Issue 1: Term Limits  
Consensus/Rationale: Option 3- 3 years break. Option 1- 1 year was too short of a break and allows for a break between term limits allows for other individuals to step up in leadership roles that may not have otherwise had the opportunity. Table strongly supports term limits, if not already in place.

Issue 2: Diversity

TABLE 1:  
Issue 2: Diversity  
Yes.

TABLE 2:  
Issue 2: Diversity  
Consensus: Defer to Academy’s efforts  
Rational: Diversity is a broad topic

TABLE 3:  
Consensus that we should increase diversity in HOD
*Need to be concerned about diversity in EVERY area of our profession. Should set this example in the HOD.

*We SHOULD align with whatever the academy is doing because we do need more diversity within HOD.

**TABLE 4:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
Defer to Academy efforts - discussed efforts on inclusivity could be addressed by HOD rather than trying to change representation of the membership.

**TABLE 5:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
Report out on decision with rationale.

It would be beneficial to encourage more diversity within the HOD to represent what our membership actually looks like. Diversity in the HOD would also help enhance and support the Academy’s efforts to support diversity.

**TABLE 6:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
**No-defer to AND’s diversity strategic plan:** diversity is a long-term issue, best addressed by AND’s strategic plan (current plan 2015-2020; will be updated soon)

**TABLE 7:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
**Defer to the Academy’s strategic diversity initiative**  
Allow the “trickle down” effect; it will be easier for the Nominating committees to highlight diversity if the Academy has strategic efforts underway. All for not recreating the wheel but don’t want things to be legislated.

**TABLE 8:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
*No summary, see full dialogue below*

**TABLE 9:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
*No summary, see full dialogue below*

**TABLE 10:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
We agreed to defer to Academy’s diversity efforts.

**TABLE 11:**  
Issue 2: Diversity  
Yes, the composition of the HOD should address diversity as opposed to the Academy; the HOD should be leading these efforts; voice of members
TABLE 12: Issue 2: Diversity
Consensus/Rationale: HOD should not use the composition to address diversity, rather should use other Academy Groups or additional Affiliate Training to address diversity.

Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age

TABLE 1: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Keep it at under 30 and appear to be more in favor of age versus practice years depending on what the goal of this change was - is it to focus on the perspective of a younger individual or someone just coming out of school/intern, etc..

TABLE 2: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Consensus: 3 at under 35 years of age and 2-3 in practice at 5 years or less x2
Rational: There is benefit in representation from each, under 35 years in practice and under 5 years in practice as each bring unique skills and points of view.

TABLE 3: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Majority consensus: focus on diversity in terms of age. Keep the 3 delegates at 30 and under with no years of practice minimum.
*This keeps the focus on ensuring that the younger generations are represented.
*Opposed rationale: A few members believe 3 years minimum needed in order to successfully act as an HOD member.
*Report out: keep the delegates 30 years and under with SOME sort of practice experience in order to properly represent.

TABLE 4: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
We reached consensus, majority supported under 35 years of age (4 voted in favor) to level set younger representation within HOD to align/balance with membership. Others in group felt a maximum of 3 years (3 voted in favor) was appropriate.

TABLE 5: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Increasing the age to 35 may help encourage younger members who don’t feel confident they have enough experience to take on these positions, which would add to the diversity of ages and generations represented.

TABLE 6: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
NO CONSENSUS. Need clarity on the goal of this role; term limits may help to increase representation of younger/newer members in HOD; advocacy for and mentorship of younger/newer members could also help; evaluate effectiveness of current At-Large position before expanding or modifying.

TABLE 7: Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Group prefers with both ways.
Some like the recommendation as written (age under 30 years) but others would like to include a delegate with 3 years or less in the profession regardless of age.

TABLE 8:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
No summary, see full dialogue below

TABLE 9:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
No summary, see full dialogue below

TABLE 10:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
We agreed to support change to Under 35 years of age.

TABLE 11:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Option 2 to increase to 35 years of age due to the need for time to complete DI, Master’s and obtain 3 years of experience.

TABLE 12:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
Consensus/Rationale: Both age and years in practice are important factors. Recognize the composition of the HOD does not reflect the diversity of the Academy as a whole. Concur with the report recommendations that the 2 additional delegates are added with ‘under 35 years’ and ‘3 years’ of practice.

**Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs**

TABLE 1:
Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
Yes. At least 3 or one for each MIG

TABLE 2:
Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
Consensus: Offer each MIG an opportunity - that the MIGs must be willing/able to support a HOD position
Rational: MIG involvement to increase diversity with Academy financial support consistent with DPG support

TABLE 3:
Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIG
Yes
*If only 3 for multiple groups rep. multiple MIGS, coming from larger MIGS, would smaller MIGs feel like they aren’t being represented?
*Who is going to pay for MIG delegates to attend the house?

TABLE 4:
Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
Yes - majority voted for 3 MIG delegates at large (4 voted in favor) to increase diversity of representation within HOD while others voted for 1 MIG delegate at large (2 voted in favor), due to varying size of MIGs. 1 abstained from vote, 1 voted to not have MIG representation.

**TABLE 5:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
Three MIG delegates at large would provide more representation from the MIGs and provide more diversity.

**TABLE 6:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
**NO CONSENSUS** - need more information and further discussion. MIG membership is small numbers, may not represent the demographic groups (anyone can be a member). Could At-Large MIG delegates negatively impact representation of affiliates and DPGs? Support for deferring the decision to a later phase vs. implementing many changes at once.

**TABLE 7:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
**Yes for including representation from MIG’s Wish to see only 1 representative from a MIG.**
Rationale:
Don’t believe representation from a MIG will give us diversity; sometimes just an “interest” and not true diversity.

**TABLE 8:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
*No summary, see full dialogue below*

**TABLE 9:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
*No summary, see full dialogue below*

**TABLE 10:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
We agreed to use MIG delegates to improve diversity with 3 MIG Delegates at Large

**TABLE 11:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
Yes, we want MIG representation. Consensus around 3 individuals but want to make sure the delegate is representative of a specific demographic group because anyone can join the MIG. It will be important to consult with MIGS.

**TABLE 12:** Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
- Consensus/Rationale: Table likes the idea of adding MIG Delegates (no consensus on number of added delegates), but wants leadership to consider the added cost associated with adding delegates.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**
**TABLE 2:**
Likes:
Points of view were heard and actions were taken
Fan of term limits x2
Appreciated fresh approach
Bringing in broader scope of members/increased diversity
Opportunity to have opinions heard

**TABLE 4:**
For the 4 issues:
- What modifications need to be made (or should/could be made) to the identified recommendations to garner your support?
  - Issues of diversity, gender, age typically come to the surface - nice to see the issues being dialogued addressed in the recommendations
  - Focus on improved communication was positive
  - Real-time issues being addressed; this is important to constituents (important to be adaptable)
  - Length of term of delegates - some have been involved for long period of time, need to do something about the perception of participation in HOD.
  - Change from mega issue to strategic issues. Separation of professional issues to facilitate change
  - Differentiation between strategic and professional issues, establishment of task forces, limitation of terms to incorporate more voices and representation
  - Idea of multiple professional issues (hard to have active participation if not relevant to constituency). Allows delegates to select most relevant issues for their constituents.
  - Structure needed an overhaul, great that diversity is being addressed as an important issue within our association
- How do we get to consensus and ability to make a motion?

**TABLE 6:**
The HOD Leadership team identified the following success criteria (members & relationships, communication, agility, visionary & strategic thinking)

One member expressed liking the breaking out professional issues and strategic issues, better linkages between other initiatives and HOD, in favor of term limits. The proposal is strong and viable. Another participant applauded HOD for responding to previous complaints.

**TABLE 7:**
What the delegates liked about the EDT recommendations
Provided good “food for thought” with respect to diversity in time of practice. Also the benefit of future leader in the HOD.
Will be much fairer r/t standardized term limits
The delegates working together and collaborating more with HLT than in the past. Getting us back to the way things were done in the past.
Excited about the prof issues having task forces. Would like to see more that can be done with members.
Like the visionary approach. Thinking about the future practitioners, younger age, second career. Being able to tap this important part of our membership is ideal.
Recognizes the need to reach all members through the HOD membership. Being more agile.
Liked the systematic approach to communication and gathering input from the delegates/members.
The division between the strategic and professional issues.
The more openness of the HOD; broadcast the meetings.

**TABLE 10:**
What did you like about the report:
- Liked term limits due to questions.
- Like development of diversity recommendations up to this point.
- Comfortable with recommendations and no major concerns about age.
- Liked term limits and diversity.
- Liked concept of term limits and no concerns regarding age.
- State policies/bylaws had restricted potential candidates for Delegate. Like term limits and break between terms.

Likes term limits but may limit candidates due to membership pool.

**TABLE 12:**
Overall feedback on the report/recommendations:
- Goal was to provide input opportunity from members and represent the voice of all dietitians
- Liked the term limit for the delegate; allows for other leaders to have opportunities and allows for more diversity
- Overall thought the report identified the information that the HOD and Academy needs to address to move forward; liked seeing the separation of issues

Dialogue about diversity was good to identify the need; however some did not like the ‘under 35’ and there was some concern about the MIGs

**FULL DIALOGUE**

**Issue 1: Term Limits**

Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]

Option 1: 1 year
Option 2: 2 years
Option 3: 3 years
Option 4: Other

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

**TABLE 1:**
The comments on the different platforms was not a universal support for term limits. How long should the breaks be?

Two terms back to back is good. There needs to be more than a one year break. Delegates should have to sit out for a full delegate term so at least 3 years for a full back-to-back term.

In California they see the purpose for setting term limits to get “new blood”. If we continue to have the same people run for office we won’t get new people to serve as a delegate. This change could help to get younger people into these positions. We need as large of a break between terms as possible in order to have new people. A break beyond one year is ideal.

The same people appear to serve all the time, if not in the HOD then they serve in other positions. There needs to be fresh eyes. A full 3 year break should be required.

Three year break. Six years in the HOD - everyone needs a break.

Go along with consensus. Smaller DPG’s and MIGs may not have enough volunteers to take that 3 year hiatus.
Concur with what the group is saying. Smaller states and DPG’s are having difficulty finding a delegate replacement. We need to “tap the shoulders” of the people we feel would do the position. Are we stretching the circle of people to include a broader volunteer base? Sometimes we don’t expand our circle of nominations or encourage people to run for positions because we know the regular people will do it. Think of someone new to run.

Is there a situation where no one runs and no one wants to take another term? Not sure. Have some type of clause in the policy procedure at the state level, for example, to make an exception to the rule. It may spur efforts to widen the net. Board or president/president elect may have to step in to appoint someone in the delegate position if there is no one who wants to be nominated.

TABLE 2:

Option 1: 1 year - consensus of (2) 3-year terms with a 1 year break - consider override term limit if lack of candidate interest
- What modifications need to be made (or should/could be made) to the identified recommendations to garner your support?
  - Consensus on two terms
  - 3 year terms - up to 3 terms with 3 year break
  - Consider ability to run for office outside of HOD
  - If we all agree to 2 terms, should it be a six year term and then at least a 1 year break, no matter if you are serving the affiliate or a DPG, MIG or At Large HOD
  - Override term limit if lack of candidate interest
  - Term break as delegate after 6 years
  - Rational for 2 years - terms do not match up and may end up sitting up longer
  - Rational for 1 year - same as above
  - 1-3 year break, limiting to two 3 year terms

TABLE 3:

Option 1: 1 year- 1 vote
Option 2: 2 years- 2 votes
Option 3: 3 years- 8 votes

TABLE 4:

Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]

Option 1: 1 year (Rita, Dave, Jessica, Adair)
Option 2: 2 years (N/A)
Option 3: 3 years (Naomi, Mary Beth, Jenny)
Option 4: Other- No break

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.
- Less than 3 years is not feasible for working into the system. 1 year is not enough. The purpose is to distance yourself from the affiliate or DPG to come back refreshed/recharged.
- 1 year brought to the table for small states facing the challenge of smaller membership
  - Could see this as an exception, not a rule.
- 2 terms (6 years non-stop): we are discussing after these 6 years
- individual with different leadership roles for multiple years (people don't like having the same person in HOD year after year, however they could jump between different leadership roles. Will this rule accomplish a break in individuals acting as delegates?
- Why do we need term limits? Discussion held by evolution designer team was diversity in thought and ideas. This was the rationale and importance for term limits, to facilitate movement, new ideas, new practice settings reflected, etc.
- Comment on perceived lack of individuals interested in participating as delegates: Creating a significant term limit requires a new individual to step up into a leadership position.
  - If we have a 3 year term limit and realize it is an issue (new leadership not stepping up), we can go back and change this ruling.
- While there is burnout, there is also a learning curve coming back in.
  - Learning curve facilitates fresh ideas.
  - If there are volunteers who are needed, it would make it an easy way out instead of having to get around the rule
  - Realistic to allow 1 year

**Majority consensus is 3 year break.**

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.
- How could we have less than 3 years if each term is 3 years?
- Plan is: 2 consecutive 3 year terms and then a required break.
  - Concern: Could go from delegate for 3 years to affiliate for 3 years. (Many belong to multiple DPGs)
    - So, should the BREAK be required to prevent going from affiliate to DPG, etc.
- Purpose: to have more and more members involved in HOD. So allowing people to go from affiliate to DPG and remain in HOD for 12 or so years is not meeting that goal.
  - So should 3 year break be required no matter HOW you are involved in HOD.
- On the other hand, do any affiliates or DPG have trouble finding delegates? Maybe an appeal would be necessary (IF you are having trouble finding someone, then can continue to serve).
- What modifications need to be made (or should/could be made) to the identified recommendations to garner your support?
  - An appeal process would need to be set in place in case an affiliate or DPG is having trouble finding a delegate.
  - On application for all HOD positions, add, “When was the last year you served as a delegate?”

**How do we get to consensus and ability to make a motion?**
  - Majority consensus has been achieved- 3 year break.

**TABLE 5:**
Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]
[Would be new concept; 3-year term for affiliate; question if a delegate would be lost if no one to replace in a state:]
Option 1: 1 year (question if length would encourage others to try for opportunity)
Option 2: 2 years
Option 3: 3 years
Option 4: Other
Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.
There needs to be a break long enough to encourage others to try for opportunity. A minimum of two years would be preferable but there may be benefits for longer, up to three years.

**TABLE 6:**
Issue 1: Term Limits
The sticking point is how long of a gap there should be between terms. One member expressed a one year gap is good, and prevents someone from going from a state delegate to a practice group. One member wondered whether the break should be for one term, as opposed to one year. A member of the Evolution Design Team provided some background information. The thought was that after being involved as an affiliate, some members may be more involved in a DPG. Term limits are the best practice when it is considered as a representation. There is a need to bring new people in and give opportunities for more members. One member had heard that the concern was for scenarios where members could serve two consecutive terms, take a year off, and then return to serve another term with a DPG. Another opinion was expressed that term limits may prevent people who are doing a good job, from serving. It was noted that most HOD positions are elected positions, allowing opportunity for others to run. There was attention to the concern that others do not bother trying when someone is running again. It is noted that the gap is really a three year gap when individuals serve a full three years. The design team considered a potential hardship for some affiliates or DPGs. The intent was a one year minimum.

**TABLE 7:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: 1 year break between terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

Addendum:
1. May need to have an exception in those affiliates where the leadership pool is so small and there aren’t candidates to serve in a delegate role.
2. If going from an affiliate to a DPG delegate, remove the 1 year term

In favor of term limits (MS), 2 terms for 3 years each. For affiliates, prefers one term but could add another term as a DPG delegate
Favors 3 year term; no more than 2 terms consecutive. Favors no break between terms
Favors 3 year term with 2 term limit. Not always is there someone ready to step into delegate role (need a provision if no one is available to serve). Constituency in the affiliate is very different than that of a DPG.
Favors not having a break if one is going from an affiliate to a DPG delegate and vice versa.
Favors a 1 year break.
If a term limit, a year break is sufficient.
2 consecutive terms with 3 year limits and a 1 year break is very reasonable. Too much time away may be difficult. What is the benefit in waiting longer? Might be different if going from an affiliate to a DPG delegate. A one year break is good for affiliate delegate terms.
Lose continuity with taking a year off. When new leaders are in place and they don’t have passion, can take away from the leadership. Don’t feel there needs to be term limits.
A break gives the opportunity for new blood and a new perspective. Leans toward term limits of 2 consecutive terms followed by a 1 year break. Have a responsibility to groom new members to begin leadership roles. Not sure what the best approach to address when no one does step up to this opportunity. Suggesting one additional term without a break if this occurs. Constituents don’t always respond when queried for input. Makes it a challenge for the delegates. As an organization, we need to determine how to encourage our members to respond. Would like the HOD address engaging our members.
Susan B - a great webinar for affiliate Nominating Comm to engage members to serve and to increase diversity.
May need to have an exception in those affiliates where the leadership pool is so small and there aren’t candidates to serve in a delegate role. The goal is to charge the affiliate nominations team to engage new candidates. Some affiliates include a delegate-elect.
Every affiliate and DPG are on different schedules
If going from an affiliate to a DPG delegate, doesn't favor the 1 year break between terms. This could be a second addendum.

**TABLE 8:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: 1 year (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: 3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 4: Other**

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

- Only one delegate per State?
- Will the break apply to the HLT?
- If a delegate has to return?
- Two term limit with no break. History how long for other states.
- Three year with a three year break.

I think we should let the states and DPGs make the decision on term limits with recommendations from the HOD for a minimum break-if possible. This take some pressure off the smaller states, who may not be able to get more people involved.

You can do 6 years for two terms.

Break would be outside of the 6 year period, will this apply to HLT, allows new members

Not able to **fill the position, need to take a break, or needs to leave early.**

Two year break on a case to case basis, depending on the situation. Exception to the rule.

Leave the decision to the Affiliate.

Appointed vs **elected**

**TABLE 9:**

**Issue 1: Term Limits**

Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]

**Option 1: 1 year**

- Option 2: 2 years
- Option 3: 3 years
- Option 4: Other

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

- In smaller groups/memberships, harder to fill board
  - maybe have full term in b/t to get new ideas, thoughts, people, more diversity, etc.
  - healthy to have a break
- But with 3 year break, people may move on professionally
  - hard to retain existing leaders
  - 1-2 years more feasible?
- even in larger groups/memberships, see same people
  - so not a bad idea for people to sit out at least a little while
  - highlights importance of ACEND encouraging educators to encourage students to fill positions when they are professionals
- ideally, delegates would like longer gap
but practically, not very feasible

**TABLE 10:**

**Issue 1: Term Limits**

Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]

Option 1: 1 year
Option 2: 2 years
Option 3: 3 years

**Option 4: Other** Defer on decision until more data available on the number of delegates in for extended periods of time and would a break time cause issues with smaller affiliates obtaining candidates for delegate positions.

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

- If outgoing Delegate, 1 year break may actually turn out to be a 3 year break depending how the positions rotate within the affiliate.
- Consider how this may impact availability of quality candidates.
- Would support an affiliate delegate after their term going into a delegate position for a DPG or MIG.
- May need consideration for small states with small membership numbers and ability to fill the delegate positions. Larger states have difficulty filling delegate positions as well.
- Hold on the term limit option and survey the affiliate boards to determine any issues related to filling the delegate position.
- Instead of having a break between terms, would it be better to have a limit on the number of terms or time served.
- Look for objective data on number of terms for delegates.
- Is time limit for the break necessary or is just a break adequate.
- Agree that there is a need to bring fresh perspective and new voices.

**TABLE 11:**

**Issue 1: Term Limits**

Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]

Option 1: 1 year
Option 2: 2 years
**Option 3: 3 years**
Option 4: Other

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

Majority agrees with Option 3: 3 years, one year may be too short. Some did not hear much feedback and felt indifferent about all options.

Clarification is needed after the first 3 year term, re-elected vs re-appointed.

If an individual was elected for a 3-year term and wants to serve again for another 3-year term do they need to “re-run” (do other candidates have to be solicited)- there was an individual who wanted to raise this concern

**TABLE 12:**

**Issue 1: Term Limits**

Responses showed support for a break between terms, between 1-3 years. Please have the table determine consensus on how long that break should be. [highlight the consensus choice]
Option 1: 1 year  
Option 2: 2 years  
**Option 3: 3 years**  
Option 4: Other  

Report out on the option your table decided with rationale.

- Discussion: conducted an initial survey poll during the call using to do a quick straw poll. Initial results indicated all options were discussed with members. Option 1 seems to be too short of a break considering individuals can serve 6 years. Discussion indicated between Option 2 and 3 were preferred.
  - Assumes 3 year term; can serve 2 terms consecutively so individual can serve 6 years before break referred to above.
- Consensus/Rationale: Option 3 - 3 years break. Option 1 - 1 year was too short of a break and allows for a break between term limits allows for other individuals to step up in leadership roles that may not have otherwise had the opportunity. Table strongly supports term limits, if not already in place.

---

**FULL DIALOGUE**  
**Issue 2: Diversity**  
Should we use the composition of the HOD to address diversity within the HOD or defer to the Academy’s efforts to do so?

**TABLE 1:**
Yes. Diversity goes beyond race, diversity includes gender identification, culture, religion. There is at times so much conflict in these areas - “being in the white women club”. There have been male minority colleagues and recent graduates who have different ideas/views than women. Gender identification and helping to define and explain it better helps us to better understand who we are serving - members and the public.

Feedback received by NDEP members - diversity absolutely should be the responsibility of HOD. Men not being mentioned as one of the groups- Asians and African Americans mentioned. Also there is no mention of disabled. Identification of this group should be the responsibility of the HOD.

Depends on how you view the HOD. If members vote that HOD should be there representatives then diversity should be an issue but not sure how that fits into representing their constituency. Do you make the HOD shaped that way - a more diverse house? We need more information. Should we address diversity - yes. should the makeup of the house be changed to have equal representation by each group - how do you do that when your members vote you to represent them?

The above is a complication because if a representative is voted in then we have to do what needs to be done with whoever shows up. The Academy’s effort should focus on bring more diverse individuals into the association.

Make up of the HOD and how the design team moves to identify diversity. The composition of the HOD can be tweaked to add delegates that are under 35 and from MIGs. MIGs have not been represented and this is how to increase diversity.

3 yes, 2 more clarification on how we do that.
TABLE 2:

**Consensus to defer to Academy’s efforts**

- Encourage at the level of nomination of HOD
- Representation through MIGs - concern of budget to travel
- Academy efforts to drive
- HOD diversity
- Need to look at much broader, diversity inclusive of unique skills
- Ensure different areas of practice are represented - DPG role
- Academy as a whole lacking in diversity

TABLE 3:

**YES**

Report out on decision with rationale.

- Need to be concerned about diversity in EVERY area of our profession. Should set this example in the HOD.
- We SHOULD align with whatever the academy is doing because we do need more diversity within HOD.
- **Consensus that we should increase diversity in HOD.**

TABLE 4:

- HOD is made up of Academy members. Diversity of HOD is constrained within the profession. When you review <35 year old and recs, diversity is constrained within Academy membership.
- If HOD has a different philosophy than BOD, efforts may not be hand in hand.
- President addressed diversity and inclusion, these are different concepts. These can be addressed in action, not policy.
- You cannot enforce diversity - if profession looks one way in composition, and HOD represents composition of membership, we as the HOD cannot change that.
- We need to support Academy’s diversity efforts
- Efforts on inclusivity could be addressed by HOD rather than trying to change representation of the membership (diversity).
- HOD is overrepresented by Academia - we don’t get to other areas of dietetics which are less represented. While we should support diversity efforts, we cannot guarantee diversity in HOD.
- This is an Academy issue, not an HOD issue.
- Differentiating between strategic vs. professional issues maybe bring in a diversity of thought if HOD is working to get a variety of constituents involved - bringing in professional issues may contribute inadvertently to address diversity/inclusivity.

TABLE 5:

[Encourage rather than force diversity; age including older and younger and MIGs; non-traditional areas of practice; years in practice is also a concern re: expertise; different generations may be represented in different proportions - age would have a different impact than years in practice; greater proportion of those over age 55 currently represented; concern that the younger people in practice may lack either the experience or confidence in their experience to take on these opportunities. Age rather than years in practice would help represent different generations. More representation by younger members may help with moving the practice forward; the composition of the HOD may help enhance the addressment of diversity]

It would be beneficial to encourage more diversity to represent what our membership actually looks like. Diversity in the HOD would help enhance and support the Academy’s efforts to support diversity.
TABLE 6:
Should we use the composition within the HOD or defer to the Academy’s efforts outlined in the Strategic plan around diversity? The Spring meeting provided information about the makeup of the HOD.
Are there examples for how the HOD could have its own process or plan that would align with Academy efforts? More time was required to look at the Strategic plan. The Design team (see report) followed the areas that were the least diverse (e.g., under age 35); the other piece that stood out was Member Interest Groups (MIGS).

The diversity component was more difficult. The entities should be electing representatives that they want, and this push seems to go against that. Pushing so much for younger representation presents some challenges as more seasoned professionals bring an important perspective. The membership should be represented, in terms of who is sent to the HOD rather than through a diversity plan. Is it possible whether getting more representation from the MIGS helps to better address the diversity matter.

The HOD could consider leaning toward the Academy to address the diversity aspect. It was noted that it is going to take time. It was noted that The Academy’s Strategic plan includes strategies and tactics through 2020. Even if it is determined that the HOD does not want to act on now, it doesn’t preclude the HOD from acting on the issue in the future. There may be a benefit to holding off on changing the structure piece, especially with so many variables; it may be more difficult to measure progress.

TABLE 7:
Allow the “trickle down” effect; it will be easier for the Nominating committees to highlight diversity if the Academy has strategic efforts underway. All for not recreating the wheel but don’t want things to be legislated.

How would we defer to the Academy? The Academy has a diversity strategic plan underway, includes outcome measures and implementation dates. Do we need to develop our own diversity plans or allow what the Academy is doing to assist the HOD with its diversity efforts? Do we need to make additional steps to address HOD diversity? Would leave this effort with the Academy.
All for not recreating the wheel but also it is important to have things in place to make sure HOD diversity does reflect that of Academy membership.
It isn’t a good idea to choose a delegate candidate based on diversity alone. Question as to how this will be implemented.
Per Susan, more of a “trickle down” effect; it will be easier for the Nominating committees to highlight diversity if the Academy has strategic efforts underway. Currently the HOD membership is very close to representing our full Academy member diversity.
The HOD needs to decide how to address diversity.
If this needs to be addressed in the future, this can occur.

TABLE 8:
Should we use the composition of the HOD to address diversity within the HOD or defer to the Academy’s efforts to do so?
Report out on decision with rationale.
**HOD to develop its own Diversity (S) plan, to reflect current membership representation**
Demographics: Academy - HOD (AGE is separate issue)
90.6 females
3.8 males
9.6 did not report

white 77.8
Asian 3.9
Black 2.6
Hispanic 3.3
not reported 7

train the nominating committees to include diversity on the State ballots
Underrepresented groups may not be involved with the process for HOD
Promote diversity within HOD
As a male do not participate under the HOD, more ethnic not gender, including the MIGs
To have a better mix.
Discussion Delegate to mentor a successor, create the interest on Diverse all responsible to do it.

TABLE 9:
**Issue 2: Diversity**
Decision: Composition of HOD should address diversity w/in the HOD
Rationale:
- HOD represents composition in some way but not in others
  - could seem like cop out if HOD deferred to Academy
    - not being representative of constituency
- should be cautious in way we approach subject of influencing diversity
  - elected group of individuals
  - could focus too much on certain group, like delegates under 35 for example, and neglect others
- Most people step up for positions
  - need more engagement, encourage more people to step up
- lack of understanding/sharing of information about what delegates do
  - why it’s hard to get people to step up
  - diversity could be helped if we communicated better, whether through the HOD or aligning with the Academy
  - mentorship program could be very helpful in grooming leadership, especially for people from underrepresented areas
    - mentorship program and better communication could make it less intimidating and confusing

TABLE 10:
**Issue 2: Diversity**
**defer to the Academy’s efforts**
Report out on decision with rationale.
- Academy working to update the plan to include 2020-2025. Prefer to allow the Academy to move forward before making changes to the HOD which may not mimic the Academy.
- Assist and support Academy implementation of diversity plan.
TABLE 11:  
**Issue 2: Diversity**  
All agree, yes the composition of the HOD to address diversity within the HOD.

TABLE 12:  
**Issue 2: Diversity**  
- Discussion: Report indicated to increase the diversity of the group, however the HOD has no control over who the public votes in as representatives. Report tries to address the diversity via the ‘under 35’ and MIG representation (Age and Ethnicity). Option to consider the HOD taking more responsibility in diversity efforts, or leave efforts to the other Academy groups (e.g., Diversity Committee). Training Affiliates for diversity efforts may be another option or prong to the diversity efforts.  
- Consensus/Rationale: HOD should not use the composition to address diversity, rather should use other Academy Groups or additional Affiliate Training to address diversity.

**FULL DIALOGUE**  
**Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age**  
If table answered yes to issue 2- Should we be looking at diversity in terms of age or years in practice?  
*If age:*  
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age  
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age  
Option 3: Other  
*If years in practice:*  
Option 1: 3 years  
Option 2: 5 years  
Option 3: Other  
Report out with rationale.

TABLE 1:  
One of the reason the age was changed was because of educational requirements.

Years of practice matters more. If they are new to the field then they don’t have the same input. We want the younger crowd in there for the diversity but years of practice is really something we should consider.

If we want the viewpoint of younger members then why increase the age? The younger person would be an entry level person. Leaning toward leaving it at 30.

The NDEP group did not address this specifically. Getting the entry level perspective is critical it lends itself to the educational process, what’s happening with credentialing, the exam, etc. In favor of keeping the age as 30 and younger.

In favor of under 30. California’s president, who is close to 30, was able to accomplish significant work/changes/ideas by looking at things with fresh eyes. Talk a lot about losing membership in the Academy and the young students can do things that we wouldn’t already do by bringing in new ideas and looking at things differently. Get them involved early. Sometimes comes down to money and time - what are they getting from their membership. Leave at under 30.
With younger delegates are we looking at it from an age perspective or a new RD perspective? Some people come into the profession in their 40’s or 2 or 3 years post grad then they wouldn’t be represented. Keep at under 30 but they need to decide what they’re getting from these individuals - viewpoint of younger people or just credentialed people.

If we went with 3 years of practice how would that be different from keeping the 30 years of younger age? A traditional student would be younger than 30. The younger thought process is what we were focusing on - are they bringing a different perspective from their recent internship? Would this be any better? Any different?

There is a huge maturity difference between those who graduated high school and those who have been out in the real world. The learning styles between the two will be different, their use of technology and how they interact with others would be different. If you’re looking for a younger perspective then keep it younger; if you’re looking for a perspective on a recent graduate then age may not matter.

Need to have a good knowledge base of voting members.

TABLE 2:
- younger people as part of diversity, have to look at age
- both, 3 at under 35 years of age and 2-3 in practice at 5 years or less x2
  - 5 years of practice or less would offer opportunity to those who have has change of career and are newer to the field - second career individuals bring insight
- Does the Academy pay the expense of being an at-large delegate?
  - Be sure Academy pays for all At Large Delegates before increasing numbers of at large delegates for 35 and under as well as 5 years of practice

TABLE 3:
**Majority consensus**: focus on diversity in terms of age. Keep the 3 delegates at 30 and under with no years of practice minimum.

If age:
**Option 1**: Keep at under 30 years of age - 9 votes
**Option 2**: Increase to under 35 years of age
**Option 3**: Other-
-Under 30 brings in more diversity of younger generations.

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
-Some feel that more years of experience may be needed to successfully act as an HOD member others feel that it is not indicative of ability to act successfully.
-Does years of practice need to be associated with “delegate in large under 30”
  - **Yes**: 3
  - **No**: 7
Report out with rationale.
- **AGE:** Keep in mind soon RDs will have a required masters so they will be older when joining. This may be one reason to raise the age to 35 so that the RD can get experience.
- Could we require both age AND years in practice to ensure that each has experience. On the other hand, a person with less years in practice may still bring something valuable to the table.
- Some practice experience can be important but it can be possible to get that by 30 anyway.
- We definitely need to increase the number of at large delegates in a younger age group.
- Possibility of just 1-2 years in practice rather than 3.
- Average graduate: minimum 25-26 years old depending on program.
  - **What about 1 delegate at large having to do with years of practice and the other with age?**
    - *Because someone older but new to the profession could bring a new perspective to the table.
    - Under 30 “at large” and under 3 years of practice “at large.”
  - Everyone is in agreement that they want a delegate representative that is younger, but also that they want someone with experience. A vote will be needed because so many options.
  - Some feel that more years of experience may be needed to successfully act as an HOD member others feel that it is not indicative of ability to act successfully.

**TABLE 4:**
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
**Option 2:** Increase to under 35 years of age (Adair, Mary Beth, Rita, Jessica)
Option 3: Other
If years in practice:
Option 1: maximum of 3 years (Naomi, David, Jenny)
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other

Report out with rationale.
- Rationale for adding two delegates: HOD compared to total AND membership, is underrepresented in younger age groups. Part of this was standardization across AND and also Future Practice Model (masters).
- Question: do you agree/prefer age or years of practice?
- Looking at age is the only way to address inclusion of younger generation, years in practice doesn’t address this.
- Purpose of HOD: discuss professional issues, strategy to address issues.
- Need to have a few years in practice to speak to issues- if a person has not worked very long, they cannot discuss issues in depth.
- Years in practice more representative of younger demographic than 35 years of age
- Goal: better levelset younger representation within HOD to align/balance with membership.
- Question: Can age and years and practice be combined so that we have new delegates at large in both categories?
- Maximum of 3 years
- Report recommends adding 2 more seats, this vote is only related to those 3 delegate roles

**TABLE 5:**
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
**Option 2:** Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other
If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
Report out with rationale.
The increase in age may help encourage younger members who don’t feel confident they have enough experience.

TABLE 6:
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
Report out with rationale.
Alternative approach to consider could be based on years of practice. Member input was as follows: RDNs have to go to school longer, so it is increasing the age at which RDNs are able to begin practice. There were concerns from some members with using age instead of years of practice. There was a second vote of support for years of practice; age is somewhat discriminatory and doesn’t consider the multiple ways in which a person arrives at their career. At what point does someone with a PhD enter practice. There needs to be consideration for RDNs who enter the field as a second career and are older when they enter the field. Years of practice makes more sense. The answer may lie in what the goal is. The spring meeting identified that 35% of Academy members are under 30, but the representation in the HOD does not align. If the goal is to represent the perspective of membership, the younger less experienced members are currently under-represented. It might be possible to change the at large delegate from under 30 to under 35. Do we add 3 positions under that position to bring in a younger voice? It may be helpful to separate out the concept of younger voices vs practice experience. The younger members are able to run. Do we need more positions to force the representation or is there a need to do more awareness building? SCAN does a lot to include younger members and consider succession planning. There was a comment that the group should consider that RDNs under 35 make up only 15% is represented of the HOD; 47% if the members in the HOD are over age 50. Term limits may help address this issue. There may be a possibility of putting stages into the process. Have we looked at the effectiveness of the younger delegate? This could be considered before a decision to add more. There could be a very positive impact of having more involvement. If they are not effective, could we do a better job of training.

If table answered yes to issue 2- Should we be looking at diversity in terms of age or years in practice? The group did not achieve a consensus. The initial discussion favored years of practice rather than age, but the discussion recognized the disparity. At least two members asked whether it is possible to consider two options (age as well as years of practice). There may be greater support for this change if there are specific goals and an evaluation plan.

TABLE 7:
Group prefers with both ways. Some like the recommendation as written but others would like to include a delegate with 3 years or less in the profession regardless of age.

If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
Report out with rationale.

Offer a split in delegates by age; one younger in practice and new to profession and also include younger in age.
Have both under 30 years and under 5 years of practice
Need an effort for younger age.
Would go with years of practice vs age. Can bring in different perspectives.
Agree with splitting, under 30 years and 3 years or less of practice.
Both age and years of practice are beneficial. Need both viewpoints
Both age and years of practice are important
Agree with what others have stated. Younger generation brings a different view. Years of practice also beneficial. If had to pick one, would pick age due to the way they view things.
Keep one under 30 years and also one with 3 years or less of practice. This may be difficult in expectations.
May want to choose the 5 years of practice as 3 years may not be ready to serve as a delegate.
Agree with how the EDT wrote the recommendations.

TABLE 8:
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other: Delegate at Large under 40 years of age with under 5 years of practice, to reflect diversity

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other:

Report out with rationale.

Age 35
Second career to help with Diversity
What about if there in there 40?
I’m for increasing the age to 35 but still have reservations on using age, I got my RD and started practicing when I was 22 so by 35 I was very experienced, it depends on the goal of age limits

What is the percentage of age for second career
Have both age and years of practice

TABLE 9:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other

Report out with rationale.
- Increase to 35 b/c of additional Master’s requirement starting 2024
- People under 35 may have different ways of communicating, generational differences (like adeptly navigating technology)
- Is 35 enough, though? Many people feel 35 is not old enough for addressing younger generation
  - b/c of second careers, additional education, delayed schooling for various reasons

TABLE 10:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
Report out with rationale.
- Look at years since credentialed vs years in practice.
- Age is important not just the time in practice.

TABLE 11:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age
Option 3: Other

If years in practice:
Option 1: 3 years
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
Report out with rationale.

Most agree with Option 2 to increase the age to 35 and potentially paired with some experience. Most spoke about increasing age due to being unable or still in the process of completing an internship and/or Master’s degree by 30. Overall concerned with capturing younger member representation.
TABLE 12:
Issue 3: Delegate at Large: Under 35 Years of Age
If age:
Option 1: Keep at under 30 years of age
**Option 2: Increase to under 35 years of age**
Option 3: Other

If years in practice:
**Option 1: 3 years**
Option 2: 5 years
Option 3: Other
Report out with rationale.
- Discussion: Each individual may have a varied age/years of practice. HOD seems to have a variety of ages, number of years in practice, and skills already. The current profile of the HOD-15-18% are under 35 ages; does not mirror Academy membership as a whole, which is closer to 36%. Do need a delegate to represent that group. Suggestion to keeping it as age because you develop different opinions and perspectives as you age, rather than number of years in practice. May have both- since age can sometimes get overlooked. Someone may be over 35, and is new to practice. Discussion of suggest of the 2 additional Delegates-at-Large position, split so 1 is focused on age, and 1 focused on years in practice. Keep the original option as is. Perhaps request more information from the age groups being discussed, could be valuable to have younger individuals input.
- Consensus/Rationale: Both age and years in practice are important factors. Recognize the composition of the HOD does not reflect the diversity of the Academy as a whole. Concur with the report recommendations that the 2 additional delegates are added with ‘under 35 years’ and ‘3 years’ of practice.

FULL DIALOGUE
Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No
If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large?
Option 1: 1
Option 2: 3
Option 3: other
Report out with rationale.

TABLE 1:
Yes we should because we have a un-diverse profession.

Yes. Great way in addressing what we talked about earlier. Don’t know how to get around diversity with making guidelines at a state level related to people who need to be a certain gender or religion.

Yes. This is a better way to increase diversity even if it results in a bigger HOD. Delegate from each MIG? There would be one or 3 to represent all MIGs. This would be a delegate at-large position. There would be a potential to have up to 3 with the MIGs.

Good to be inclusive and adding 3 people would not be a problem to add to the house.
How many MIGs are there? Three large ones and some smaller ones. Each MIG should have a representative. Some of the MIGs may not have the financial means to participate.

MIG summary count - 6. Why did the leaders send this out in the materials? So delegates would be aware of how many MIG’s there are in the Academy. Three MIG’s in the HOD would increase the representation. There needs to be assistance in managing the cost to the meetings and the cost to HOD for a larger group. All 6 should be represented unless they can’t afford to be. What is the actual cost? Can the Academy subsidize or budget for this so no one is left out? Who will step up?

It may be difficult to have people step up.

The Academy should help the MIGs financially if they feel they all need to be there. All the MIGs should contribute funds and nominate a delegate for all essential meetings. In favor of at least 3 delegates for the MIG.

We all feel that there should be at-large delegates for the MIG - need at least 3 with the potential for all to have a representative and that the Academy should make that part of their diversity plan.

TABLE 2:
Yes or No - as long as we can pay for it

- Currently 6 MIGs with a total 3,763 members in 6 different member organizations
- MIGs representative at the house would provide more points of view
- Do the MIGs or Academy pay?
  - MIGs do not have membership dues
- Possibly one from each of the 6 MIGs
- DPG may have cost envy if MIGs included and DPG has to pay, potential fall out
  - Could MIGs pay to have members represented?
  - Consensus to offer each MIG an opportunity - that the MIGs must be willing/able to support a HOD position
  - Academy does not support DPG

TABLE 3:
Yes or No
Is there anybody opposed to adding positions for the MIG? NO

Comments:
- If only 3 for multiple groups rep. multiple MIGS, coming from larger MIGS, would smaller MIGs feel like they aren’t being represented?
- Who is going to pay for MIG delegates to attend the house?

TABLE 4:
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No
No (Naomi,
Abstain - Temporary measure: - what affiliate are they involved with - will we need this option - maybe we need this to fill a gap temporarily...

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
Option 1: 1 (Rita, Jessica (depends on the size of the MIG))
**Option 2: 3 (Adair, Mary Beth, Jenny, Jessica)**
Option 3: other

Report out with rationale.
- 8 MIGs total: challenge is that some MIGs are large enough to have budgets while others are not large enough. MIGs represent diversity, which is low in HOD compared to Academy membership. This was a way to move towards better structure where those diversity groups were more represented in HOD.
- New MIG next year: Global MIG open to all international members, giving two bodies of international representation. MIGs should not have representation in the HOD, professional representation should be affiliate
- DPG members are also represented while still having an affiliate
- MIG is important to have representation if that is the only place they feel represented.
- If we are voting yes or no to creating diversity, we need MIG representation. If you are deferring to the Academy this is irrelevant
- Unique culture amongst MIGs - they should have representation, it is not duplicate of other affiliates. Important to capture the MIG collective culture
- Complex issue, diversity and inclusivity efforts being addressed by Academy.
- Cannot think of any detriment to giving different cultural backgrounds representation

**TABLE 5:**
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Some groups have smaller sizes and financial resources may be a concern; Candidates would be nominated from MIGs; there are currently 6 MIGs; more representation from MIGs would help represent the different areas]

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
Option 1: 1
**Option 2: 3**
Option 3: other

Report out with rationale.
Higher representation from the MIGs would better represent and bring more diversity

**TABLE 6:**
The Designer Team recommended three. The choice of three was difficult, and had to do with representation based on numbers. There are > 3700 members in MIGs; one does not have to be of a particular ethnicity to join any of the MIGs; any member can join any MIG, so MIG membership may not be a surrogate for diversity. Consider whether to make structure and process changes, especially because not all MIGs has the structure to hold elections. Implementation is an important consideration and another topic. There needs to be a lot in place, and it may not happen right away. It was observed in the designer report that if allocating seats to MIGs means that larger states lose delegates, that is an important consideration; a fair amount of votes would be given a small group. Consider the number of members in WY vs number of members in CA. The designer team decided not to go with the Senate model; seats would not be taken away (from larger states). Addition of the MIG delegates would be incremental, and the issue would be costs. Stacking the HOD (making it larger) has upsides and downsides. This proposal warrants investigation.
If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
Option 1: 1
Option 2: 3
Option 3: other  **NO CONSENSUS**
Report out with rationale.
Delegates need more information and time in order to make a decision. This topic will be brought to an offline discussion.

**TABLE 7:**
If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
- **Option 1:** 1
- **Option 2:** 3
- **Option 3:** other
Report out with rationale.
Don’t believe representation from a MIG will give us diversity; sometimes just an “interest” and not true diversity. There are 6 MIG’s

3 sounds like a lot for only having 6 MIG’s.
1 for all of the 6 MIG’s makes sense.

**TABLE 8:**
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
- **Option 1:** 1
- **Option 2:** 3
- **Option 3:** other  **One per MIG (total 6)**
Report out with rationale.
One per MIG (total 6)
Diversify the population to be represented equal
Affiliate or MIG Delegate, Funds

**TABLE 9:**
**Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs**
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large?
- **Option 1:** 1
- **Option 2:** 3
- **Option 3:** other
Report out with rationale.
- Struggling with age component above, so maybe we do need cultural component
- 3 sounds like a fair number, going off design team’s recommendation
  - 3 delegates would collectively represent all the MIGs
TABLE 10:
**Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs**
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
Option 1: 1  
Option 2: 3  
Option 3: other  
Report out with rationale.
- Would be good if the MIGs rotate in having Delegates represent them.
- Maintain overall HOD size to maintain efficient functionality.
- Support having MIG representation to improve HOD diversity.

TABLE 11:
**Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs**
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
Option 1: 1  
Option 2: 3  
Option 3: other  
Report out with rationale.

Most agreed that greater MIG representation is needed, with a discussion on the number of delegates. Agreed that too many delegates may make decision making more difficult. Other issues that was brought up ways to look for individuals within the MIGs to represent the underrepresented and to have some sort of guidelines that should be communicated with MIGs.

TABLE 12:
**Issue 4: Delegate at Large: MIGs**
Should the HOD use MIG representation to achieve diversity?
Yes or No

If yes, how many MIG Delegates at Large??
Option 1: 1  
Option 2: 3  
Option 3: other  
Report out with rationale.
- Discussion: Clarification- 3 MIG representatives to represent all MIGs. Question- how are the 3 representatives determined? Conversation redirect to not get in the weeds of ‘how’ the representatives are determined, just are they needed to help achieve diversity. Three seems to be a reasonable number, given a process to determine how those three will be determined at a later time. Their position would align with the policy of other At-large-Delegates. Consideration of cost adding delegates. If it is representing a small portion of the Academy membership, why 3 individuals?
- Consensus/Rationale: Table likes the idea of adding MIG Delegates (no consensus on number of added delegates), but wants leadership to consider the added cost associated with adding delegates.