

AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

MINUTES

1968-1969 Senate
April 11, 1968
Presiding: Gail F. Farwell

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Farwell at 9:15 a.m., April 11, 1968, at the Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel in Detroit, Michigan.

II. AGENDA FOR THE MEETING

President Farwell pointed out that this meeting of the Senate was for purposes of organization and that the 1968-69 Senate is not empowered to conduct business or take actions until after May 1, 1968. He then outlined the several matters that this Senate must take up. Dr. Farwell concluded his opening remarks by indicating that, although the Senate would be free to discuss other matters, it could not take any formal action.

III. SENATE REPRESENTATIVES TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President Farwell stated that this Senate must select four representatives to the APGA Board of Directors, two for one-year terms and two for two-year terms. In addition, a Nominating Committee must be appointed to select candidates for any vacancies that may occur.

It was moved and seconded that: The President appoint a Nominating Committee from the Senate and that this Committee present a slate of candidates for Senate representatives to the Board of Directors. Motion passed.

A Nominating Committee was appointed consisting of Carl McDaniels as Chairman and Walter Durost and Christine Adams as the other members.

President Farwell then appointed an Ad Hoc Committee of the Senate to serve as a Nominating Committee to select candidates for vacancies that may occur during the term of the elected Senate Representatives to the Board of Directors. This Committee consists of Annabelle Ferguson as Chairman with Raymond Hylander and Joseph Hogan as the other members.

At this point, the Senate recessed to allow the Nominating Committee under Dr. McDaniels to meet and to caucus with other Senate members in order to present a slate of candidates for representatives to the Board of Directors. It was pointed out that only duly elected representatives from Branches would be eligible for nomination for this office.

Following the recess, the meeting reconvened, and Dr. Farwell called for a report from the Nominating Committee. Dr. McDaniels announced that the Committee was presenting a slate of five candidates for the one-year term and five for the two-year term, and that there could be additional nominations from the floor. He then presented the slate as follows:

Nominees for a one-year term:

1. Gerald Saddlemire, President, New York State Branch
2. Herbert Agnor, President, Ohio State Branch
3. Annabelle Ferguson, President, Maryland State Branch
4. Garland Fitzpatrick, Past President, Connecticut State Branch
5. Donald Moler, President-Elect, Illinois State Branch

Nominees for a two-year term:

1. Richard Hoover, President, California State Branch
2. James Windsor, President, Virginia State Branch
3. Katherine Cole, President-Elect, National Capital Area Branch
4. Christine Adams, Past President, Kentucky State Branch
5. Eugene Kasper, President, Kansas State Branch

There were no additional nominations from the floor, and it was moved and seconded that: The nominations be closed. Motion passed.

Vote was taken by written ballot. Following the voting, President Farwell announced the results as follows:

For one-year term: Gerald Saddlemire and Herbert Agnor

For two-year term: Katherine Cole and Richard Hoover

IV. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

President Farwell stated that this Senate must also select a Committee on Committees to serve in an advisory function to the President and President-Elect of APGA. He then called for nominations and the following names were submitted:

Ruth Rockwood	Charles Larsen
Alfred Stiller	Gilbert Moore
Helen Cornwell	Katherine Cole
Gale Oleson	E. Wayne Wright
Joseph Hollis	Garland Fitzpatrick

It was moved and selected that: The nominations be closed. Motion passed.

Vote was taken by written ballot to select a five or six member Committee on Committees. Following the voting, President Farwell announced the results as follows:

Joseph Hollis (appointed as Chairman by President Farwell)
Katherine Cole
Charles Larsen
Ruth Rockwood
Alfred Stiller
E. Wayne Wright

V. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE DUES INCREASE

The question of a possible increase in membership dues was raised. (This item had been discussed in the meeting of the 1967-68 Senate on April 10, 1968, and that Senate had tabled the matter.) It was pointed out that the

1968-69 Senate is not authorized to take action on a dues increase at this meeting, but that it can take the matter up for discussion only.

Although there was no formal action, numerous comments were made concerning the implications of a dues increase. The various comments are recorded in the minutes for purposes of information.

It was pointed out that a straw ballot was taken in the 1967-68 Senate and the sentiment was in favor of an increase. Also, that it is obvious that the Association and the Divisions need money. It was suggested that the Senate should consider whether there is some means for getting a vote on a dues increase immediately after May 1, when this Senate would be able to take formal action.

Question was raised on the possibility of instructing the Finance Committee to review the matter and prepare a recommendation to the Board of Directors to consider at its May 1968 meeting. If the Board of Directors approved such a recommendation, it could be submitted to the Senate for a mail vote.

President Farwell outlined the reasoning of the Subcommittee on Dues from the Executive Council that had prepared the recommendation for a dues increase. He listed the several reasons this Committee felt a dues increase is necessary.

1. The steady rise in cost of many fixed items that cannot be cut from the budget.
2. The need for setting up a policy reserve to permit advance planning in carrying out important activities.
3. The need for a property reserve.
4. The need for some kind of emergency reserve (for example, the Convention might have resulted in a serious financial loss).

Following Dr. Farwell's summary, the comments continued from the floor.

Feeling was expressed that under the new By-Laws, the Senate is intended to be the policy making body. In view of this, it was proposed that all recommendations received on a dues increase be presented to the Senate rather than simply one recommendation approved by the Board of Directors.

Question was raised as to the need for recommendations to come through the Board of Directors if the Senate is indeed the policy making body.

A comment was made on the idea of a mail ballot. Feeling expressed that it might be setting a dangerous precedent to vote by mail ballot on matters such as this since it would open the door to mail balloting on matters that might not be well understood without full discussion.

There was considerable discussion of use of a mail ballot. It was pointed out that some way must be provided to conduct business between Senate sessions and that this would have to be either by using a mail ballot or by delegating authority to the Board of Directors. It was noted that with the new organizational structure, it is very likely that it will be necessary to use a mail ballot for some matters that might come up.

Point was raised on the timing of the Senate meeting under the new By-Laws. It was noted that with the new organizational structure, the senate is given more authority and responsibility; yet it does not meet until the time of the Convention near the end of the fiscal year. Two possibilities were suggested to remedy this situation: (1) consideration of changing the fiscal year for the Association; or (2) holding more than one Senate meeting per year. It was pointed out that it would not be financially possible for such additional Senate meetings to be held at the Association's expense.

A show of hands was requested on the question, "Should the Senate take the question of a dues increase under consideration immediately?" Show of hands indicated agreement that this should be done.

A show of hands was requested on the question, "Would it be more favorable to present more than one recommendation for an approach to the dues question, so the Senate has the opportunity to decide on more than one proposal?" Show of hands indicated agreement to having more than one proposal.

A show of hands was requested on the question, "Does the Senate feel it would be better to vote for a one-step dues increase for the total amount needed or for a dues increase in several steps?" Show of hands indicated agreement that this should be done in one step.

Following these straw votes, the discussion and comments continued.

Comment was made that the Divisions should have been consulted before the dues increase recommendation was presented to the Senate.

It was proposed that the Senate might approve the first step of the proposed dues increase but that the further steps be postponed until such time as there can be full and open debate on the dues increase, the method of implementation, and the method of communicating the increase to the entire membership.

The next speaker expressed agreement with this viewpoint and concern that the membership be fully informed as to how the dues money is being spent. The feeling was expressed that failure to inform fully the membership could result in a substantial loss of members.

Comment was made on the matter of primary Division membership. Attention was called to the general agreement of persons meeting to discuss the new By-Laws that this should not be retained.

Further support was given to the need to inform the membership of reasons for a dues increase. It was noted that our members must also hold membership in other professional organizations and, therefore, must sometimes make a choice as to the organization most helpful to them. Concern was also expressed that a dues increase that does not also include a real increase in services may cause people to drop their membership.

Question was raised on the preparation of two proposed budgets for 1968-69. It was pointed out that one budget (Plan A) is based on approval of a dues increase, and the other (Plan B) is based on the dues remaining the same. Since it could not be known at the time it was necessary to prepare the budget whether or not there would be a dues increase, the preparation of two budgets was necessary.

There was discussion on the portion of dues to go to Divisions and several points of view were expressed. It was suggested that Divisions should receive the same amount for each member of the Division whether or not the member belongs to more than one Division. Another suggestion was given that there are differences among the Divisions in the finances they require, and that some consideration might be given to rebating a minimum amount to all Divisions plus some differential payment that might vary with the Division.

Question of having a rebate to the Branches was raised.

A show of hands was requested on the question, "Should there be a rebate provided to State Branches such as is now provided to Divisions?" Show of hands indicated that the Senate was about evenly divided on this question.

The first comment on this question was that this matter of rebates to State Branches should be studied further and that any recommendation should come through the State Branches themselves.

Further opinion was expressed that probably eventually the idea of a rebate to State Branches would come about, but that there are many questions that need to be answered before this happens. Feeling was expressed that this is a very complicated question and should be studied thoroughly before any such action is taken.

It was further stated that many Branches would like to protect their autonomy and would prefer not to have rebates in this way. Suggestion was given that the Senate might want to consider some provision for paying expenses of the Branches incurred because of their affiliation with APGA as an alternate to direct rebates from membership dues.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of the 1968-69 Senate was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.