

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P001
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Chris Moe-Herlick	Position: Past Central Division Senior Advisor and PSIA Level 3 Certification	Date: 3-4-09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Region Director and Past Skills Development Advisor		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Proposed change for the Senior Alpine Skiing & Snowboarding Page 18 of the manual 4 th Paragraph: "Examining teams during the Alpine Skiing/Snowboarding evaluation will be made up of NSP minimum Senior level classification members with experience in Senior evaluation, of whom at least 1 of the 3 evaluators are current PSIA or AASI Certified Level 2 or higher. If requested by the region, the NSP-C Ski School will provide evaluators who are current PSIA/AASI Certified Level 2 or 3.		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): The proposal is to ensure that evaluators are minimum current Senior Patrollers with evaluating experience at the Senior level, and to allow flexibility in that a non PSIA Senior Evaluators are still able to evaluate skiing/snowboarding in their Region's Senior Evaluation. The current verbiage does not allow this flexibility and thus is eliminating qualified evaluators. By having a minimum requirement of at least 1 of the 3 evaluators having a current level 2 or 3 PSIA/AASI Certification allows the ability to provide specific skill development feedback for the candidate.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 0 Against - 8 Abstain -0		

Tabled, Linda to chair a committee, Chip Knappen from Tony's area, Bob L and Phil Montville from JT's area. The Committee will develop a new Senior evaluation credential proposal for the Fall Meeting

Alternate proposal text that Linda presented at the meeting:

Alternate certification for Senior Alpine Evaluator: Central Division

It is recognized that there are currently excellent Senior Alpine evaluators who do not/cannot comply with the PSIA level I I-III requirements that are listed in the Central Division Senior evaluator description. It is proposed to develop an alternate track that would qualify selected existing evaluators that would allow them to continue to function in the ski evaluator's role. The following modules are being considered:

- An error analysis component, 80% score on a calibrated video presentation.
- Error correction teaching component (how would you remedy the errors that were observed in the video analysis)
- Written component: to include BERP, DIRT, movement pools terminology, etc., also Senior manual information
- Ability to demonstrate all skills/all terrain (possible video)

Individuals for this program would be selected by a consensus of Division and Region leadership team including the RD, Ski School Supervisor, Senior Supervisor and others. The individual or individuals' Region would be responsible for certification fees (to be determined.) Every attempt will be made to hold this event on the east and west sides of the lake, relative to enrollment and need.

It is required that this individual maintain membership in the NSPC Ski School.

It is required that this individual participates in a Senior evaluation (not as Lead) at least once every three years.

It is required that this individual recertify every three years by attending a Division certification clinic.

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P002
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: John Thomas	Position: Central Division Western Region Director	Date: 03/10/2009
Proposed by:	Position:	Date:
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Central Division Toboggan supervisor		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): See attachment		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): See attachment		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 2 Against - 6 Abstain -0		

Toboggan Refresher proposal

This proposal is to create a toboggan refresher procedure that is similar to the OEC refresher process. Just like the OEC skills refresher is critical to the success of the skiing public the toboggan refresher is critical to success of the Patroller providing the best possible service. The current process doesn't allow a tracking process to make sure every patroller is refreshed on toboggan skills each season.

I propose that by December 1, a form similar to the OEC refresher form is sent to the Patrol Representative (PR) that would be filled out by the Toboggan IOR after the area's toboggan refresher is complete. The Toboggan IOR would have until the Patrols registration is due to complete the form. The completed form would be required to be submitted before a Patrol registration is accepted. Any Patroller that has not completed a refresher cycle could not be registered as a patroller until a toboggan refresher is completed. If a toboggan refresher is not completed they would have the option of going inactive or become an Auxiliary patroller.

To try and make the dates clearer for the 2009-2010 seasons the following time line of events would take place if this proposal was accepted.

November 1, 2009 the National office would send the Toboggan roster to the PR
The Patrol would conduct Toboggan refreshers any time starting from November 15, 2009 and would have until the end of the Local Area season to complete the Toboggan refresher. Anytime after the Toboggan refresher is completion the Toboggan IOR would send the form to the NSP office. The form would need to be sent in and logged by the NSP office before a patroller would be registered for the 2011 season. This would be repeated the following season and every year after that.

The relational of this proposal is track the status of Toboggan refreshers and to provide a class registration process for the Patrols.

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P003
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Rose DeJarnette	Position: Central Division Auxiliary Program Supervisor	Date: 11/11/08
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others:		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:17.4.2 A.3		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year):none <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):none		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): See attached		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): See attached		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

Original Text in 06/07 P&P

3. Senior patrollers who wish to reregister as auxiliary patrollers will forfeit their senior alpine or nordic patroller classification. To become a senior auxiliary, these individuals must complete the senior auxiliary core requirements and all elective requirements as listed in 17.4.1.A.

Proposed Text

3. Patrollers who have achieved the Senior alpine skill classification who wish to reregister under the senior auxiliary skill classification may do so following forfeiture of their senior alpine or senior Nordic patroller classification. There are no additional requirements.

Justification:

17.4.2.A.3

This article was changed as many felt it was inappropriate to ask long standing Senior Alpine patrollers to take the Aid Room Management Module (ARM) before transitioning to the Senior Auxiliary skill classification.

It is very difficult for many of our patrollers to make the transition from Senior Alpine to the Auxiliary Skill Classification. Many patrollers will continue to pull a sled even though they feel very uncomfortable doing so, risking injury of themselves as well as others. They pull the sled once a year just to meet the frosty requirement. The rest of the season they avoid the toboggan. On paper, the patroller numbers look fine per shift, but in reality there may not be enough patrollers to pull sleds on certain shifts.

This transition should be made easy for the patroller that recognizes their personal limitations and respectful for the patroller that has to be ask to change status. From a PR standpoint, it is hard enough to tell a patroller that they need to change to the auxiliary skill classification for safety reasons. Then you add "if you want to maintain senior status you must complete the ARM". Many patrollers feel it is demeaning to be required to take the module after so many years of service. Right now, long standing alpine patrollers are being registered as senior auxiliary without being asked to take the Aid Room Module (ARM). The people registering them cannot bear to ask the patroller to take the module considering their many years of service to the organization; it is considered an issue of respect for the individual.

Many in our organization see the Aid Room Module as just another road block or hoop to jump through. I personally find it difficult to justify to them how this module is different and/or necessary for them to become a Senior Auxiliary. The only rational given in favor the ARM is that long time patrollers need to "Brush Up" on first aid skills. For people with poor first aid skills, the ARM is not the answer. First Aid skill training and refreshing is to take place at local annual refreshers. If people have poor first aid skills, we should look to improving our refreshers, holding OEC Enhancement Seminars as well as on shift training sessions. If individuals are still inadequate, then maybe individual training is appropriate. We should not wait for the patroller to take the Aid Room Module to address first aid training issues. We should not expect the Aid Room Module to fix their inadequacies. Only people with adequate first aid skills should be taking the module, as with Senior Emergency Management (SEM). The SEM requires skill sheets be signed prior to attending the event. The Aid Room module recommends that the patroller have completed the SEM. As designed, the ARM will not improve first aid skills.

We always say we value the patrollers...what better way to put words into action. When a patroller is unable to continue running toboggans (for whatever reason), we need to say thank you to them for considering the safety of our patients as well as their fellow patrollers. The transition to Senior Auxiliary should be seamless and carry all the awards, numbers, etc the patroller acquired as a Senior Alpine.

As we strive to retain patrollers it is imperative that we respect them in their decision to no longer handle loaded sleds. NSP needs to realize that patroller respect and satisfaction are key to retention of members, not only in this scenario, but across the organization.

R.A. DeJarnette

Central Division Auxiliary Supervisor

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P004
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Ken Meldahl	Position: Southern Region Director	Date: 3/29/2009
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> Others:		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:CD		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Pages 12 & 13 of 56 Chapter 3 Division Elections Timing: Region Directors December 22 DEC to provide Election Schedule and nomination application <i>to Webmaster and/or RPN editor for publication.</i> February 15 DEC to send, if available, resumes, position papers, voting instructions and Ballots to electorate. <i>DEC also to send electorate information to approved candidates.</i> Division Director December 22 DEC to provide Election Schedule and nomination application <i>to Webmaster and/or RPN editor for publication.</i> February 15 DEC to send, if available, resumes, position papers, voting instructions and Ballots to electorate. <i>DEC also to send electorate information to approved candidates.</i>		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Currently there is no one indicated on who the DEC should provide this information to. Currently candidates do not know whom to send campaign information to when or if campaigning. This would allow them that information.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against -0 Abstain -0		

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P005
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Jeannine Mogan	Position: Lead evaluator for the Area Ops module of the Certified exam	Date: 03-26-09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Certified staff, NSP leadership, MSAA leadership, ski area managers.		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures: Certified Manual		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Changes to the Are Operations & Risk Management - Module #6 in the Certified Manual. Please see the attached document.		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Upon review of the Area Operations & Risk Management module of the Certified manual, the following general recommendations were made by Certified patroller staff: 1. Remove chair evacuation questions as they are addressed in the evacuation module. 2. Add questions that reflect current issues of the NSP and the NSAA. 3. Reorganize the order of the questions and ensure the score card matches, creating a better flow to the interview process. 4. Ask for the candidate's NSP resume to evaluate NSP leadership.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

Area Operations & Risk Management – Module #6

The information in this section will serve as a guide during the Area Operations & Risk Management Interview portion of the Certified Exam.

This overview describes what is expected from the candidate and what is likely to be covered during each portion of the interview process. The depth and level of detail will depend on ~~you're the candidate's~~ initial answer ~~at and~~ the discretion of the interview team.

The setting is a job interview for the Patrol Director (Representative) position at ~~Marquette Mountain Ski Area~~ the ski area at which the test is taking place. All the questions are ~~taken from the Certified Manual (Area Operations and Risk Management Module.)~~ based on the Interview Guidelines below.

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

The Patrol Management interview will be conducted indoors and **possibly** outdoors at the base of the mountain (area to be determined at evaluation). The interview will be conducted and scored by **a minimum of** three Certified Staff evaluators on Thursday and the overflow on Friday afternoon, if needed.

~~You are expected to get a trail map of the area and be able to demonstrate knowledge of probable budget, staff, equipment and procedural requirements needed to patrol this area. Make sure you are knowledgeable of the area's hours of operations.~~ Candidates are expected to be able to demonstrate knowledge of the following topics:

LEADERSHIP

- Candidate must bring an “NSP resume” detailing NSP leadership positions held.
- The role of the Patrol Director/Patrol Representative. Including: personnel, equipment, training, area coverage, communication, etc.
- NSP programs

EDUCATION OF RIDERS

- Your Responsibility Code
- SMART STYLE
- ATML

COMPLIANCE ISSUES

- ADA
- OSHA (MSDS & BBP)
- HIPPA
- ANSI

CRITICAL INCIDENTS

- “Red Flag” Incidents
- Investigation Kits and Procedures
- Incident Report Procedures
- CISD

AREA MANAGEMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT

- NSAA and MSAA
- Current issues facing the NSP and NSAA (Young Adult Patrollers, Terrain Parks, helmets, etc.)
- Area Management
- Interdepartmental Relations
- Risk Management Issues
- Snowmobile or other machine transport training and operations
- Manuals and Planning Documentation (P&P, evacuation, MCI, Incident Reports, Employee Injury, etc.)

~~TOPICS OPEN TO DISCUSSION CAN INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES:~~

- ~~Personnel (pro/volunteer, compensation, duties, etc.)~~
- ~~Equipment & supplies~~
- ~~Mountain coverage~~
- ~~Trail opening/closing procedures~~
- ~~Toboggan placement—look at trail map and decide where you think they should be located~~
- ~~Snowmobile or other machine transport training and operations~~
- ~~Patrol administration~~
- ~~Communications~~
- ~~Patrol image~~
- ~~Training Basics, Seniors and Certified~~
- ~~Lift and surface conveyance safety features~~
- ~~Lift evacuation~~
- ~~Accident reports~~
- ~~Mass casualty/Search & Rescue Plans~~

~~There should be no real surprises for you. Remember, be clear and concise with your answers and show confidence.~~

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P006
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Patrick Perlman	Position: ARD – Southern Region	Date: 2/4//2009
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> Others:		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CD Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year):\$0.00 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):\$0.00		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Chapter 2 Division Director Qualifications 5. Must be registered in the Division as a Senior (<u>Alpine, Nordic or Auxiliary</u>) Patroller in any discipline <u>or Certified Patroller.</u> (pg 6) Region Directors Qualifications: (F04-005) 5. Must be currently registered in their <u>Region</u> as a Senior (<u>Alpine, Nordic or Auxiliary</u>) Patroller in any discipline <u>or Certified Patroller.</u> (pg 9)		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Improves definition of who is eligible to Run and Serve as a Division and/or a Region Director.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09 P007
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Bev Benzing	Position: Treasurer	Date: 4/3/09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Division Director Jim Woodrum and the former Treasurer Mary Green		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures: Central Division		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): No Cost <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses): no cost		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Add new section to Program Supervisor Responsibilities and OEC Program Supervisor Responsibilities Pg 8,9 of 56: <i>3.A.5 Maintain all division assets assigned to them in ready to use condition, reports the asset status yearly to the treasurer and transfers the assets upon end of term.</i> Add new section to the Accounting Controls pg 22 of 56 <i>Treasure shall develop and maintain an accurate inventory of division assets. Assets are considered as equipment, tools, other items used by division staff for program delivery. Treasurer will report on status and custodian of assets yearly.</i>		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Assets are purchased for programs managed by Central Division supervisors and simply expensed. There is no accounting or control of those assets beyond paying for the item. There is no management reporting responsibility for the assets once purchased. Each year three or four items valued at \$1000 is expensed. There is currently no managed list of assets purchased by the Central Division.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09 P008
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Bev Benzing	Position: Treasurer	Date: 4/3/09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Division Director Jim Woodrum and the former Treasurer Mary Green		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures: Central Division		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): No Cost <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses): no cost		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Add new section to Administrative/Program Staff Reimbursement Policy Pg 24 of 56: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Ski School Supervisor with the concurrence of the ADD has the discretion to fully subsidize NSP-C Ski School insurance cost for active division staff instructors up to but not to exceed 10 members. Additional members can be added with the approval of the ADD responsible for the program. This expenditure will be charged to the ski school and documented by the supervisor on the yearly expense report. The intention of this expenditure is to improve administration of division ski school programs.</i> 		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Our NSP-C Ski School instructors are required to maintain liability insurance. The division negotiates this insurance and supplements the cost of that insurance with \$10 per person per year. There have been requests to pay the divisions staff insurance in full (currently about \$66 per year).		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes: with the concurrence of the ADD added to above wording		
Final Board Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against -0 Abstain -0		

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P009
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Kevin K. McQuillan	Position: Central Division Legal	Date: 4-1-09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> Others:		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Proposed change for number of votes for Central Division Bylaw changes: Chapter 1 Central Division Board of Directors ... Modification of the By-laws requires an affirmative <u>2/3</u> vote of <u>5 of</u> the Board <u>members</u> at two separate meetings. ARTICLE VIII – By Law Changes 8.1 The Board of Directors shall have power to make, alter, amend and repeal these by-laws by affirmative vote of <u>5 of the Board members</u> a two thirds majority of the entire Board of Directors (as contrasted to a two thirds majority of		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Because the Board has been reduced in number from 9 RDs to 8 RDs, a 2/3 vote of the Board Members would now need a 5.333 affirmative vote, which is not possible. Requiring 6 affirmative votes would raise the requirement to ¾ of the Board Members, while requiring 5 votes would maintain the existing policy of needing 6 affirmative votes out of 9 or all but 3 votes – the 5 out of 8 votes would preserve the need for all but 3 votes, and if one was doing pure math, 5.333 would be rounded down to 5.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 7 Against -1 Abstain -0		

2nd Bylaw vote 4/27/09 For 7, Against 1, Abstain 0

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09 P010
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Bev Benzing	Position: Treasurer	Date: 4/3/09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Division Director Jim Woodrum and Webmaster Chris Raudabaugh		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures: Central Division		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): No Cost <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses): no cost		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Modify PnP section Administrative Assistant Responsibilities Pg 7 of 56: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates and distributes the Central Division <i>Staff Directory and Organization Chart on the division website</i> – Quarterly. 		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Our website has been improved to allow the Region Directors to routinely update their staff information. The Administrative Assistant still updates the Staff portion as well as the organization chart on the website. The website now provides the avenue for distribution.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09 P011
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Darcy Hanley	Position: Senior Program Supervisor	Date: March 31, 2009
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> Others:		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): QA Mentors can be selected by Region Director, Senior Program Supervisor, or Region Senior Program advisor. Prospective QA's must participate in two senior evaluation events and be mentored by the assigned QA for the events. QA mentees must be a Senior patroller, toboggan IT, and a senior evaluator. Mentees will complete a QA evaluation form to be submitted to the Region Director, Assistant Region Director and Division Senior Program Supervisor.		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): QA mentoring draft as attached and discussed requires amendment due to the fact that no patroller indicated interest in following the outlined QA mentoring process. (per attached) Revision of the draft is requested as noted above.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 0 Against - 8 Abstain -0		

Tabled this proposal: Linda will work with Darcy to get the wording to be more explicit.

Senior Evaluation Quality Assurance Program

The Central Division Senior program is a result of the concerted effort between the regions and division training staff. It is critical to maintain the standards established by those involved in the program development. An important consideration of the Central Division Senior Program is ensuring the evaluation is consistent from year to year and from region to region. The division has a team of individuals who are versed in the senior program and are powerful resources to utilize as both “information gatherers” and “information providers”. These individuals will travel to each of the evaluations with a clear picture of how the senior evaluation should operate. They will act as observers and will only intervene in the event that something should occur (or not occur) that falls well outside the guidelines of the program. Immediately following the evaluation the division QA staff member will meet with the region staff to review the completed QA form and, if needed, provide any additional suggestions to improve the event. Once the paperwork is completed a copy will be sent to the Region Senior Program Administrator, the Division Senior Program Supervisor and the Region Director. This step in the process is not just an “evaluation of the evaluation” but is a means to give positive feedback toward improving the evaluation. The final result of the QA process will generate an outstanding program for the participants, including both candidates and administrators.

(p. 5, Senior Program General Information for All Disciplines, Central Division Senior Manual, 3rd edition)

Proposed additions to QA program based on feedback from 2007 Alpine clinics

Qualifications and Development of Division QA Staff Member

The QA staff member should be an experienced senior examiner in the respective discipline and an IT in any discipline. Experience in the evaluation and administration of the program is important for an understanding of the flow and procedure of the presentation of the program. The QA staff member must have a good view of “The Big Picture”. A critical trait of the QA staff member is the ability to communicate, both by listening and providing feedback. The individual must be confident without being confrontational. Anyone interested in becoming a QA staff member must complete the division staff application. The development of the new QA staff member will require shadowing an experienced QA staff member at a minimum of 2 different region evaluations. This can include an evaluation in their own region plus 1 other.

QA Staff Interaction During the Evaluation

The intent of the QA program is for the division staff member to provide support to the region administration during the evaluation. There may be occasions during the evaluation when the QA staff member may have to intervene. Any immediate intervention by the QA staff member must be done discretely and with the concern of the candidates in mind. The intervention must be done in unison between the QA staff, region director and evaluation administrator.

Criteria for QA Mentoring Candidates

Mentoring candidates are required to attend a Division STW. The candidate should be familiar with the Division QA staff and be a participant in the Senior module at the STW. The candidate must be familiar with the Senior manual and evaluation.

The intent of the QA program is for the division staff member to provide support to the region administration during the evaluation. There may be occasions during the evaluation when the QA staff member may have to intervene. Any immediate intervention by the QA staff member must be done discretely and with the concern of the candidates in mind. The intervention must be done in unison between the QA staff, region director and evaluation administrator.

Discussion with the candidate should include situations where an intervention may be necessary. These situations should include but not be limited to those that occur during an evaluation of the senior event. An immediate intervention during a senior evaluation is:

- (1) evaluation is not meeting the standard
- (2) critical performance objectives are not being met
- (3) issues of safety.

If immediate intervention is necessary the QA must be discreet and involve the senior evaluation advisor and Region Director. The mentoring candidate should provide a final QA report. The mentoring candidate provides supporting details to the QA that should be included in the QA report. If remediation is necessary the QA and mentor should provide the feedback as a team. The mentoring candidate is named in the final report. Mentoring candidates should collaborate in two evaluations.

Responsibility of QA

The QA is required to provide the mentoring candidate with the QA form found in the senior manual. The QA should include the mentoring candidate in all email, conferences and or other forms of communication prior the evaluation date. The QA should confirm evaluation date, location and time of arrival with the mentoring candidate. The QA should include in the final report the mentoring candidate’s name, date and location. QA should attend a region STW.

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P012
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Kevin K. McQuillan	Position: Central Division Legal	Date: 4-5-09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Division Director Jim Woodrum		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Proposed addition to Central Division Policies and Procedures: <u>There shall be no recording, by visual or audio means of any type, of any Senior or Certified Evaluation, unless prior approval has been obtained from the Event Coordinator for the Evaluation. If approval is given, the recording shall be conducted only from locations designated by the Event Coordinator.</u>		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): Such visual or audio recordings have the potential to disrupt the event and intimidate candidates without proper controls.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any): <i>Proposed addition to Central Division Policies and Procedures, on p.34 of 56, as the third ¶ under "General":</i> <i>There shall be no recording, by visual or audio means of any type, of any NSP Evaluation, unless prior approval has been obtained from the Event Coordinator for the Evaluation. If approval is given, the recording shall be conducted only from locations designated by the Event Coordinator and may be used only for purposes authorized by the Event Coordinator. If the Event Coordinator believes that recordings are occurring that would disrupt the Event, the Event Coordinator has authority to stop the Event and either cancel or reschedule it.</i>		
Committee Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes: Made the wording more explicate		
Final Board Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

NSP PROPOSAL FORM <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: S09-P013
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i>		
Proposed by: Kevin K. McQuillan	Position: Central Division Legal	Date: 4-5-09
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> Others:		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Policies & Procedures:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, OR <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them): Proposed addition to Central Division Policies and Procedures as Appendix B: <p style="text-align: center;">[See attached Procedure for Suspension or Revocation of NSP Membership]</p>		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): This is to set forth a step by step checklist to follow when a proposed sanction is suspension or revocation of NSP membership.		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any): See complete procedure in the attachment. The original proposed wording was amended as suggested and approved by the board members and Kevin, the proposal originator.		
Committee Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against -0 Abstain -0		

Appendix B

Procedure for Suspension or Revocation of NSP Membership

NSP Policies and Procedures provide that conduct of a member that is believed to be a violation of the NSP Code of Conduct is to be reported to the line officer immediately superior to the member. Such line officer is to perform an expeditious investigation of the reported conduct. Such Policies and Procedures also require that where the contemplated sanctions include suspension or revocation of the NSP membership certain procedures be followed. This procedure is in accordance with the NSP Policies and Procedures.

Notice:

The Line Officer shall give written notice to the affected member of the accusation at least 10 days before any sanction is imposed (and before any meeting called at the discretion of the line officer for the purpose of hearing the accusation and response). The notice shall include:

1. A statement of the reported conduct and the related provisions of the NSP Code of Conduct,
2. copies of any supporting documents or materials,
3. the range of possible sanctions contemplated by the officer, and
4. an invitation to responding in writing, within 5 days of the date of notice if possible.

Temporary Suspension:

If the conduct appears to be a serious violation of the NSP Code of Conduct, the line officer may, after consultation with his or her direct superior line officer, temporarily suspend the membership of the member in question, pending review of the conduct. Unless earlier terminated, the temporary suspension will expire 10 days after imposition. A temporary suspension may be extended for a reasonable period if personally approved by the division director or national chair.

Finding and Recommendation to Division Director

If the line officer finds the member in violation of the NSP Code of Conduct, the line officer may recommend to the division director that the membership status of the member be revoked or suspended. In any such recommendations the line officer shall make a written report of his or her findings and recommendations, and shall forward them, along with supporting and responding documents, to the division director.

Investigation and Sanctions by Division Director

The division director (or a committee established by the division) will conduct any additional investigation deemed necessary by the division director or committee. If a committee is established, the committee shall make its findings and recommendations in writing to the division director.

If the division director finds the member in violation of the NSP Code of Conduct, the division director is authorized to impose any of the sanctions listed in the NSP code of Conduct, including, but not limited to, suspension of NSP membership for a defined period, not to exceed one year, or revocation of NSP membership.

The division director shall set forth in writing his or her findings, conclusions, and the sanction, if any, imposed. Information concerning the member's right to appeal the officer's decision shall accompany the imposition of any sanction.