

Beta Theta Pi
185th General Convention
Minutes

Friday, July 26th, Afternoon Session

- Roll Call (14:46)
- Directions from **Convention President-Elect Olver** (14:51)
- Welcoming remarks from **General Fraternity President Brant** (14:57)
- Welcoming remarks from **Chief Executive Office Rundle** (15:01)
- Opening Exercises (15:03)
- **John Stebbins, Emory '92**, moves to accept the appointment of the following Convention Officers (15:10)
 - Convention President: Thomas Olver, *Central Michigan '96*
 - Convention Vice Presidents: Thomas Cassidy, *Cincinnati '76*, Peter Barnhart, *Miami '66*, Monte Chesko, Jr, *Cincinnati '77*, Frederick Brower, *Miami '50*, Thomas Fey, *Miami '68*, Dr. Ferdinand Del Pizzo, Jr., *Washington in St. Louis '58*, Captain Jerry Blesch, *Centre '60*, and Joseph Chinnici, Jr, *Ohio State '64*
 - Convention Parliamentarian: Kevin Levy, *American '16*
 - Convention Secretary: Jason Steckel, *Case Western Reserve '92*
 - Marshall: Jason Waggoner, *Truman State '04*
 - Committee of the Whole Chairman: Ross McKenzie, *Guelph '84*
 - Convention Floor Managers: Ethan Bell, *Wisconsin-Oshkosh '16*, Ty Leech, *Minnesota '17*, Remy McClain, *Truman State '19*, and Jacob Tidwell, *East Carolina '04*
 - Motion passes with unanimous consent
- Opening comments from Convention President Olver (15:11)
- **Convention President Olver**, moves to admit non-members to the legislative hall for the duration of our Convention at the discretion of the Marshall (15:18)***
 - So moved and seconded***
 - Passes with unanimous consent
- Introduction of Fraternity Officers (15:19)
 - General Secretary, John Stebbins, *Emory '92*
 - General President, Jonathan Brant, *Miami '75*
 - General Treasurer, Ken Bryan, *MIT '88*
 - Trustees
 - Robert Bell, *Oklahoma '80*
 - Scott Fussell, *Middle Tennessee State '95*
 - Bill Haywood, *Miami '74*
 - Aaron Kozuki, *Washington in Saint Louis '05*
 - Willie Romero, *UNLV '95*
 - Nick Sexton, *Eastern Kentucky '11*

- Joel Stern, *UC Riverside '94*
 - Chief Executive Officer, Jeff Rundle, *Kansas State '03*
 - Collegiate Commissioners
 - Nazar Abbas, *Miami '24*
 - CJ Fovozzo, *John Carroll '23*
 - Christopher Cardenas, *Texas '24*
 - Alex Holton, *George Mason 23*
 - Phillip Miavelstück, *George Mason 25*
 - Jake Polzin, *Minnesota '25*
 - Nick Zingales, *Sacred Heart '23*
 - Archivist and Historian, Zach Haines, *Miami '05*
 - Alumni Affairs Commissioner and Advisory Council Commissioner, Mike Okenquist, *Villanova '94*
 - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Commissioner, Ryan King, *Southern Illinois '01*
 - Insurance Commissioner, David Shaw, *Louisville '06*
 - Scholarship Commissioner, Mike Wortman, *Nebraska '70*
 - Officers of the General Fraternity House Corporation
 - Beta Theta Pi Foundation Board of Directors
 - Members of the Advisory Council
 - Regional, District, and Assistant District Chiefs
- Report from Committee on Credentials and Registration (15:22)
 - **Ethan Wilczynski, Bethany '25** reports the following registration numbers for this General Convention of Beta Theta Pi:
 - 449 total people registered and 412 people present
 - This includes:
 - 152 total delegates
 - 103 in attendance with voting privileges
 - 6 not in attendance with voting privileges
 - 31 in attendance without voting privileges
 - 4 not in attendance without voting privileges
 - Additionally, we have:
 - 42 General Fraternity officers
 - 77 alumni and guests
 - The committee maintains the standard as outlines in Chapter 1, Section 3 of the Code of Beta Theta Pi
 - **Jade Zazzara, Boise State '26** moves to approve the minutes of the 184th Convention with edits that include misspellings and punctuation.
 - The motion passes with unanimous consent

- Report from the Committee on Chapters, Panel Two (15:26)
 - Delegate, members, advisors, and other guests from San Diego State University are asked to exit the Convention Hall
 - **Gavin Biancalana, Missouri '26**, states that the Committee on Charters recommends not to grant the Epsilon Beta Chapter at San Diego State University their charter. Although the chapter demonstrates great optimism, academic success, and very strong brotherhood, after careful consideration we have chosen not to grant this colony their charter at this time for the following reasons.
 - They lack unique qualities to offer the students at San Diego State.
 - They have significant room for improvement regarding risk management protocols and proactive procedures, lack of safety, and health education, as well as a lack of an alumni network.
 - We would like to acknowledge that this colony has accomplished great success in the past two years. However, we would like to see this continue without the guidance of a Chapter development consultant.
 - Motion to return to “Good Standing” the Epsilon Beta Chapter at San Diego State University
 - President Olver invited delegate to return to Convention Hall to make comments
 - The delegate from San Diego State requests a copy of the committee’s report.
 - **Paul Sommerfield, Centre '90**, makes a motion to table the motion
 - **Paul Leo, Cornell '81**, seconds the motion
 - Motion passes with unanimous consent
- Report from Committee on Charters, Panel One (15:38)
 - **Brandt Downey, Indiana '67**, states that the Committee on Charters moves to grant the Appalachian State colony a charter. He states that the chapter has demonstrated good Beta spirit and dedication to the cultivation of the intellect, their growth strategy and sustaining a high retention rate representing Beta and its principles.
 - Motion to grant the colony at Appalachian State their charter (15:39)
 - Passes with unanimous consent
 - Introduction of Theta Iota Chapter and comments
- Report from Committee on Charters, Panel Two (15:44)
 - Delegate from Boise State is asked to exit the Convention Hall
 - **Phillip Miavelstück, George Mason '26**, offered the following report. The Committee on Charters would like to provide following directives and recommendations for the colony of Beta Theta Pi at Boise State:

- First, as a directive, the colony will have their standing updated to under the organization and required to complete a membership review.
 - Additionally, we recommend the following:
 - Increase advisor interactions with bi-weekly and as-needed meetings.
 - The chapter should host an alcohol safety workshop at least once a semester.
 - The chapter should implement an Academic Assistance Plan
 - The chapter initiation rate should be greater than or equal to 85%.
- Motion to place the colony at Boise State on “Under Reorganization” to facilitate a Membership Review (15:46)
 - Debate
 - **Nick Gilson, Utah ‘03** opposes the motion. He serves as the regional chief, for this colony. The Colony has faced some challenges with behaviors that would not align it with our mission and vision and not keep it in good standing with the General Fraternity. When these behaviors came to light in May of this year, in collaboration with University, General Fraternity myself, General Secretary Stebbins, and Director of Risk Management Services Ethan Bell, a list of directives were issued to the Colony. The goal is to get them on track to get into good standing. I appreciate the recommendation from the committee, and I understand we need to be accountable for our actions. Accountability is a big thing for us as an organization, but so is self-governance and the directives that are currently in place are a good start. The behaviors that that put them into this situation came to like at the end of the semester, and there really hasn't been an opportunity for them to self-govern. I think this is stripping them of that. Give them an opportunity to self-govern and go through the directives as they have already been doing.
 - **Pieter Verbeek, Case Western Reserve ‘26** supports the motion. He served on the committee, and he feels they did not come with well-prepared presentation and some very concerning things said. Among them was them saying they have brothers who do some behavior that would be considered hazing, but they mean well. Ultimately, autonomy is something that we would like to afford all our brothers. A thriving chapter

is something we'd like to see for all of our brothers, but some very direct involvement I think is warranted at this point.

- **Randy Groves, Kansas State '78**, seeks a point of information: What happens if the motion does not pass?
 - **Jacob Tidwell, East Carolina '04** states if the motion fails, the chapter will retain its current status.
- **Jade Zazzara, Boise State '26** opposes the motion. He speaks on behalf of Chapter President who could not attend Convention. He said there were unfortunate events with new members but did not specify in his comments what they were. The chapter met with school officials and school sanctions were removed. The chapter was allowed to continue recruitment as long as sanctions were followed. There were also conversations with General Fraternity and the chapter was placed under probationary status.
- **Aakarsh Naik, Georgia Tech '25** seeks a point of information: What does reorganization mean?
 - **Ethan Bell, Wisconsin-Oshkosh '16** explains that under reorganization, the General Fraternity would facilitate membership a review and identify each individual to determine if they are worthy to remain a member.
 - After a voice vote, there is a call for division and the motion fails, 55-67.
- No report from Committee on Charters, Panel Three, Four, Five, and Six (15:57)***
- Other actions from Panels Three and Four (15:57)***
- Report from Committee on General Fraternity Finance (15:58)
 - VOTE: Approval of Financial Review for Fiscal Year 2024 (15:58)
 - Unanimous consent
- Report from Committee on Nomination of General Fraternity Officers (16:01)
 - Motion to elect nominees to the Board of Trustees (16:01)***
 - Kendall Bryan, *M.I.T.* '88 nominated to serve as General Fraternity Secretary for a three-year term.
 - Aaron Kozuki, *Washington in St. Louis* '05 nominated to serve as trustee for a three-year term.
 - Dr. William Fox, *St. Lawrence* '75 nominated to serve as trustee for a three-year term.
 - Robert Selsor, *Missouri* '82 nominated to serve as trustee for a three-year term.
 - Motion passes with unanimous consent
 - Comments from newly elected members of the Board
 - **Brother Ken Bryan, MIT '88**: Beta has given me so much: enduring friendships, personal growth, and a pretty good

working knowledge of Robert's Rules of Order. Every time I come to a Beta convention, Wooden Institute, Keystone, board meeting, or local event, I leave inspired and motivated to be a better man and a better human being. In volunteering for Beta, you are trying to give something back - to pay it forward. Somehow, despite your best efforts, you always get back even more than you give. I am honored that you have entrusted me to serve as your General Treasurer for another term. Some great Betas have served this role before me. Several of them are in this room and I am honored to follow in their footsteps. As Sir Isaac Newton said in 1675, "If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants." I will do my utmost to serve you as your General Treasurer with honesty, humility, and humor. I'm proud to be a Beta and hope to be a better one.

- **Brother Aaron Kozuki, *Washington in St. Louis, '05***
- **Brother Dr. William Fox, *St. Lawrence '75***: The first convention I attended was 50 years ago in Bedford Springs, PA. I came back to Oxford for the 150th 35 years ago, and so this is a homecoming moment for me. Some of you know where the Saint Lawrence campus is. Some of you probably have no idea where it is. But if you know the Canadian border, we're not far from it. It's a part of New York State, the lovely called the North Country. It was saying in the North Country that I've heard two years that old man sees his youth coming up the road. I have a greater appreciation for what that means now. I thank Mike Feinstein, John Stebbins, and Jonathan Brandt for their encouragement in this moment. They were persistent and, of course, very persuasive. Beta is a living tradition that I think you men who are in college already tend to appreciate. I met the generation touched by Shep and Chandler and Barry. And then there was Seth Brooks and Ralph Fang and Hugh Stevenson who touched me and whatever they saw in my generation, I see. And you men, I finished my education. I have finished raising my children. I have finished my professional career and very much of that time I have deliberated deeply on what men and women face in their 20s. It's been called the defining decade, your 20s, and it's also a dangerous decade. And there are a few things that I've thought about in the last day or so that I might suggest will be part of my thought as a trustee. First, we heard this this morning in the ritual. It's vitally important in your 20s to build intellectual stock and social capital. I say, as a former college president, hard study matters. Deep reading matters. And the reason I say it matters to you in your 20s is the risk. You may not have much to say in your 50s if you don't

respect a life of the mind. And then secondly, you'll need to settle some abiding, soulful questions in your 20s. What you're going to believe in, what your values are, what to love, and boom, to love, you must touch that important testing stone, a moral testing stone in your 20s. And finally, I think of Seth Brooks, who kept in his pocket his entire life, a little silver coin, and it was given to him as a boy starting in Brooklyn. And because it had been in his pocket for, you know, many decades, the coin was rubbed pure and blank except for the inscription which remained, said we live our life and deeds, not years. Important thing to think about in your 20s. Live our lives and deeds, not years. What are you going to do? Who are you going to help and how do you wish to be known? Your 20s will define your thinking, your believing and your doing. Some of that creates an understanding of yourself, your community and your privilege will be abandoned. Get wisdom, Get understanding. The words from the ancient author came back again this morning. It's the process of beginning that officers and trustees of the fraternity are here to encourage a brief, and the good fraternity must form an unbroken line now, nearly two centuries old, young men in their 20s seeking their best thoughts, their best beliefs, their best deeds. I'm in that line with you now, and we're marching along. I'm on it.

- **Brother Bob Selsor, *Missouri '82*:** Brothers, my association with this fraternity has had a profound impact on my life. My most treasured friendships arose from being a Beta. Likewise, my professional career has been critically enhanced by the support and guidance of older Beta alumni. A Beta introduced me to the mother of my child, Grayson, who is a senior in the Missouri chapter and is here today. I thus have a great debt to the fraternity and as one of the earlier speakers alluded, the more I have given to the fraternity the greater the debt has become. That's because the more I have given the more I have gotten back. I came to a Beta convention 45 years ago and heard the keynote address that year from Hugh Stephenson, the fraternity's president at that time. Hugh was my mentor in college and as you might guess, as a 19 year-old I hung on his every word. His speech was entitled "The Far Side of Failure" and his message was simply not to fear failure but to aim high, take risks and to understand that failure is part of the road to success. I have followed that philosophy throughout my life and it has served me well. I believe my experiences as a Beta volunteer, as well as years of practice as a lawyer, will hopefully be of benefit in embarking on this new role. I pledge

to you that as a trustee I will be fiscally responsible, and that I will work to protect the well-being of Beta's chapters everywhere and to make the fraternity stronger as a result of my efforts. Thank God I'm a Beta.

- New Officers are installed
- Recognition of Brother Amarnath Budarapu, *Lawrence '87* on concluding his term on the Board (he is not present).
- Report from the Committee on General Fraternity Finance (16:30)
 - **Joe Sudbeck, TCU '26**, recommended passage of Proposal 1 regarding Transportation Reimbursement for Voting Delegates to Convention. He stated that the entire committee feels this will only bring benefits to delegates in the future by increasing the amount of money they can receive for travel.
 - No debate
 - Vote
 - Motion passes unanimously
- Report from the Committee on Constitution and Jurisprudence (16:35)
 - **William Harper, Creighton '25**, stated that the committee recommend not passing Proposal 2 regarding Eliminating Conflict of Interests within the Administrative Office Staff. The committee received information from the General Secretary on behalf of the Board of Trustees to safeguard against the conflict of interest amongst the General counsel. The board is able to obtain their own counsel without needing the CEO, board members or other general counsel council's approval. This proposal advances financial safety. Currently our CEO happens to have AJD, so we have the benefit of both, both being the CEO and general counsel. Typically, we do not have a CEO that is an attorney, so we're currently having an additional benefit from that. The General Counsel currently only provides advice to the Board of Trustees and we believe that the author did not fully understand the duties of general counsel.
 - Debate
 - **Phillip Miavelstück, George Mason '26**, supports the motion. He states he has been asked to speak on this motion by Brother Micah Mudlaff, *George Mason '20*, who is the original author of this legislation and proposal. Currently, the positions of CEO and General Counsel are held by the same individual because the primary responsibility of the general counsel is to provide legal advice to the President, CEO and other officers of an organization. This has created a situation where the CEO is advising himself on legal matters, the consequences of which extend far beyond the convention hall, but to the administration of, but to the administration of the risk management program, insurance program, and the adoption,

necessary policies and procedures of the fraternity, among other items. These responsibilities are fitting for ACEO, for an organization of general counsel should offer independent advice and counsel on these matters. It is clear that an arrangement which does not provide for the independence of these offices has created a conflict of interest that would not be acceptable in other institutions. A governor and attorney general are not the same person, nor the CEO and general counsel of private businesses and nonprofits. Even if the CEO has a legal act as such, this proposal does not impact the ability of any qualified officer, including the CEO, to assist with litigation activities, rather ensures accountability, checks and balances, and diversity of opinion within our leadership. While many Greek organizations do not employ a specialized position for litigation activities, which by the way, suggests a strong preference for utilizing outside counsel. This legislation is consistent with best practices of pure organizations who do, including Lambda Chi Alpha, Chi Omega, and Alpha Phi Alpha. Let me be clear, this amendment presumes no wrongdoing by any current member of the administrative office staff, but it does ensure our staff uphold their core values and remain above reproach, particularly at the highest levels of the organization.

- **John Stebbins, Emory '92** opposes the motion. He reiterated as Chair of the Board of Trustees, they take the conflicts of interests of the board very seriously and the integrity of the board and put a lot of control and effort into making sure that that's preserved. He would take issue with the comments made by the brothers supporting this legislation that say they don't think this is best practice. The other organizations that he named, their CEOs didn't happen to also have a JD. The Board oversees the hiring of outside counsel. Jeff [Rundle] is typically not the one in the courtroom as CEO and General Counsel litigating cases for Beta. Beta has outside counsel it uses for HR matters, for tax matters, for litigation matters that are assigned and handle most of these items. Having that title allows him as an attorney to interface with other attorneys in managing litigation. That allows us to save costs that we would otherwise have to hire outside counsel for or employ an attorney on our staff to handle those matters. It's the board's recommendation that we continue to let the current practice continue because it will allow flexibility for our CEO to handle those issues more efficiently and also at lower cost for the General Fraternity.

- A. A request for exemption must be submitted in writing utilizing the form or process established by the administrative office.
- B. The request for an exception must specify
 - I. Any campus specific policies or practices that have bearing on chapter officer terms, such as institutional rules requiring specific officer terms, deferment, deferred recruitment schedules, and non-standard academic calendars.
 - II. Any chapter specific policies or practices that have bearing on chapter officer terms, such as local constitution and bylaws.
 - III. The time frame of the requested exemption or request that the exemption be permanent
 - IV. A proposed alternative calendar of chapter officer terms, election deadlines and reporting deadlines.
- C. If an exemption is granted by the general secretary or his designee, updated chapter officer terms, election deadlines, reporting deadlines will be established for the chapter. Specifically, this amended language allows for flexibility for groups that cannot adhere to the standard officer election power. This will bring the vast majority of chapter elections closer together.
- Debate
 - **Jacob Tidwell, *East Carolina '04***, supports the amended proposal. He states he is the original author of Proposal 4 and worked with the delegates to draft this proposal and urges delegates to accept.
 - **Simon Hinmon, *Pacific '25***, opposes the proposal because his chapter and other chapters do not follow the full fiscal year of elections. He was elected at the end of the school year in May. They are allowed to have the chapter officers follow the full fiscal year that they're in either go sophomore, junior, senior year. As a newly elected president, it's a great honor to be in this Convention as a brand new chapter president learning the ropes before starting the school year strong with his fellow officers. They have utilized the summer for several months of transitioning with the previous officers as well as

learning from many alumni, the previous president and other fellow presidents. He encourages to vote no so the chapters are able to propose themselves on how their elections can run, because at the end of the day, all the brothers will be at these Conventions and they'll be ready by their own chapter readiness.

- Parliamentarian Levy offered a Point of Order that this is debate on the amendment, not the proposal
- **Chuck Graves, Middle Tennessee State '94**, asks for a point of information. Why are we voting yes if they recommended no? The Parliamentarian addressed his question.
- **Nathan Weaver, Centre '25**, supports the amendment and stated that by his understanding as of now, 93% of chapters already fall within the new proposed timeline. That remaining 7%, like his own chapter, have trouble following it. They worked tirelessly with Jacob to craft this new amendment language which would propose filing for exemption on behalf of the chapters and General Secretary reading those exemptions is much clearer and more focused.
- **Tom Reeves, Eastern Kentucky '99**, seeks a point of information. Is this annual or ongoing?
 - **Jacob Tidwell, East Carolina '04**, states that the language doesn't currently place a time frame on the exception so as currently written, it would be at the discretion of the General Secretary to improve the language.
- **Tony Dempsey, John Carroll '18**, seeks a point of information. Is it meant to say "exception" or "exemption"?
 - **Jacob Tidwell, East Carolina '04**, states all chapters are held to the code, exception is the intended language; it was a typo.
- **Joe Sudbeck, TCU '26**, makes a motion to table amendment and proposal until tomorrow and email to delegates today.
 - Seconded by **Dylan Celeste, LSU '23**.
 - Passed

Saturday, July 27th, Morning Session

- Roll Call (9:09)
- **Connor Froling, East Carolina '25**, makes a motion to pull from the table the motion to approve the status upgrade for the Colony at San Diego State Sam (9:17)
 - Seconded by **Jeff Kobasa, Clemson '25**.
 - Debate

- **Tanner Dozier, San Diego State '25**, speaks in favor of the motion. As such a successful new colony, they have proven our ability to meet, if not exceed, all the baseline charter requirements to become a deserving chapter of Beta Theta Pi. He understands the committee has raised some concerns and would like to touch on them as thoroughly as possible given the allotted time. There is some concern that they are not taking proactive measures to minimize risk and promote the health and safety of their members. However, every semester, health and safety officers from the campus attend chapter meetings to educate brothers on risk management policies at SDSU. They also abide by all precautionary measures that the Beta Theta Pi Risk Management policy recommends. Additionally, several members of the chapter volunteered to receive CPR training and are now fully certified and this makes all events safer. There are also concerns that they would not be able to thrive without the assistance of an on-site Chapter Development Consultant (CDC). He believes this to be untrue because they have been very independent, even during the time that the CDC was present. In fact, the most recent CDC, Tyler Jacobs, *American '22*, is so passionate about the colony that he wanted his words to be spoken during this discussion process: “The SDSU Colony has only been back on campus for two years, but it is more deserving of its charter than many other groups I've worked with, despite it being smaller. They compete with and often surpass other fraternities, especially in Beta core areas of brotherhood, home, and personal growth at SDSU. In the second year, I served as an advisor and witnessed their incredible accomplishments and growth. The men achieved these milestones on their own and showcase their dedication and strength as a colony. Based on their impressive progress and commitment, I strongly recommend the return of Epsilon Beta's charter.”
- **Tyler Mirza, San Diego State '25**, shares a few achievements from the past few years. They have strived for excellence in the classroom with the highest grade point average of any IFC chapter on campus, a 3.34 yearly GPA. They've also worked hard as a chapter to sustain an impressive average member retention rate of 93% and a 99% collections rate for the two years they've been on campus. This summer they sent over 10 members to Wooden to further expand their Beta knowledge and leadership. In the fall, we met 223 students for recruitment. They performed at a high enough level to receive the coveted Sisson award. If the Administrative Office can recognize the

quality of the colony's operations, there's no reason for you as a delegate to overlook the confidence of the chapter.

- **Gavin Biancalana, Missouri '26**, speaks in favor of the motion. Yesterday he addressed everyone as the head of the committee. Today he is addressing everyone as an individual and offering his personal opinion. The San Diego State Colony is excelling far beyond anything one could expect from a 2-year-old colony, that they have achieved standards worthy of Beta Theta Pi. They consistently display strong brotherhood and mutual assistance through numerous brotherhood events, retreats, and rituals where they regularly take time to meet, reflect, and grow individually and as a holder. Although only two years old, he has been told SDSU has already had success that could rival many other distinguished chapters in participating and hosting philanthropic events and fundraisers. He read a testimony from the San Diego State University's CDC, who he spoke with the night before: "I think one of the biggest things I can mention being with the chapter last year is I really didn't have much to do with their success. No more than your own advisors are responsible for yours and your chapter's success. I've worked and interacted with a lot of chapters in the past six years and in my opinion, SDSU deserves a charter more than some chapters that already have theirs. They actually have a strong brotherhood, which is one of the biggest reasons for their success. In those two years, they have far exceeded the expected growth rate of AO, proving they know how to and can recruit. In all honesty, I think not having a charter will hurt and will hurt their growth more than anything. Without it, they won't be able to get back into their campus house, which is a huge selling point for most SDSU PNMs when they're deciding between bids." (**Tyler Jacobs, American '22**) He believes the San Diego State Colony has much to offer Beta Theta Pi as well as well as an extremely high ceiling for what they can accomplish as a chapter and it is our responsibility to provide them with all the opportunities we can for them to reach their potential.
- **Paul Sommerfield, Centre '90**, seeks a point of information. He asks if the committee chair wants to reinforce their comments from the "no" microphone given the contrast with the CDC's recommendation?
 - **Gavin Biancalana, Missouri '26**, stated he did not want to do so.
- **Sam Soares, Central Florida '26**, calls the question
 - **Tommy Cook, Florida Atlantic '25**, seconds the call to question

- Passed
 - Vote
 - Passes unanimously
 - **Tanner Dozier, *San Diego State '25***, thanked everyone for seeing what he sees in his chapter. He thanked his executive board who helped him a lot this semester, and all the members of the chapter. They've done so much and make them a high quality chapter, not just the nine guys on the exec board. They also have a very engaged advisor team. They've been doing so much, volunteering so much of their time over the past semester and the last two years. It wouldn't be right without mentioning Fred Pierce, one of the most influential alumni, who unfortunately passed away recently. They couldn't have done it without him and wish he could be here to witness this moment.
- **Matt DelBrocco, *Case Western Reserve '12***, makes a motion to remove Proposal 3 from the table.
 - **Connor Froling, *East Carolina '25***, seconds the motion.
 - Debate
 - **Ken Bryan, *MIT '88***, speaks in favor of the proposal. He states they been working over the last several years to take things out of the Code that are overly specific or put a burden on the legislature every year to do things, and offered two examples. Yesterday they removed the specific nice cent per mile mileage reimbursement and put in the IRS allowed amount so you don't have to come back and vote every time we want to change that. Last year we made a change. The code required someone to be reimbursed for travel expenses by paper check. We use much more advanced methods, electronic payments, so we took that out of the Code and allowed payments by methods other than a check. In the Code it explicitly tells you what officers you need to have. That was written a long time ago. The proposal is to take that out of the Code, take the specific enumerated offices out and put that outside so we can be more flexible about how we change the officer structure over time to be responsive to the chapter. He encourages delegates to approve this proposal to take unlimited specificity out of the Code.
 - **Tucker Dunn, *Oklahoma '24***, speaks in opposition to the motion. He favors any proposal that adds convenience and adds ease to our lives as delegates and to any general fraternity programming. But that's not the only consideration to consider here. This proposal puts the authority in the hands of the Board of Trustees to determine what officers that each chapter needs. While the current specific language is not optimal, leaving it up to each and every chapter is best because the members probably know what's best for their chapters more than anyone one-size-fits-all solution ever could.

- **Tucker Dunn, Oklahoma '24**, states the amendment does a lot to make the proposal more palatable, but almost defeats the point of the proposal by making it so vague. It's very unclear under what circumstances a chapter would get this exception and leaves the discretion solely to the General Secretary. He spoke with Brother Stevens yesterday who offered reassurances that he would probably leave it to the discretion of the chapter most of the time. There might not always be a General Secretary that's friendly to chapter autonomy. Putting the authority in the hands of the General Secretary, is probably not best for every single chapter. This amendment specifically makes the legislation more vague and less clear. What we're voting for is to hand authority away from ourselves into the general fraternity.
- **William Harper, Creighton '25**, seeks a point of information. Can the typo be corrected.
- **Kevin Levy, American '16**, moves to amend the amendment to correct typo
 - **Tony Dempsey, John Carroll '18**, seconds the motion
 - **Kevin Levy, American '16**, calls the question
 - **Matt DelBrocco, Case Western Reserve '14**, seconds
 - Motion passes
- **Joe Sudbeck, TCU '26**, seeks a point of information. What time was the motion made to send the email to the delegates?
- **Kevin Levy, American '16**, made a point of privilege. He noted that the floor managers were working after the session finished until dinner.
- **Chuck Graves, Middle Tennessee State '94**, I would encourage you to pass this amendment. He supports three different chapters at Center, Tulane, and Vanderbilt. Those brothers have a deferred rush schedule, so individuals that come into the universities cannot pledge until the spring. This particular amendment was led by the brothers at Centre to allow them the autonomy to elect a rush chairman in the Spring so that individual has some runway leading up to the next Spring to learn the role and actively recruit. Electing brothers in late November does not give a rush chairman the ability to properly learn the role, build the relationships that are necessary as part of the rush process, and bolster the chapters. He encourages delegates to vote for the amendment. It has a specific impact on few of the chapters, not all, but those ones that have deferred rush it definitely makes a big impact.
- **Simon Hinmon, Pacific '25**, comes again to talk about chapter autonomy. As presidents, brothers are diamonds. Chapters know how to make members the finest, brightest possible. Through chapter

autonomy chapters will be able to be successful as they see fit because they are able to see their brothers and know how their chapter runs within their homes, chapters, and everywhere else. Chapters are able to utilize the semesters, year, fiscal year, however they see fit to be successful. Even though our chapter has been using the fiscal year, it has not been working well for the for the most part. Our chapter recently implemented within our bylaws, because we had the autonomy to do so. Using the school year instead of the fiscal year was most efficient for us using the summer. Since it is a small school, 6,000 students, commuters making up half, we utilize all the school resources throughout the summer with commuter brothers to be successful. As Associate Student Body Government Vice President, he utilized every summer day possible working with the school president, Regents, and others. This included having an entire orientation day for Greek life. Chapter autonomy helps chapters be as successful as possible. He encourages everyone to look out for their chapter as well.

- **Landon Robinson, Arkansas '25**, seeks a point of information. Was it determined if it was ongoing or needed to be requested annually?
 - President Olver referred back to the screen.
- **Tucker Dunn, Oklahoma '24**, calls the question.
 - **Jeff Malinowski, Central Michigan '16**, seconds
 - Motion passes by voice vote
- Vote on amendment
 - Passes by voice vote
- Discussion on amended Proposal 4
 - Debate
 - **Clay Forrer, Butler '26**, opposes the proposal. He had a conversation with Jacob Tidwell last night that was very informative. He believes this amendment limits chapter autonomy and creates unnecessary paperwork in order to choose the election cycles that chapters want. His chapter is on the election cycle this proposal suggests. If they ever wanted to change it in the future, they would have to do unnecessary paperwork for an exception. Currently, 93% of the chapters are on the proposed schedule. Is it worth it to limit chapter autonomy and put other tasks on our chapter president's plates to get 7% on the proposed schedule?
 - **Pieter Verbeek, Case Western '26**, opposes the proposal. His school operates on a standard schedule, but he would like to bring to everyone's attention the requirement to submit elections by November 15th. There is still some of the semester left after November 15th. His chapter prefers to have elections a little bit later in order to have all the information necessary to know if candidates

are wholly qualified, if they've made good on their promises made up until that date. This proposal mandates that we have a little bit less information going into every election and we prefer to elect the best candidates possible.

- **Chuck Graves, Middle Tennessee State '94**, asks for a point of information. Why was November 15th chosen?
 - **Jacob Tidwell, East Carolina '04**, states that date was chosen to avoid chapters trying to do elections over Thanksgiving with many of our chapters ending their operations that week. They were not trying to push chapter operations in the final exams for those chapters that have to deal with that date. It also provides approximately 60 days before winter leadership development programming. Many of you were there for CPLA this past year and that gives us about 60 days to get that person registered and to purchase airfare where needed, as opposed to waiting for the week before and spending the night driving. That's why that date was chosen.
- **Nick Bartlett, Texas '26**, opposes the proposal. One of the points in this proposal says that all exec elections need to be done by majority vote. Another chapter was speaking with him about their election process. What their chapter has is working great for them and what our chapter has is working great for us. There are different ways other chapters are doing it that has been working great for them. Moving to a majority vote sometimes places the power in in the hands of the wrong people within a chapter. Each chapter knows how to handle the members in their chapter. If we move everything to standardized majority vote, it may end up changing the outcomes of some of our elections and in a negative way that that could impact the fraternity in the long run.
- **Paul Sommerfield, Centre '90**, supports the proposal. Yesterday in the debrief, there was a very healthy discussion on our first great principle where we talked about helping. Sometimes the help comes in the form of taking the 7% into consideration instead of just sticking with the 93%. He encourages everyone to take the 7% into consideration.
- **Zack Danzo, Colorado '27**, opposes the proposal. Like many chapter, our bid day is decided by the university and usually comes in late September. In order to have a formal education process and allow those members who are newly initiated to participate in election processes, elections are in December rather than November. If that date moves up, newly initiated members could not run for positions.
- **Phillip Miavelstück, George Mason '26**, calls the question,
 - **Aakarsh Naik, Georgia Tech '25**, seconds
 - Passes by voice vote

- Vote
 - Fails by voice vote
- Stand at ease at 10:03
- Assembly called to order at 10:15
- Report from Committee on Risk Management
 - **Luke Rothfuss, Kansas '26**, The Committee on Risk Management moves to approve Proposal 5 with an amended text clarifying the voluntary aspect of their accused member i.e. 1 through 8 changed to.: A collegiate member may agree to voluntarily recuse themselves from all fraternity activities upon his own request for upon the request of the Chapters Executive Team.
 - Moves to adopt Proposal 6 with amendment
 - There was discussion to clarify the wording of the amendment
 - Passes by voice vet
 - Amended Proposal
 - Debate
 - **Tim Fortier, Central Michigan '25**, CMU Chapter (Yes): He is speaking from experience under this matter and strongly urges passage of this proposal. When it comes to unfortunate situations where we have to deal with a member that has been a part of any type of misconduct, a chapter can sometimes find itself fighting a battle on two fronts, especially the president, risk manager, and exec board as a whole. It would help tremendously to have policies in place where it almost takes the decision out of your hands and puts it into the hands of that member. Speaking from experience, if this would have been in place, it would have helped tremendously. He would definitely recommend supporting this.
 - Vote
 - Passes by voice vote
 - **Luke Rothfuss, Kansas '26**, The Committee on Risk Management moves to approve Proposal 6 to provide clarity and flexibility in the event of a chapter of the organization. The committee believe this will ensure clear parameters for the start of each process so members are fully aware of their requirements.
 - **Ben Swartz, Connecticut '05**, makes a motion to add an amendment at the end of Section 2B, letter C2. The text reads, “by the one who ordered the reorganization or the designee or those with jurisdiction under Chapter 13, Section 1.”
 - **MJ McRae, Washington & Jefferson '26**, seconds.
 - **Ben Swartz, Connecticut '05**, states that the purpose of this legislative proposal is to add clarity to the section on reorganization, which he agrees with, by adding an additional sentence. Having recently experienced a chapter

reorganization as discussed yesterday around chapter reorganizations, members can potentially be lose their status as a collegiate member of the chapter. By the time the chapter gets to that point, there's challenges. When a chapter is struggling, the current rules allow for other disciplinary actions, but it's not clear who or how those disciplinary actions can take place, leaving a seemingly all or nothing situation. That has limited the ability to help a chapter find some other middle ground for some members that might some accountability, but not removal. This amendment adds some clarity so chapters have a little more flexibility to help the chapter have the support it needs and accountability for the membership.

- Vote: passes by voice vote
- **Niko Marchetta, James Madison '25**, makes a motion to amend Chapter VIII, Section 2B(c)(2) of the proposal to read, "This shall include all components for collegiate members to successfully participate in the reorganization process and explain how the general fraternity will keep this process fair, such as taking videos of every interview and ensure continuity between the interviews and so we can ensure no specific member was treated unfairly and giving the general fraternity hard deadlines need to meet as we meet our deadlines."
 - **Dylan Celeste, LSU '23**, seconded the motion.
 - **Niko Marchetta, James Madison '25**, supports the amendment and stated that during the reorganization process at his chapter, they felt that some of the members in their chapter were targeted during the interviews and not every interview was treated the same. This process is very serious and they were accountable for actions during the process. This amendment is intended to ensure that the General Fraternity is accountable in the way they go about the process by creating stricter guidelines and rules that are followed across the organization.
 - **Will Harper, Creighton '25**, opposes the amendment. He believes the language is very vague. He feels the General Fraternity is not going to have a chance to accurately gauge what they find fair, which is what a chapter wants in the reorganization process. An amendment is justified here, but with more exact language on how the general fraternity is held accountable. Recording videos or possibly having a journal of the process would be beneficial here, but broadly saying it is fair doesn't help anyone involved in a reorganization process

- **Tom Reeves, Eastern Kentucky '99**, opposes the amendment. He asked if everyone has thought through the unanticipated consequences of a video record or why some chapters might be in the position of being reorganized in the first place. This amendment protects neither the General Fraternity nor the members. There could be things that come up in those interviews that an individual member would never want on videotape. If someone ends up in litigation over one of these issues, they might regret a videotape record of that conversation. He urges delegates to vote no.
- **Sebastian Feldman, Miami '25**, seeks a point of information. Can someone opt out of video?
 - **Ethan Bell, Wisconsin-Oshkosh '16**, states that an interview is a necessary component to complete the reorganization and to retain your active status. Every member can opt out that is self-selecting early alumni status. If they are granted that status, they can appeal that during the membership status review.
- **John Stebbins, Emory '92**, states he personally takes very seriously the membership that everyone holds in this Fraternity. When there is a reorganization, we want to have a lot of controls in place. There are the initial interviews, there is an appeal process to the membership status review committee, and in some cases he has personally heard appeals, to make sure every brother has an opportunity to express his situation before being moved to alumni status. It's important to understand the objective of these membership reviews, to get the chapter back on track. When you add the video recording element, aside from the legal points, you also have to understand you may not get full candor in those interviews. Therefore, the process suffers and we don't get the chapter back on board where we're where we need it to be. For the good of both the individuals, you don't want these recorded, also for the good of the chapter and getting them back on track, everyone wants honest and transparent discussions to take place. He would encourage delegates to vote no on this.
- **Dylan Celeste, LSU '23**, seeking a point of information. What typically goes on in these reported interviews that might be seen as controversial?
 - **Ethan Bell, Wisconsin-Oshkosh '16**, reiterates that the question is what topics are discussed in interviews and if they were to be recorded. To clarify, in the present, we

do not have a standardized operation to record our interviews save for note taking that are then destroyed upon the completion of all appeals. That is the first time we record. Secondly, the conversations are related to individual conduct in the chapter. Any issues with not maintaining good standings, such as not having academic performance or having conduct issues or not being current on their dues. Those pieces are then added to a conversation around are you positively or negatively contributing to the overall culture and operations of the chapter?

- Vote
 - Amendment fails by voice vote
 - Vote on proposal as amended
 - Passes by voice vote
- **Pieter Verbeek, Case Western Reserve '26**, moves to reconsider Proposal 5
 - **William Harper, Creighton '25**, seconds the motion
 - Debate
 - **Pieter Verbeek, Case Western Reserve '26**, states he agrees with this proposal 95% of the way, but has one small problem. At the very end of the proposal, it states that if a recused member remains recused for an undetermined period of time due to investigation during the period of the investigation. After that they can petition for reinstatement, but there's no requirement for the Kai committee or the exec board but there's no timeline for their reinstatement and no requirement for these to rule on them in a timely manner. If we vote to reconsider, I would like to propose an amendment to add a 30-day time limit requirement for the Kai committee to hear and rule on any petitions made for reinstatement.
 - Vote
 - Fails 36-76
- Report from Committee on Constitution and Jurisprudence on Proposal 7 Regarding the Compensation of Officers, Directors, Trustees, and Key Employees.
 - **Will Harper, Creighton '25**, states that the Committee on the Constitution and Jurisprudence recommends that the Convention not advance this proposal. The Committee received information from current and past General Treasurer's about the oversight of Fraternity financials and the checks and balances already in place amongst undergraduate members. The Committee recognizes the need and appreciates the proposal, but believes that there is a certain lack of understanding of the General Fraternity finances and the checks and balances already in place. Officers named in the proposal already are not compensated for their roles and a 5% budget for executive compensation does not allow for competitive wages for executive

members. The executive compensation and reporting can encompass one person or 10 and sticking to a 5% percentage would not allow for flexibility amongst the Fraternity. As a reminder, there was 7% inflation rate in 2021 and a 6.5% inflation rate in 2022. Attempting to outpace that with this 5% would constrain us heavily. There's no flexibility for emergency funds currently with this 5% proposal. The Form 990 that this proposal was based off of also has \$100,000 threshold from the IRS. This threshold is a constant and caused more executives to be reported above this threshold in the past few years due to inflation. It's hard additionally due to different requirements and change in requirements from the IRS to compare previous 990 forms with current years. We already have good oversight by Fraternity undergraduates due to yearly approval of the Convention as we did yesterday. There is oversight in place already of the CEO and staff salaries and, in addition, independent contractors were included in this. Independent contractors can include IT services and janitorial staff at the AO. These are people that we don't have a ton of control over what their contracts look like.

- Debate

- **Alex Houlton, George Mason '23**, supports the proposal. He speaks about a fraternity that has operated on a budget deficit for three of the past five years. A fraternity whose liabilities have increased from \$2.54 million to 3.76 million in just the past four years. A fraternity whose percentage of expenses directed towards executive compensation ballooned from 1.9% in 2013 to a staggering 9.2% in 2022. The fraternity's administrative office just raised general fraternity fees by 7.1% this year. The fraternity just described is ours. These figures have been coupled with an 810% decline in membership between the years 2019 and 2022 and a \$55 increase in the dues charge per member of the fraternity. These metrics are not encouraging to say the least. They do not reflect performance warranting the almost quintupling, that is a 500% increase, of the percentage of total expenses directed to executive compensation. This legislative proposal seeks to reassert dues paying members oversight regarding important financial number in the matters of the fraternity. Capping the total compensation of officers, directors, trustees, key employees, high compensated employees, and independent contractors of identified 5% of total expenses is not only good practice, it's also aligned with previous year's compensation levels which averaged 4.23% from 2013 to 2019. Our 9.2% figure is even more illuminating when one takes into account that 4.2% of Sigma Chi's budget, 3.8% of Pi Kappa Phi's budget and 1.5% of Alpha Chi Omega's budget are directed towards the compensation of their respective executive employees. Regarding

the question of talent, the current high compensated employee had the same position in fiscal year 2018 when their compensation was \$106,754 less than their current salary. Our fraternity executives have demonstrated willingness to work below their current levels of compensation. The Foundation can compensate employees if the Foundation Board feels their compensation from the Fraternity is too low, as they did in FY2018 with reportable compensation from related organizations exceeded 150,000 for one key employee.

- **Randy Groves, Kansas State '78**, seeks a point of information. Can the Board provide information on how they determine compensation?
 - **Ken Bryan, MIT '88**, General Treasurer, provides a high level overview of how we do compensation and how the processes and controls we have in place to manage that. The fraternity and foundation are separate legal entities for administrative convenience. We hire all of the employees through the Fraternity. Fraternity pays all the employees and when they do work for other entities like the General Fraternity House Corporation or the Foundation, we recharge their time to those entities. The foundation cannot give raises because it doesn't actually have any employees. The previous conventions have empowered the trustees to hire the CEO and compensate the CEO and through the code have empowered CEO to hire and compensate the rest of the staff. So let me review some of the processes and controls we have in place around compensation. So first, the Trustees have adopted an executive compensation policy that sets limits on compensation and the annual increases that employees can receive. We have a delegation of authority policy that limits what the CEO can and cannot do without further approval by the Trustees. And we have an annual review process where we review the CEO's performance and compensation and the performance and compensation of the senior leaders of the organization. We set the way we set the compensation with CEO's through a multi-year contract. Before we do that, we collect information from the market. We look at what other non profits of similar scope and size pay their executives, and we look at what other leading Greek organizations pay their executives. And we make sure we're paying fairly compared to the market. Staff compensation is in no way tied to revenue or expenses. It's tied to the market for talent and with other organizations with whom we compete for talent. The way we

set the compensation is at the end of the budget, which the trustees approve per the Code before the start of the fiscal year on June 1st. And then as, the committee chair said, we have a robust process for the Convention Delegates to give oversight of the Fraternity finances. As the General Treasurer, I prepare a report together with our CFO. We delivered that to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee asked a lot of questions, detailed questions. They dug into every aspect of the finances that interested them. They gave you a report yesterday and you unanimously approved that report. That's the oversight mechanism that we have for compensation and for the annual budget. If you have further questions, factual questions about dues or budget, I can certainly address those based on points of information.

- **John Stebbins, Emory '92**, stated our liabilities have gone up, but you cannot look at liabilities by themselves. You cannot look at a budget deficit by itself. For example, last year we ran a budget deficit. Part of the reason was because we transferred \$400,000 to our General Fraternity House Corporation as a strategic investment. So that makes the financial results look bad last year, but what it doesn't take into consideration is two years before that we made over \$700,000 in an incentive fee on a real estate deal at the University of Illinois, which was able to add money to fund the General Fraternity House Corporation. It just happened in two different years. We can't look at numbers in isolation. With the percentage increase in compensation from 1.9% to 9.x%, that is concerning. The reality is that we're dealing with IRS forms from 2008 that put a threshold on reporting that you have to report people that make over \$100,000. People tick over that threshold in their careers with Beta Theta Pi. So, you may have one year where you only have to list one person back then, so 1.9%. And then the next year they go over that 100,000 threshold and now we have to list four people. So, there is so much nuance and I'm happy to respond to point of information's. This is the reason the Convention charges the Board of Trustees with this. It is incredibly complex to look at all the financial reporting. We have CPAs that advise us, professional attorneys, etcetera. And because of that complexity, it's hard to litigate from the General Convention. If you just take a budget of \$7,000,000 from General Fraternity, you multiply it times 5%, that's

\$350,000 today. We have to report five people on the Form 990. That's \$70,000 apiece. I don't know what you all expect to work for when you get out of college, but I guarantee our staff who have legal degrees who could go into private practice and have run the Fraternity for 20 years certainly need to work for more than \$70,000 a year if we want to have the best talent running Beta Theta Pi.

- **Tom Reeves, Eastern Kentucky '99**, seeks a point of information. What would be the impact of indexing compensation to expenses? For example, if costs are lowered would it lower compensation?
 - **Ken Bryan, MIT '88**, states if we had a sudden decrease in non-compensation expenses, that would mean we need less revenue and the most likely place that would be implemented is a dues decrease. I don't think our fee is going to go down, but if we did have some external factor, the thing that the Trustees would do is address affordability.
 - **Tom Reeves, Eastern Kentucky '99**, to clarify my point of information, the question is if we lowered the expenses and still had to stay at the 5% of expenses, that would naturally cause a lowering of compensation, correct?
 - **Ken Bryan, MIT '88**, that is correct.
- **Ian Ross, Central Michigan '21**, served as George Mason's brotherhood advisor as well as their District Chief, and has been involved in conversations with them over the last couple of weeks leading into this legislation and wanted to give a little bit of color around those conversations. We've been talking about the value-add of the dues that you pay through the General Fraternity back to you and how that can be articulated better. Those are important conversations we need to have them more often. We need to pursue them together. He believes this legislation is borne out by some in the chapter in an earnest effort to have accountability in our finances. There are other co-sponsors involved with this legislation who have proposed similar targeted pieces of legislation in the past. He believes we'll continue to do so. They are disgruntled. They have had bad experiences with our Fraternity and they service that through legislation. That's evidenced in some of the FAQs and what if we pay people less and they leave. "Oh, if they really care about the Fraternity, they'll just take less compensation." I am paraphrasing, but that's the sentiment. You see it bubble up in certain spots. We're failing to remember some of our conversations yesterday about trust and about having confidence with one another to frequently execute our offices. This legislation is more about that lack of trust bubbling up than it is about resolving any financial nuisance.

controls should rest. In all those debates, it has always come back to our chapters and to our undergraduates, regardless of where the situation has been. It's very important to understand this industry is changing. The complexities of our industry have become very, very complex. That requires different skills, different expertise, a lot of things that we need to be relying on more and more. When you talk about the centralization, what we are trying to do as an organization, at least from my perspective, is putting the right people at the right conversation with the right expertise versus someone like myself and maybe in the past as a District Chief. I don't know the risk management expertise that Ethan [Bell] has. I need Ethan, so please do not misconstrue some of the efficiencies that Jacob [Tidwell] may be trying to bring to the table as it relates to running a fraternity, running business, so we can be more efficient. We're trying to take control out of our presidents, out of our chapters, out of our general fraternity officers. I just want you to understand, in a lot of the debates, and there have been a lot of debates, we always come back to making sure and coming from the perspective that our General Fraternity is run and governed by its members and not necessarily the staff or anyone else. But we also need to recognize as an industry, the complexities that are going on with our universities, with our jurisdictions. It requires a certain amount of expertise. So, let's not forget that.

- **Ross McKenzie, *Guelph '84***, (No): Let's not confuse centralization with standardization.
- **Bryant Fiesta, *UC Irvine '16***, very quickly on proposals three and four, the reason why they were presented to you is for you to decide what is best for the organization. He wanted to point out the language that's currently in front of the delegates. He appreciates that we're having this conversation that this has been put forward. He used to work on staff, doing expansion for three years and opened up College of New Jersey, University of Houston, and Colorado Boulder. He lived on that campus for nine months out of the year. He moved his life there, understood the community, met with the community, and met with the campus, and tried to make sure that the approach to expansion was local. As a Regional Chief for the Mid-Atlantic, he's there just to say hi and tries not to talk a lot about operations because they have local advisors who are much more seeped into local contact and he trusts them. He trusts the exec board to make those decisions and relies on district teams who know the district. He is questioning this trend of centralization because self-governance is one of those principles that he leads with.

- **Nate Guenard, Georgia '25**, seeks a point of information. Are there any implications of a resolution?
 - Convention President Olver, clarified that it is a message from the body to leadership.
- **Gavin Reider, Cornell '25**, said he was talking with his House Corporation President, when he turned to him and he asked what makes Beta special? He turned to me and he told me that we're the only fraternity that allows our undergraduate members to have a say in our legislation. When we have this amount of power to our individual chapters is something that sets us apart. That is something that we should try not to tear down even for the sake of industrialization organization.
- **Cameron Newton, UCLA '26**, calls the question
 - He then withdraws the motion
- **Jason Steckel, Case Western '92**, states he is the Chapter Counselor, and on staff at Case Western Reserve. He meets with 13 chapter presidents every week from 13 different organizations. One of the things he tells them is it is not their chapter. They are simply stewards of a chapter for the time they're there. We are 185 years old. He believes firmly in autonomy, but we are a drop in the bucket of hundreds of thousands of people. He believes there needs to be that balance between the self-regulation of each chapter and the Great Fraternity that we are a part of. We need to make sure we are all caretakers of what we have. He doesn't know people's motives, but knows the people that are putting some of these things forward. He believes their motives are good and pure to protect this Good and Great Fraternity that has been around for 185 years. If you don't know, there's a lot of the world that is coming after us. It's really important that while we self-regulate, we also protect what it is that we have been stewards of and are asked to take care of, to pass it on to the next generation.
- **Nick Bartlett, Texas '26**, feels it would be important to speak on this point in regards to CPLA. A general consensus among CPLA is that there needs to be more time in it for you to speak with chapters of a similar fit. I understand the points. There's an importance of diversity of thought. In the way of standardization of everything, certain things are going to work better for chapters that just have more things in common. He believes it would be important if there was sometimes in CPLA, Keystone, and any other kind of connection level events, for chapter presidents of these organizations to talk to organizations of a similar nature. This could help with them be able to go about their business in a better way and be able to discuss some of the topics we discussed that people like.

