

AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

1966 - 1967 EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Meeting, November 16, 17, 18, 1966

Minutes of First Session, November 16

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Presiding

Opening

The meeting was called to order by President Hoyt at 9:15 a. m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D. C. Members present were: Norman McGough, Melvene Hardee, Bernard Black, Frank Noble, Henry Isaksen, Ralph Johnson, Ben Shimberg, Raymond Ehrle, Paul Fitzgerald, Kenneth Hoyt, Willis E. Dugan, Paul Munger, Eugene Koplitz, C. Winfield Scott, Wesley Tennyson, Henry Borow, Garry Walz, Marceline Jaques, Leo Goldman, and Edmund G. Williamson. Elizabeth Greenleaf attended as an observer. Members unable to attend were: John Muthard and Eldon Ruff.

Agenda

President Hoyt opened the meeting with a review of the tentative agenda that had been prepared. He indicated that during this first session the appointment of sub-committees would be confirmed to study several of the items on the agenda and bring recommendations back to the Council for action later in the meeting. He then called for a report from the Executive Director.

Executive Director

Dr. Dugan indicated in his opening remarks that at this time the organization within the headquarters office is becoming clarified but that much more internal communication must be accomplished prior to the achievement of any basic headquarters reorganization. He indicated that administrative staff members hold weekly meetings to help establish and improve communication and involvement in the on-going operation. Dr. Dugan then introduced the several administrative staff members and briefly outlined their areas of responsibility. He indicated that these staff members have been asked to sit in on Executive Council meetings as observers and to serve as resource persons to provide information on particular items for Council action. Dr. Dugan then summarized some of his activities since taking office as Executive Director. He mentioned meetings with people within the Office of Education, and advised the Council of his attendance at the signing by President Johnson of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Facilities Act. Dr. Dugan also mentioned visits to several APGA branches throughout the country and advised that he had attended meetings of a number of APGA committees, including Placement, Federal Relations, Membership Task Force, Publications, Constitution and Finance.

In concluding his report Dr. Dugan assured the Council of his awareness of the continuing financial concerns and of his desire to do everything possible to maintain a fiscal position that would be as stable as possible. Dr. Dugan concluded his reports by outlining five points to improve and stabilize the financial position of the Association.

(1) He indicated that everything possible is being done in the headquarters office to establish more effective personnel utilization.

(2) He outlined the necessity of some reduction in force and indicated that recent reductions have been absorbed through better utilization of the remaining staff.

(3) He pointed out the definite need for means of increased revenue. He indicated that at the present time membership dues represent about 70% of the Association's income and indicated that further ways must be sought to increase income.

(4) He indicated the need to explore possibilities for developing new projects. Such projects could be a means of providing additions in staff and income.

(5) He indicated the need to encourage and stimulate new development of APGA memorial funds.

Minutes Approved

Following the Executive Director's report, President Hoyt called for action on the Minutes for the last Executive Council meeting. In the discussion, Dr. Scott raised a question about the statement on page seven concerning a Western office. He stated that he believed it had been moved that the Western office report be tabled at the last meeting and he indicated also that he has now drafted a further statement on this matter that would be available for the Council to see and possibly to act on during this present meeting. President Hoyt assured the Council that the notes from the last meeting would be checked and the necessary corrections made in the minutes. It was moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The minutes of the last Executive Council meeting be approved as corrected. Motion passed.

Elections Report

President Hoyt then called for a progress report on the APGA elections from the Chairman of the Nominations and Election Board, Dr. C. Winfield Scott. Dr. Scott advised that according to the Constitutional requirement the two persons on the nominations ballot receiving the highest number of votes be declared candidates, that the present nominations ballot produced as two of the nominees Esther Lloyd-Jones and Gail Farwell. The Nominations and Elections Board has voted on the other 12 candidates from the nominations ballot and members of the Board have been requested to rank the top three nominees from that survey (these were Robert Stripling, John McGowan and Harry Smalenburg). Dr. Scott expects to have the results of that balloting to present to the Council before the present meeting ends. Following Dr. Scott's report, President Hoyt stressed the feeling that the Council should consider

the current problems relating to "open" Divisional nominations. General agreement was expressed that a need exists to improve these procedures.

Sub-committee Assignments

President Hoyt again called attention to the tentative agenda and following a discussion on the relative importance on the various items, seven sub-committees were appointed and were asked to hold meetings on Wednesday evening to go over particular reports and to present their summaries and recommendations to the Executive Council for action on Thursday or Friday.

Constitution

Jaques, Scott, Isaksen, Borow
and Goldman

Staff Associate

Pat Lawlor

Finance and Property

Johnson and Shimberg

Bill Dugan and Gene Hunter

Conventions

Black and Munger

Ted Driscoll and Bev Gunstone

APGA Relations with other Associations

Fitzgerald and Hardee

Dyck Vermilye

Professional Preparation and Standards

Noble, Koplitz, Greenleaf, and
Ehrle

Robert Callis and
Wray Strowig

Federal Relations and Legislation

Hoyt, McGough, Tennyson and
Walz

Laura Mae Kress

Task Force on Membership

Fitzgerald

Pat Lawlor

President Hoyt appointed Garry Walz as a committee of one to report on the matter of ERIC and copyright regulations.

Treasurer's Report

President Hoyt then called for a report from APGA Treasurer, Ralph Johnson, and from the Chairman of the APGA Finance Committee, Roger Lennon. Dr. Johnson first presented his report as Treasurer. He called attention to the six month financial report and statement of assets and liabilities that had been prepared in the APGA headquarters office. Dr. Johnson pointed out the continuing problem of reduced income throughout the summer months, and pointed out that although in the past budgets have appeared to be balanced, there has always been a serious cash shortage during the summer. He called attention to the re-financing of the mortgage on the APGA building in December of 1963. He indicated that this re-financing was intended to provide working capital. He pointed out that at this point, APGA has used up \$107,000 in working capital (unencumbered balance from re-financing) since January, 1964, in addition to income received during that same period. During that same period the mortgage has been reduced by \$6,000 a year. Dr. Johnson pointed out that the 1966-67 budget indicates a projected 12% increase in income compared to a similar period last year. However, over the same time period the expense budget for the first six months is up 29%. He indicated that 15% of the increase in expenses represents increases in staff salaries due to adoption of Federal salary scales. Part of this increase is due also to additional fringe benefits and the higher salary scale put into effect during the last fiscal year to bring salaries in line with the Federal Government scale, as well as changes in staff personnel. Mr. Ehrle asked whether the six month time period shown in the budget was really representative of income and expenses over a full year.

Dr. Johnson called upon Gene Hunter, APGA Director of Business and Finance to respond. Mr. Hunter did agree that the first six months as shown in the budget figures presented to the Council does include some changes in personnel and other expenses. He indicated that the second six months should show a decrease in expenses, particularly those for salaries. Mr. Hunter further stated agreement with the problem of cash balance and indicated that to operate with a sound financial position, the Association should actually have over \$100,000 in the bank in April to provide for payment of expenses over the summer period when the income is lowest. He suggested as one possibility to cut expenses during the summer, the re-scheduling of some committee meetings to a point later in the fiscal year, possibly in the Fall. Dr. Scott questioned the idea of scheduling committee meetings later in the year, and expressed the belief that in order to effectively plan for committee action it was often necessary for committees to meet early in the year. Yet, it was observed that the APGA cash position is always low in summer.

Finance Committee Report

The President next called for a report from the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Roger Lennon. Mr. Lennon stated that the Committee sees itself as the watchdog of the treasury. This Committee is charged to look at the financial implications of all operations of the Association and to make judgments as to the

financial soundness of such operations as they relate to the future. The Committee concerns itself with long-range finances and has refused to concern itself with evaluation of specific line items in the budget. The Committee will not make recommendations on any specific budget items, but rather sees its role as that of alerting officers to financial consequences of particular actions.

Mr. Lennon further stated that the Finance Committee feels that the Association has been living beyond its means for the last ten years and that only the appreciation in value of the property has saved the Association from going bankrupt. He pointed out that through the years in every report the Finance Committee has submitted, it has been pointed out that the financial situation has been precarious. This Committee agrees that such an operation cannot go on forever and that we must operate on a balanced budget. Chairman Lennon further reminded the Council that the mortgage was refinanced several years ago because there was no other way to get money to meet bills at that time. He further pointed out that at the time of refinancing the Committee felt that some funds must be used for current operations but the balance should preserve our cash position if we maintained a balanced budget. He stated that the Committee wishes to urge the Executive Council to be aware of the great danger which has characterized the past financial policy of the Council and stressed that we must not continue in this same way. Mr. Lennon further stated that the Finance Committee understood that in the development of the budget for the current fiscal year last May, there had been an approximately balanced budget set up. At that time, the Committee had understood that a look would be taken in the Executive Council meeting in November to see whether or not the financial situation had improved. He indicated that the Finance Committee at its recent meeting has reviewed the budget with the proposed revisions and the Committee recommends to the Council that the revised balanced budget be approved.

Chairman Lennon stated that the Committee has urged that in the estimate of income we must be very conservative in the numbers of members and in other estimated income. He further urged that the estimate of expenses be liberal. In view of this, the Finance Committee feels that it can endorse the proposed revised budget as developed by the Executive Director and the Director of Business and Finance.

The Committee further urges that the Council and all staff must realize how tight the budget is. He stated that there is no place in the proposed budget revision to add any new functions or other special activities at this time. He stated that the Committee, after its recent meeting, feels that we have turned a corner with respect to living within our means. The Finance Committee is encourage by recent developments in APGA Headquarters of better administrative controls and better fiscal policies. The Committee feels that the present budget as presented to the Council is quite realistic. He indicated that the Committee realizes that every function and every Division of the Association is interested in expanding its activities. However, such expansions must wait until more realistic finances are available. He stated that the Committee further feels that under no circumstances should income from such things as sale of property be used for the purpose of carrying on regular operations. He stressed that our property represents our greatest single asset the Association has, and that this asset must not be used for on-going operations.

Reactions

Following Mr. Lennon's report, President Hoyt summarized the major conclusions and called for questions from members of the Council.

Dr. Noble mentioned the fact that the budget indicates the first six months of income ran behind expenses. He questioned how we can predict that income will increase during the next six months. Dr. Tennyson asked whether the Finance Committee is considering other sources of income beyond those now in existence. In response, Mr. Lennon said that about three years ago the Finance Committee had outlined several avenues of possible new support. He indicated that some exploration of these had been made but that at the present time none seems promising except, possibly as renewed publications effort. Mr. Lennon commented about the possibility of scheduling some Committee meetings (where timing is not important) for a time of year other than in the summer. He also pointed out the recommendation for consolidation of the various checking accounts into one single account.

Dr. Black commented that there may be things now being done by APGA that could be better handled by Divisions themselves. He asked about the possibility of having Divisions carry out more projects on their own and suggested that this in itself would help to cut down on expenses of APGA. In response, Dr. Goldman expressed the belief that we probably have to expect that Divisions will be asking more services rather than less from the Headquarters office in the future and he indicated that he did not believe it would be possible to cut down on expenses in this area.

Dr. Dugan then commented that probably some of the Committee reports will help suggest other ways of increasing income. One of these might be an improved publications program. Another might be some cooperative research or foundation support projects which might provide direct income, overhead, and staff provision. He also mentioned the possibility of increasing the APGA Memorial Funds. Dr. Dugan further commented on the proposal for consolidation of accounts and pointed out that this would provide a better cash balance distributed throughout the year and would help to solve some of the problems on meeting expenses throughout the summer months.

Dr. Dugan further pointed out that there are three critical factors which affect the total APGA and Divisional cash positions. The first of these is the maintenance of too-high an inventory of publications requiring storage and financing. Secondly, the Association has too large a sum tied up in "accounts receivable". We need to work toward a more effective system of current billing to keep this factor to a minimum. The third factor is the long standing continuance of a deficit budget. These three diminishing factors must be constantly recognized and managed.

Dr. Shimberg commented that it appears membership income is heaviest in the fall and he asked whether there is any possibility of working toward a more even distribution of membership dues receipts throughout the year. He commented that

the Council should consider the fact that under the present system it is too easy for members to drop their membership and later be reinstated without any kind of penalty. He encouraged consideration of a penalty provision.

APGA Property

President Hoyt asked Mr. Lennon to comment on the Finance Committee's recommendations concerning the APGA property. Mr. Lennon reported that the Finance Committee has viewed the APGA property as the Association's greatest single asset. He stated that for the past several years, every meeting of the Finance Committee has involved discussions of this property. He stated that the Committee has discussed whether or not the quarters are adequate and has discussed also the financial question of how the Association can get the greatest benefit from this asset. He indicated that in these discussions the Committee has assumed the Association should continue to hold the property as long as it could serve as Headquarters. He mentioned too the personal and emotional involvement on the part of some members with the present property.

Mr. Lennon indicated that the Committee has attempted to get continuing evaluations of the adequacy of the present building occupied by APGA and of the adjacent building at 1607 New Hampshire. The Committee has also tried to get opinions as to the value of the property and the trend of the real estate market in the future. The Committee has also attempted to gather information on the cost to the Association for various alternatives such as rental, construction, and purchase. He stated that some urgency arose in this matter when it had been reported to the Finance Committee that APGA needed to declare its intentions last summer regarding the property at 1607 New Hampshire. At that time a decision was made to tell the tenants, (the Friends of the Middle East) that their lease would not be renewed after September 1968. He indicated that this action was taken with no commitment on the part of APGA as to what would be done with the property.

He indicated that additional urgency arose this summer when there was some interest in a possible purchase of the property. He indicated that this interest in possible purchase made it necessary to at least define steps necessary to make a decision on the sale of the property. Mr. Lennon then called attention to the report to the Council from the Building and Grounds Committee. He indicated that all members of the Finance Committee are in agreement with this report that the quarters are not suitable for housing an Association such as ours. He stated that at the same time the Committee does not feel this is their decision but rather agrees that the present property is not, and cannot be made an adequate Headquarters by the investment of even a reasonable amount of money. He stated that the Committee feels that it would not be wise to spend further money in an attempt to make the present quarters adequate. Therefore, the Finance Committee recommends to the Executive Council that the Association now definitely plan to remove its headquarters operation from these two buildings. The Committee further recommends to the Council that it immediately initiate whatever steps are necessary to make it possible for the officers and the Executive Director to enter into negotiations for disposal of the property.

It was then pointed out that the Constitution states that any property of the Association can be disposed of only through action of the APGA Senate. Therefore, it is clear that no decision can be made about selling the property before the next Senate meeting in Dallas in 1967. Mr. Lennon indicated that the Finance Committee feels it is very important that the Council recommend such action to the Senate, and, that the Senate be invited to agree to give certain officers of the Association authority to sell the property under certain conditions.

He stated that the Committee feels the most important condition is that the property not be sold for less than \$750,000. He stated that this figure is based on an appraisal made by professional appraisers and provides certain allowances for realty fees, etc. He indicated that the Senate should be encourage to approve negotiating the sale of the property at a figure which would provide an equity not less than \$500,000. He further indicated that such an expectation represents a fair market value for the present property.

Mr. Lennon further stated that in the event it is not possible to get an offer yielding such a substantial equity, it is the Committee's recommendation that the matter be again brought back to the Finance Committee for an opinion as to whether disposal at a lower price is in the best interest of the Association. He indicated that an attempt should be made to get from the Senate a resolution with some flexibility to operate in any possibility. The Senate should be alerted to the need for flexibility and freedom by an authorized body to operate in negotiating the sale of the property. He indicated that the Committee suggests authority be granted to negotiate by a committee consisting of the President, the Executive Director, and the Treasurer of the Association. In making this recommendation, the Committee is declaring that it believes the Association can well afford more modern and economical housing. Such housing should be more adequate for the purposes of the Association. He stated further that the Finance Committee felt it had to separate the matter of disposal of the property from the problem of the type of new quarters and whether such an adjustment be a rent or lease agreement. He stated that the immediate need for the Association is to be moved to the position of realizing that we must dispose of the present property.

The Executive Council must move on this recommendation at this Council meeting so that the Senate can act at its next meeting in March of 1967. Mr. Lennon also added that the Finance Committee had been surprised to learn recently that the tenants at 1607 New Hampshire Avenue have not been notified last summer that their lease will not be renewed. He stated that the Committee felt that this notification should be made to these tenants as soon as possible. He indicated that it is not necessary to tell them what the Association plans, but simply that their lease will not be renewed. Dr. Walz questioned whether it is necessary to wait for a physical meeting of the Senate before taking Senate action. In response Mr. Lennon commented that the Committee is aware that this is likely to be a delicate issue before the Senate. The Committee feels that it is important to get full and definitive information to Senate members in advance of their meeting. Such a decision would be better to dealt with in a physical meeting of the Senate. Dr. Goldman commented

that possibly we should begin to look at what the Association will do about quarters after we leave the present space. He stated that if this Executive Council approved the recommendation to move, we would then go ahead now to explore what will be done after the building is sold. Dr. Shimberg commented that the issue of what is done after the building is sold is important. He indicated that he does not feel we can tell the Senate what specific alternatives are best at this time. He asked whether the present tenants might consider remaining in the property without a lease and asked whether there are problems to selling a building when a lease does exist. Mr. Lennon replied that there is no restriction on selling a building where a lease exists. He indicated, however, that the main value of the APGA property is in the land (approximately 14,000 sq. ft.) rather than in the buildings, and that therefore a prospective buyer would most likely be buying the property for the space, and not the buildings.

In summary Dr. Hoyt advised that the information presented this morning by the Chairman of the Finance Committee is for information and discussion only. He further indicated that it would be necessary for the Executive Council to take action at a later point concerning the disposal of the property.

The morning session recessed at 11:50 a.m., and reconvened at 1:25 p.m.

Committee Reports on Membership and Branches

President Hoyt opened the afternoon session with a call for continuation of various committee information reports. He first directed attention to the membership task force report and the report from the Branch Committee. Present total membership is reported to be 24,195. Since September 1, 1966 memberships have increased by 1,755. It is expected that membership will increase by 17% during the current fiscal year over a year ago. Attention was called by Miss Lawlor to a report of a sampling of persons applying for membership during October. In the survey, an attempt was made to identify the geographical location of these applicants, the Divisions for which they applied, how many are students or in other particular categories by Division, and the degree levels of the applicants (this report is attached to the end of these minutes).

The membership task force was identified as a special committee appointed by President Hoyt to examine the future direction of the APGA membership efforts. This committee has met and has come up with recommendations for action by the Council. These recommendations are contained in a written report. Commenting on this report, Dr. Shimberg expressed the opinion that some of the recommendations in the report did not seem to call for Council action. He suggested that the sub-committee of the Council study this report and recommend action to be taken on each of the recommendations contained in it. President Hoyt pointed out that such a sub-committee exists and that this committee has been asked to study the report Wednesday evening and report to the Council later in the current session.

Dr. Scott asked whether the membership task force is recommending appointment of a membership committee as well as a membership policy committee. Miss Lawlor replied that the intent was to have a membership committee to focus on membership promotion and a membership policy committee with a focus on policies. This position was viewed as somewhat ambiguous.

President Hoyt then called for a report on the branches. The attention of the Council was called to the Membership Committee's feelings that it is important that a directory of officers and committee chairmen should be published at some time during the current year. The Chairman of the Branch Committee has requested an increase in their budget for \$500.00 to support the expenses of a dinner meeting and a workshop for Branch Presidents to be held at the Dallas Convention on Saturday preceding the convention. President Hoyt stated that this would be a matter affecting the budget and proposed that the Finance sub-committee should make note of this for consideration at its meeting this evening.

Organizing committees now existing in every state in which there is not yet an APGA branch. Several states will be ready to apply for branch status and to receive their charter by the time of the Dallas convention. Miss Lawlor indicated that there now exists 97 official APGA branches. These include both local and state groups. Local branches understand that they will become chapters of state branches when such state branches are organized in a state and such local branches are agreeable to this arrangement.

President Hoyt called attention to the proposed Constitution changes to give greater representation to branches, and asked whether there is a way to dissolve some of the local groups in the event this Constitutional change is approved. Miss Lawlor replied that if the Constitution is changed as recommended, the local groups would continue to have a charter. However, in terms of the governmental structure of APGA, they would no longer have direct voting power but would participate through their state branch. Dr. Jacques commented that the matter of branch representation would likely be clearer after the Constitution Committee report is reviewed and she felt that further discussion might be saved until that time.

Constitutional Revision

President Hoyt then called for a report from the Constitution Committee, and Dr. Jaques presented the report as Co-Chairman of the Committee. She began her report by outlining the charge that had been made to this Committee. She stated that the previous committee had made some recommendations for Constitution revision and that the present committee has been asked to come up with a specific Constitutional proposal and to present a specific document to the Executive Council. In looking at the task before them, the committee had wanted to simplify the governmental structure in keeping with some modern trends. Miss Jaques indicated that the committee wanted to make sure that there was provision for communication between all governmental levels of the Association. She called attention to the Committee's

report and noted that the Committee is proposing substitution of Articles of Incorporation for the Constitution and is suggesting that the Association operate under such Articles and a set of By-Laws. She noted that in the present Constitution there are numerous duplications between Articles in the Constitution and in the By-Laws.

Dr. Jaques further reported that at the last meeting there was raised question as to the balance of relationship and power between the various elements of the Association. She pointed out that the Constitution Committee as a result of its deliberations feels that the Senate should be the primary governmental body of the Association. Therefore, the Senate needs to represent all elements of the Association, including both branches and Divisions. Also, the Committee feels that the Senate should have representation on the Executive Council and the Executive Committee. It was further felt that if the Senate is to be the governmental body, it must be small enough to be effective. There is also need to provide for continuity of Senate members. Therefore, the Committee feels that Senators should serve longer terms than one year, and it should have a rotating membership. The Committee, therefore, came up with the recommendation that APGA Senators should have a two-year term and that each State Branch should have two Senators. Thus, only one Senator from each State branch would be elected each year after the first year.

The Constitution Committee has also provided in the proposed governmental structure for more than one Senate meeting in a year's time if necessary. The Committee further feels that in order to be effective the Senate must be a better informed group than at present regarding activities of the Association. To aid in keeping the Senate better informed, the Committee suggests representation from this body on the Executive Council and the Executive Committee.

President Hoyt then called for any questions from Council members regarding the proposed Constitution revision. Dr. Black asked whether the Committee has considered the question of branches and their development in terms of development in the Senate. Dr. Jaques replied that the Committee has provided that there be only one branch in each state and that, therefore, only 51 branches (the 50 states and the District of Columbia) will be represented in the Senate. Dr. Black questioned further what this representation means in terms of make-up of representatives to the Senate and pointed out the possible danger that make-up of state branches, and therefore, their representatives, could make it possible for the Senate to really be controlled by a particular Division. Dr. Jaques responded that this would not be true if branches followed the guidelines that had been set up by the Branch Committee which guidelines call for representation from all Divisions within a state branch. This point suggested the need for all divisions to become actively involved in State branch activities.

Dr. Jaques further elaborated on the Constitution Committee's recommendation that each State branch should have two representatives in the Senate for the first 1,000 members of the branch. If membership in a state branch reaches more than 1,000, another representative would be permitted, and for an additional 1,000 still a fourth representative. The maximum representation from any state would be four persons

under the recommendation of the Constitution Committee. Dr. Shimberg asked whether there is a minimum number of members that a State branch must have before it can have two representatives. He questioned whether it is fair to give states with a very small membership the same representation as larger states. Dr. Jaques responded that the Committee has discussed the possibility of one representative from small branches but had decided to propose a minimum of two representatives from each state in order to provide continuity. The proposal is that for the first Senate meeting under the new structure, that state branches would elect two representatives, one for a one-year term, and one for a two-year term, and that following this all state branch representatives would be elected for two-year terms.

Dr. Noble questioned the reasoning in having branch representation on a population basis, while Division representation ignores this. Most members of APGA, it was noted, actually hold membership in more than one Division so that a Divisional representative, while serving as a delegate from a particular Division, would actually have interests in other Divisions as well. Dr. Isaksen commented that the new structure must provide for a clear-cut distinction of the powers vested in the Executive Council, the Executive Committee, and the Senate. He indicated that we must clarify which body should perform Executive functions and which should perform legislative functions. Dr. Isaksen further commented that it was his feeling that the Senate should perform the legislative functions while the Executive Council should serve as the executive body. Dr. Jaques responded that at the present time the Executive Council provides a policy initiating and recommending function and the Senate provides a confirming function. She further indicated that one of the Constitution Committee's concerns is that the business affairs of the Association must continue between Senate meetings and there must be better provision for such continuity. Dr. Dugan added the comment that the present Senate make-up provides for more than 300 members of the body. He indicated that this is far too large a body to develop policies and that it would be unrealistic at present to identify the role of the Senate as legislative until such time as it is a smaller size and until better communication with the members can be developed to assure that the Senate is fully informed. Dr. Williamson questioned whether it would be possible for Senate members who wish to initiate a particular item of business to do so, and he was assured that this privilege is necessary and is provided.

Dr. Isaksen commented that the Constitution Committee's recommendations represent a tremendous improvement in the governmental structure if we were to make the Senate a policy making body and the Executive Council an executive body. Dr. Noble asked for clarification of the functions of the Executive Council under the new policies, and indicated that in effect it appeared that the Council would be a long range policy making body of the Senate. Dr. Jaques commented that the Executive Council was envisioned as being similar to the Board of Directors rather than an Executive Council. Dr. Isaksen stated that if it is felt that the Senate be viewed as a policy making body then the Senate must be the only group to handle this. Dr. Noble suggested that there be provision for some type of Executive Committee of the Senate to decide what constitutes an emergency requiring action

between Senate meetings. Dr. Tennyson commented that it has been the assumption the Executive Council has in the past been functioning as a policy recommending body. He noted that there have always been comments that the Executive Council at present is too large a group to serve as a policy making body and pointed out that we are now suggesting further enlargement of such a body. He questioned whether this is a good idea.

Dr. Walz commented that it would be difficult for a Senate such as proposed to serve as an initiating body. He felt that it would be more appropriate to think of this group as serving a review function. He felt that there is much to recommend the present procedure as now used under the current Constitution. Dr. Shimberg remarked that we should think of the Senate as being like a large Board of Directors. In the same way, the Executive Council should be recognized as an Executive Committee of the Senate, responsible to the Senate and doing the work of the Senate so that every action could be an integral part of the Senate structure. He felt that it was important to in some way make the Executive Council a part of the Senate.

Dr. Dugan commented that one major problem relating to the Senate is that Senate members are not directly represented on the Executive Council. He pointed out that the proposed Executive Council would consist of 15 persons including Senate (Branch) representatives and that this would constitute a more democratic body if it had representation from the Senate. Dr. Ehrle commented that to meet our requirements we need actual clear cut representation from all factors. He suggested setting up a body for legislative functions with branch representation (the Senate) and having another body with Divisional representation. The larger body might meet several times a year and there could then be a relatively small Executive Committee to carry on the day to day functions between such meetings. Dr. Jaques responded that with such a structure, there would be question as to which group would make the actual decisions. Dr. Ehrle responded that he felt the Executive Committee would have to be responsible to the total membership and selected by election of the membership. In actual fact the Executive Committee would suggest legislation to be introduced in the Senate. Miss Lawlor commented that the APGA attorney had warned against a bicameral approach to the governmental structure. Legal counsel has indicated that it is very important to build in the clear cut basis of power within the Senate and the clear cut responsibilities of the Council to the Senate and of the Executive Committee to the Council and the Senate. Dr. Tennyson commented that we must also get more efficiency in the policy making program.

Dr. Goldman commented that to look at the practical side, most of the real decision-making must be done by a body no bigger than the present size of the Executive Council. However, he commented that on the other hand the organization will never be really strong unless the members can have a feeling that they are having a voice in control of the Association. He wondered whether the duties of the Senate could be defined by setting up a list of specific decisions that only the Senate could make. This would include such things as chartering a Division, a major policy stand of the Association on a particular items, etc. He indicated that there

is a need to provide the Senate with a real role of responsibility and that under the present structure this has not been true. He suggested also that in addition to the list of items to be acted upon by the Senate that there might be another specific list of items that should be decided by another body such as the present Executive Council. Dr. Jaques responded that the Constitution Committee did try to do this to a degree and indicated that it was hoped that the Senate would feel more importance by having Senate representatives on the Executive Council and Executive Committee. Dr. Goldman called attention to the list of proposed functions on pages 10 and 13 in the proposed By-Laws and stated that he does feel these are clear cut. He indicated that these need to be clarified to separate the specific duties of each body and that there needs to be a complete list of specific items which no body except the Senate can handle.

President Hoyt inquired whether the report of the Constitution Committee now before the Council should be presented to the present Senate by this Council. Dr. Isaksen responded that he felt this report must go to the Senate for action. He indicated that the Executive Council could include its own specific recommendations on the proposal to the Senate. Dr. Jaques indicated that the Constitution Committee's intent was to present this report to the Executive Council for review and suggestions. Following this Council meeting the Constitution Committee will meet again to consider such recommendations and to draft a final version of the report to present to the Senate meeting at the Dallas Convention. She indicated that the last Senate meeting had charged the Constitution Committee to report a draft of constitutional revisions at the Senate meeting in Dallas for possible action. Dr. Goldman commented that it would seem that the Committee could either go to the Dallas meeting saying (1) they are unable to develop a Constitution, or (2) they can present a Constitution which the Council does not endorse, or (3) they can present a draft of the Constitution that the Executive Council does endorse. Dr. Jaques commented that the Committee hoped that any report that is presented to the Senate in Dallas would have the approval and endorsement of the Executive Council. The Committee hoped that the Executive Council could endorse the intent of the present draft with suggestions for changes.

Dr. Noble commented that in these proposed revisions the influence of the Branches would be increased. President HOyt commented that if the balance of power is to work, it would be necessary for APGA branches to really represent all of the Divisions at the grass roots level. Dr. Shimberg remarked that under the present policy whereby members do not need to join a Branch in order to be national members of APGA that we would be eliminating representation from some of the members. He questioned whether it should be suggested that all members of State branches be required to be APGA members. He also called attention to the fact that there are now many members of State Branches who are not national members of the Association and questioned whether such persons would have a voice in electing their State Branch representatives. Dr. Goldman agreed and emphasized that it is quite important that only National APGA members be permitted to have a voice in selecting delegates to the Senate. It was generally agreed that this should be the case, but there was agreement too that it is really very difficult to enforce this throughout the branches.

Dr. Dugan mentioned the possibility that some consideration might be given to returning some amount of national dues (such as \$2.00) to State Branches for each national member in that state in the same manner that a portion of dues are now returned to Divisions for members in the Divisions. Dr. Munger asked whether we can include in the Constitution that all members in a State Branch must be National members. President Hoyt responded that at present many persons become members of State Branches first and that requiring national membership immediately we might discourage some people who would later join the National Association.

There was then discussion of which matters should be taken up next and further discussion of the sub-committees that had been appointed to meet this evening. It was then moved by Dr. Walz and seconded by Dr. Tennyson that: The Executive Council adjourn at this time to allow sub-committees to begin their meetings. Motion defeated

Nancy Wimmer Award

President Hoyt then called for a report on the Nancy Wimmer Award. Dr. Dugan replied that this report is merely a matter of information. He indicated that full information will appear in the November issue of the Guidepost together with a suggestion that we encourage re-nomination of persons who have previously been nominated. He indicated that the sponsors of the award have agreed with the revised criteria and stated that it appears that no further action is called for from the Executive Council. Dr. Hardee asked whether it is clear that nominees do not need to be members of the Association and Dr. Shimberg agreed that the Executive Council must make it clear that Wimmer Award winners do need to be members.

Moved by Dr. Shimberg and seconded by Dr. Isaksen that: Nominees for the Nancy Wimmer Award must be members of the Association. Dr. Scott committed that we do not have this restriction on Research Awards and wondered whether it should be required for the Nancy Wimmer Award.

Moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Munger that: APGA membership requirement be included also in the Research Awards. Commenting on the motion, Dr. Goldman stated that in the last several years the Research Awards committee has agreed that in general APGA members should be the sort to receive Research Awards. He stated, however, that the committee felt that it would be unwise to require membership since this would eliminate much worthwhile research being brought to the attention of the Association members. Following this, Dr. Isaksen withdrew his motion to include a membership requirement for Research Awards, and Dr. Munger withdrew his second.

In commenting, on the Nancy Wimmer Award, Dr. Borow commented that it makes good sense to expect a person who might receive this award to identify with the professional organization. He indicated that he did not feel such an award should go to a person who is not a member. Dr. Goldman commented that in terms

of the public reception of our discipline, we could be criticized for limiting the award to members. He did state however that he felt it would be unusual for a person who might receive the Nancy Wimmer Award not to be a member. President Hoyt then called for a vote on the motion to require APGA membership for persons to receive the Nancy Wimmer Award. The vote was 7 for, 10 opposed, and the motion was declared defeated.

Honorarium Policy

President Hoyt then called for discussion on the APGA Honorarium Policy. He called on Dr. Dugan to present the background on this, and Dr. Dugan indicated that the matter had been discussed in the Membership Task Force and in the Constitution Committee. He indicated that the question is whether an Executive Council member is eligible to receive an Honorarium when he is invited to speak in a State Branch or other APGA group. He indicated that it is clear that the Executive Director can not accept an Honorarium for speaking to APGA related groups, and pointed out that the question might well be whether such a group is willing to make a contribution to the APGA Memorial Fund. He further indicated that whether the President or another member of the Executive Council should accept an Honorarium is covered by an Article in the present Constitution which specifies a policy on this question.

Dr. Noble commented that he did not feel that an Executive Officer should accept an Honorarium. He stated that he was not sure that this should also apply to the elected APGA officers and questioned whether the elected divisional officers should not be covered by still a different policy. Attention was called to a motion made in the November, 1965 Executive Council (Motion to adopt the following policy).

"A constitutionally elected or appointed officer of the Association shall not accept an honorarium from a constitutionally established unit of the Association.

Constitutionally established units of the Association that need visits, as determined, shall have the expenses of the officer paid by the Association.

Constitutionally established units of the Association that seek visits, shall be expected to pay the expenses of the officer who is invited, or, be encouraged to pay at least half of the expenses, or, if such expenses cannot be paid at all (or if only part of the expenses can be paid) the invitation should be referred to the Executive Director for the determination by staff consultation as to the need for such a visit and the ability of the budget to encompass such a visit.

It shall be understood that the principles and practices enunciated in the foregoing policy statements apply to members of the Headquarters staff.

These policies would carry the following conditions:

1. The policies relating to travel and honoraria would apply to persons beginning at the time of the official announcement of the election ballots in the Guidepost, namely about January 1 of each year. Therefore, notice of this policy will be sent to persons who are invited to appear on the nominations ballot.

2. The policies relating to travel and honoraria will apply to all officers of the Association and this is construed to include Divisional officers as well as APGA officers.

3. Nothing in the aforestated policies regarding expenses and honoraria will apply to any officer on activities outside the Association."

Dr. Ehrle commented that this motion did not include anything about state branch presidents being covered by this policy. In commenting, on last year's motion, Dr. Scott questioned whether the category of elected officers of the Association covers state branch presidents also. He also indicated that he could report that the officers should not profit from being officers. Dr. Walz commented that as he recalled it that statement from last year had included an item that branches would first be approached as to their ability to pay. Dr. Williamson commented that as he recalled an open invitation had been given to branches to invite officers of the Association to speak. Dr. Borow again called attention to the article in the present constitution and questioned the exact definition of the policy. He noted that the article states that none of the officers of the Association shall receive any payment for their services, and he questioned what would be the definition of services to the Association. He felt that an interpretation of this was needed to include a state branch and chapter of the Association. Dr. Goldman commented that he felt that the interpretation might be that no topic would be assigned and that the person would be appearing before the branch or other group primarily as a representative of the Association. Dr. Shimberg commented that it might be clarified by saying that if an officer goes to the branch to tell the group about the Association he is speaking in his officer's role and should not be reimbursed. If, however, he is going to speak in his professional role on a special topic he should be reimbursed. Dr. Borow responded that the distinction is not clear cut and that it would really be very difficult if not impossible to make such a distinction. Dr. Goldman commented that we must avoid making the APGA elected officer liable to make the judgment on the matter. He thought it was important to develop objective guidelines to follow in making such a decision. He felt that one criterion might be the specification of a topic, and indicated that a local branch group should not be able to assign a specific professional topic if it wants the officer to come without reimbursement. Dr. Isaksen questioned whether the theme of the meeting would be considered a topic and Dr. Goldman answered that he felt that this should be interpreted as an assigned topic. Dr. Walz expressed agreement with the objective criteria idea, but commented that no matter what the criteria when a person who is an officer of the Association is invited to speak it is at least partly because he is an APGA officer. He indicated that he realized that there might be some financial penalty involved but indicated as an officer of the Association a person will be considered a representative of the Association regardless of the topic involved. Dr. Scott questioned whether the definition should also include consultant's fees. There was general agreement among the Council members that it would not.

Dr. Borow commented that it might be best to consider that determination should not be made on the matter of the topic chosen, but rather on the type of the

inviting group. Dr. Ehrle stated that he felt that there should be provision that if any local Association insists on paying honorarium that this could then go to the APGA Memorial Fund with indication to the agency that this is being done. Dr. Borow commented that the Constitution Committee should possibly take a look at the situation and re-state the policy. He indicated that he did not think that this matter should be acted upon now. Dr. Noble commented that there are two points needing clarification. First, are state branch presidents and local presidents both covered and also is the president-elect of a branch covered. The second point is that we must assure that the statement on honorarium policy reaches people before they accept nomination for office. Dr. Shimberg agreed that we need to have a good procedure to assure that information on this policy gets out to perspective nominees. Dr. Noble asked whether there needs to be a central office clearhouse to try to get more officers to visit state branch groups. Dr. Isaksen commented that he did not believe that branch and chapter office are considered officers of the Association. Dr. Shimberg agreed but felt that it needs to be clarified as to whether or not local officers are considered officers of the Association and whether or not the honorarium policy applies to them. It was pointed out that the statement in the Constitution included only APGA officers and defines them. However, the action taken on honoraria received by the Executive Council last Fall did include all members of the Executive Council.

Dr. Dugan reported that some of the Headquarters staff members have been offered University teaching assignments. He felt that a policy on this should also be developed and indicated that no policy exists to cover this kind of request. Dr. Hardee commented that she favors teaching involvement by the staff as long as discretion is used. Dr. Scott questioned whether this is a decision for the Council to make. He indicated that he felt it would be an internal personnel policy and should be left up to the Executive Director. Dr. Goldman agreed but expressed the feeling that the judgment must be made in terms of not interfering with the staff members duties to the Association. He felt that this is the only criterion that need be used. In summarizing the honorarium discussion, Dr. Scott commented that the sense of last year's motion had been that no officer, employee, or member of the council, could except an honorarium for services to a branch. This applies to honorarium only, and did not imply that the individual could not receive payment for his expenses. Dr. Williamson suggested the appointment of a committee to draft a resolution on this policy for action by the Council later in the meeting. There was general agreement that a new resolution is needed to clarify the policy. It was then moved by Dr. Shimberg and seconded by Dr. Borow that: Dr. Winfield Scott be appointed as a committee of one to review and as necessary to clarify the action that was approved by the Executive Council in November, 1965. Motion passed. The meeting recessed at 5:15 p.m. on Wednesday, November 16, 1966.

Executive Council: November 17, 1966

The second session of the APGA Executive Council opened Thursday, November 17 at 9:10 a.m. with the same people in attendance as on Wednesday.

President Hoyt opened the meeting by calling for a report from Dr. Shimberg who has served as chairman of the Sub-Committee on Finance that had met last evening. Dr. Shimberg commented that he would report first on the financial report on the sale of the property. He felt that the Council should wait for action on the proposed revised budget until a later point at which time decisions might have been made on some requests for funds that are before the Council. He commented that it has been possible to tighten the budget so that we will end the fiscal year in the black. Although, he indicated that there is a need to watch finances very closely. He suggested that the Council first take action to consolidate all of the checking accounts into a single account to cut down on internal paper work and on the number of checks needed. He indicated that this would not have any affect on the reserve and savings accounts.

It was then moved by Dr. Shimberg and seconded by Dr. Noble that: The Executive Council authorize the APGA Central Office to consolidate the current checking accounts of APGA and its several Divisions into a single account. Motion passed.

Dr. Shimberg then continued his report and took up the matter of sale of the APGA property. He indicated that a sub-committee had endorsed the recommendation of the Finance Committee that the APGA property be sold as soon as possible and that this recommendation should be presented to the 1967 Senate meeting. He suggested that the resolution as presented to the Senate be framed by APGA staff to incorporate the following elements: (1) authority to sell the building should be vested in a committee made up of the President, Treasurer, and Executive Director. Further that this committee be empowered to consummate the sale for any price which provides an equity in excess of \$500,000. In the event that an offer is received which would yield less than a \$500,000 equity, the Executive Director, the President, and the Treasurer shall consult with the Finance Committee and its chairman. If the Finance Committee agrees that the price is the best obtainable at this particular time and that the sale would be in the best interest of APGA, the deal would be consummated. Dr. Shimberg further commented with some suggestions on the presentation to the Senate that had come out of the Sub-Committee report. He indicated that in the reasoning that led to the recommendation to sell the property the Finance Committee and Executive Council Sub-Committee felt that (1) The people who bought the property should be commended for their foresight. (2) The Building and Grounds Committee report would be stronger if between now and the Convention an augmented Building and Grounds Committee visits the building and presents a report citing why the building is no longer adequate. (3) The Finance Committee Chairman should summarize why it would not be sound policy to invest funds in renovation of the present property and should also clarify how the sale figure was arrived at. (4) The Executive Director should indicate to the Senate some of the alternatives under

study for a short and long term solution of the space problems. This should include various long term alternatives to come before the Senate for approval before any final decisions are made. In summary, a careful case should be prepared for the Senate.

Moved by Dr. Shimberg and seconded by Dr. Black: The Executive Council endorses the recommendation of the Finance Committee that the present property be sold as soon as possible and that the former motion include the concept that authority is vested in a committee of the Executive Director, the President and the Treasurer, and that this committee be empowered to negotiate the sale.

Dr. Shimberg commented that the intent was that this motion be approved by the Executive Council and that it then go before the Senate as a motion for action by the Senate to support this recommendation of the Council. Dr. Noble commented that he felt we must be careful to set the minimum amount for sale and that we should vote on this and reserve the thought of being able to sell under any circumstances as a separate issue. Dr. Shimberg then restated his motion and the revised motion was seconded by Dr. Black that: The Executive Council requests authority from the Senate to sell the property provided the sale yields not less than \$500,000 and that the authority to consummate the sale be vested in a committee of the President, Executive Director, and Treasurer of the Association. A vote was called for on the revised motion, and the motion passed.

It was then moved by Dr. Shimberg and seconded by Dr. Munger that: In the event an offer is received which would yield less than \$500,000 total equity, that the special Committee be empowered to consummate the sale provided the Finance Committee concurs that such a move will be in the best interest of the Association. It was interpreted that in this motion concurrence of the Finance Committee would mean majority vote. There was general agreement with this motion and Dr. Noble commented that he felt that these two items should be presented to the Senate as separate recommendations. A vote was then called for on the motion and the motion passed.

President Hoyt then asked for comments on how this matter should best be presented to the Senate for action. It was agreed that the APGA headquarters office would prepare a plan for presentation and that this would be circulated to the Executive Council for comments and approval. Following comments by the Executive Council, it was agreed that a final presentation would be prepared and circulated to members of the Senate. Dr. Jaques asked whether the current President Elect should be included as a part of the small committee empowered to negotiate the sale of the property. There was general agreement that this should be done and the wording of the motion was amended to include the new President who is now President Elect as a member of the negotiating committee.

Dr. Goldman then remarked that a long term commitment for housing the Association cannot be made without Senate approval. He indicated that it must be

perfectly clear to the Senate that they will be consulted before a firm decision on long term housing is made. Dr. Goldman commented that if we agree to this, it means a minimum of one year delay to get approval to replace the present building. He suggested several alternatives on this to go to the Senate: (1) The Council could ask for blanket approval to do what it feels best; (2) The Council could ask for blanket approval in a limited sense; (3) Between now and the Senate meeting the Committee could look into possibilities and come before the Senate with specific proposals.

He felt that it would be unfortunate if we can now get nothing more than approval to sell the building and have to wait for at least a year to replace the quarters. Dr. Hoyt commented that the Finance Committee could be directed to study alternatives and possibly present some advice at the Council meeting prior to the Dallas Convention. Dr. Shimberg then indicated that he felt the important thing was to provide assurance to the Senate that they will have some control and will be consulted over future property of the Association. He stated that he felt short term arrangements could be made to house the Association without Senate approval and that indeed this probably would be necessary if the present property is sold.

Moved by Dr. Scott that: A recommendation be made to the Senate concerning housing of APGA during any interim period which will include the placement of responsibility for making arrangements. (The intent of this motion is that we would bring the various possibilities of arrangements that might be made to the Council and the placement of responsibilities with the Executive Committee or some designated members of this group with authority for making arrangements.) There was no second to this motion and it was dropped. After some discussion it was generally felt that further discussion on this matter was needed.

Dr. Shimberg then mentioned two other points from the Sub-Committee on Finance meeting. First, a request from the Branch Committee that a directory of branch officers be published. He indicated that the committee could be assured that this can be done within the present budget by inserting a directory as a removable center section in a future issue of the Guidepost issued just prior to the convention. In the discussion it was indicated that the Guideposts remaining to be issued for the current year are generally quite long and it might not be possible for this to be done. Dr. Noble commented that at the Executive Council should decide whether or not the publishing of a directory is something that needs to be done and if they decide that it does then it should be left to the headquarters staff to work out details. Dr. Dugan commented that the earliest possible issue of the Guidepost in which such a directory could be printed would be after the January issue. Dr. Hoyt commented that this request had actually been made at the last Executive Council meeting but had been taken from the budget due to finances. He indicated that the present financial status would seem to indicate that we cannot afford to do this this year. It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Jaques that: The Executive Council endorses the idea of providing a permanent record of a directory of officers and this shall be accomplished within administrative procedures of the headquarters office providing it be done without increase in the budget. Motion passed.

Dr. Shimberg called attention to the request from the Branch Committee that a Branch Presidents Workshop be held just prior to the Dallas Convention and that holding such would require the amount of \$500. He indicated that the Finance sub-committee is sympathetic to this request and recommends that a contingency fund of \$500 be established in the budget to be used only in the event that the funds for this event cannot be realized in some other way. Possibly it could be taken from funds already allotted to the Branch Committee or some funds that may be remaining in other committee budgets at the time of the Convention. He indicated that the committee felt that only in the event the \$500 could not be found within these other sources would the contingency fund be used. This would mean that the item would need to be shown in the approved revised budget to be passed by the Council. It was then moved by Dr. Shimberg and seconded by Dr. Noble that: A \$500 contingency fund be set up to be used for providing the branch workshop under the terms as outlined in the sub-committee's recommendation. Motion passed.

President Hoyt next called for action on the report of the Professional Preparation and Standards Committee and introduced Robert Callis and Wray Strowig to present their report. First, however, he called upon Dr. Koplitz, who had served as chairman of the sub-committee which studied the PPS report last evening. Dr. Koplitz opened his report indicating that the sub-committee had studied the document on accreditation as proposed by the sub-committee of the PPS Committee. He indicated that the sub-committee had been unable to reach agreement on recommendations, and therefore, proposed that the entire report be presented to the Executive Council for discussion and decision.

The President then called upon Dr. Wray Strowig, Chairman of the PPS Committee, to present his report. Dr. Strowig opened his report by outlining the background which led to the appointment of the sub-committee on accreditation from the PPS Committee. He indicated about a year ago he had received a letter from the Executive Director indicating the need for the Association to develop a plan on accreditation. At the 1966 Convention, the PPS Committee discussed the matter and at that time decided to appoint a sub-committee to make a special study. The sub-committee was appointed to be chaired by Robert Callis.. At the time of appointment of the sub-committee, it has been agreed that the sub-committee would have a free hand to examine the whole accreditation question without feeling bound by an APGA or division policy. Last spring a meeting was held with representatives of the National Commission on Accreditation and with representatives of all the organization within NCA. (NCA is a holding corporation for any association dealing with matters of accreditation in higher education. This is a policy-making body of Presidents of colleges and universities.) In the meeting last spring, there was discussion of what possibilities would be for accrediting in the personnel and guidance field. From that meeting it was felt that the possibilities were poor. APGA was invited to make further deliberation. Dr. Strowig indicated that this was not the first attempt of APGA to do something about accreditation and that some of the divisions had also been working on development of statements on the role and functions of personnel and guidance workers and actual standards for accreditation. He indicated that we must also recognize that NCATE has been accrediting counselor education programs on its own. He indicated further

that the NCATE accrediting has been with the approval of NCA. Dr. Strowig indicated that there is also some defacto accreditation going on in some of the government agencies much of which is in non-school settings.

Dr. Strowig then continued that following the meeting NCA the sub-committee on accreditation held a meeting of the committee and pointed out that financial limitations of the Association imposed a geographical limitation on committee membership. Dr. Black asked for clarification of the charge that had been made to the committee concerning accreditation and Dr. Strowig replied that the charge was to make a study with a review of making specific proposals to the Executive Council. Dr. Shimberg commented that it seems that there is now a proposal before the Executive Council and the present issue is whether or not the Council will approve it. Dr. Williamson commented that there was some question whether those who train counselors in higher education are also qualified to prepare student personnel workers. He expressed the question as to whether whole range of counselor education is adequately covered in the report as presented. Dr. Hoyt pointed out that the document before us comes to the entire Council with full approval of the complete PPS Committee and that the Committee has recommended it to the Council for approval. Dr. Williamson expressed concern with establishing the relationship with fields outside of those covered by our division. He also indicated that we must be careful to develop internal relations and that we need a broader involvement than with just the APGA divisions. Dr. Tennyson expressed the feeling that it has been appropriate for us to get this started within our own organization, but now we may need to involve other groups. Dr. Munger commented that we should not be delayed in our actions by any higher education question when we are now ready to act on secondary and elementary standards.

At this point Dr. Strowig continued his presentation of the sub-committee on accreditation activities. He indicated that at the meeting last May with NCA, dealing in its own field, it believed that counselor education needed firmer action. He indicated that the talk later turned to the possibility of getting accreditation done by some inter-media agency and that acceptance of this concept by NCA was quite encouraging. He indicated that following that meeting that the sub-committee had met and completed the first draft of a report, and that was ready for action. He indicated that this third draft had been approved by the PPS Committee before submission to the Council. He noted that the proposal asks APGA to request the National Commission on Accreditation for a liaison committee to meet with APGA to develop mutual satisfactory proposals. He also pointed out that the proposal is talking about operational machinery and is not talking about standards for accreditation. He indicated that the PPS Committee did not feel that it would be appropriate for this committee to undertake the development of specific standards for accreditation. He indicated that there was a need to think in terms of at least three to five years before accreditation could actually be done.

Dr. Hoyt next called for a report from Dr. Robert Callis, chairman of the sub-committee on accreditation from the PPS Committee. Dr. Callis called attention

to the wording of the proposal that had been presented to the Council and pointed out that in the statement mentioning "counselor educators" that this should be changed to read professors who are engaged in counselor and personnel preparation programs. He indicated that the intent was to be certain that the statement said graduate level professors rather than administrators.

He then continued that the sub-committee is proposing to improve and expand existing accreditation. He indicated that it is not a matter of establishing accreditation since this is already being done in a large number of areas of concern to APGA. He indicated that the sub-committee is also convinced that the accreditation that is now being done is being done exclusively by NCATE and that while this is good but a need exists for improvement. Dr. Callis indicated that the NCATE authorization authorizes them to accredit only in educational settings. He stated that the committee also learned that the guidelines include the fact that they will not allow any accreditation by a separate professional association but that it must be done by institutions or bodies represented by institutions. He also pointed out that there will be no increase in accrediting agencies. He indicated that the third guideline is that the general policy is to have accreditation of graduate schools as a whole and not by segments, and that this would be done by regional accrediting associations.

If there is accreditation of a speciality such as personnel work it would be on a national basis rather than regional. Dr. Callis indicated that with this informational background the sub-committee first reviewed the question of the need for accreditation for personnel and guidance. He indicated that the need varied in the various specialities but on the whole there was a definite need. The sub-committee first decided that it should not deal with content or standards but should concern itself to the implementation and structure of accreditation. The sub-committee recognized that there would probably be speciality accreditation but did not feel that this was part of its charge. The committee next felt that the influence of the Association should be summarized and in line with NCA policy. The proposal now before the Council is designed to be as close to the NCA desires and intent as possible.

Dr. Callis further indicated that the committee realized that there is no possible way of establishing accreditation outside of NCATE. The Committee feels that it is also necessary to provide a way for all interested individuals and groups to be able to get their ideas in the group of accrediting officials and to have such ideas considered. There is a need to get accreditation expanded so that we can eventually ask that funds be appropriated through legislation that will go only to accredited institutions.

In summary, Dr. Callis stated that the sub-committee is recommending that the Council adopt the proposal on page twelve of the document now before the Council. He indicated that the sub-committee does not propose that the entire proposal as such be approved but are only asking for a liaison committee appointment to continue the study. He expressed that accreditation would take five to seven years at a

minimum to become operational. He indicated also that the committee believed that there should be wide ranging consultation with other related professional associations but did not feel that it was a part of the sub-committee to undertake this.

Dr. Hoyt then summarized that the sub-committee is asking the Council to move that APGA's request from NCA for a liaison committee to study problems of accreditation. He asked whether the committee is also asking the Council to approve their plan for accreditation. Dr. Strowig responded that the sub-committee is simply bringing the first 11 pages of its report for information and is asking only for approval of the recommendation on page 12 for a liaison committee.

Dr. Hardee commented that she felt that historical actions need review, and also that we need to know the present feeling of NCATE with respect to accrediting criteria. Dr. Callis indicated that the sub-committee had gone into this matter in its deliberations. Dr. Hoyt pointed out that the first 11 pages of the report constitute the study that the Executive Council had asked this committee to make. However, page twelve contains the recommendation that the committee is bringing to the Executive Council. Dr. Isaksen expressed the opinion that the Council cannot approve the recommendation on page twelve without also giving approval to the first 11 pages. He felt that we should not establish communication with NCA if by doing so we would encourage participation in NCATE.

Dr. Callis remarked that the Council needs to keep in mind three main points: (1) Do we want a structure that will maximize the influence of the profession in accreditation; (2) Do we want to get all accreditation in personnel and guidance under a single accrediting agency; (3) Do we want to provide channels for all ideas in accreditation.

Dr. Noble asked whether approval of page twelve meant that a group would be set up but the Executive Council would have veto power over any proposal coming from such a group.

President Hoyt asked that Dr. Greenleaf, who was sitting on the Council meeting as an observer be permitted to speak on the proposal now before the Council. Dr. Greenleaf commented that the Association represents a great number of different areas and that there is no one answer to the preparation of student personnel workers. She expressed concern that within our Association we should be allowed flexibility. She further expressed concern that the information contained in this proposal has not been communicated to the membership and she also indicated a concern that action on the proposal would affect developing relationships with NCATE and further inter-divisional groups. Dr. Strowig then commented that he felt that the sub-committee should be complimented on the speed with which it got recommendations back to the Council. He indicated that the PPS Committee did not feel that it was this committee's responsibility to make contact with other associations but felt that the Executive Council should do this. Dr. Callis added that the committee did not take into consideration the actual accreditation content but rather limited its

deliberations to structure. Dr. Greenleaf questioned whether it would be desirable to withhold action on this proposal until the next meeting of the Council. Dr. Williamson remarked that he would feel better that instead of proposing action on the item on page 12, the Council took time to go outside of APGA to meet with our Associations first.

Dr. Jaques asked whether it would be possible for the Council to pass a proposal for continuing study of the problem of accreditation and that we might explore with NCA the appropriateness of working through NCATE or through some other groups. Dr. Walz commented that we can talk about the need for greater deliberation and study but, that the fact is, things are now being done that have great effect on counseling. He thought that we should not rush groups but at the same time we should not go too slow with those groups within APGA that now have standards. He felt that it might now be appropriate to take the proposal on page 12 and say that a committee be appointed to meet with APGA representatives and representatives of other appropriate associations. It was then moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Munger that: APGA request that NCA appoint a liaison committee to meet with APGA representatives and representatives of other appropriate associations with a view to developing a proposal for accreditation in personnel and guidance that will be based on the following points (include the three points that Callis suggested). Dr. Noble expressed the hope that APGA would be involved in this. He indicated that he would feel happy to have APA as our accrediting association rather than NCATE. Dr. Shimberg wondered whether the request to set up a committee with NCA is not jumping the gun. He indicated that he would feel better if we recognized the problem and established to bring together and discuss the issue with groups that are appropriate and then have that group meet with NCA. Dr. Scott commented that perhaps the next step should be to authorize the PPS Committee and the Sub-Committee to expand deliberations to include other organizations outside of APGA to work on the problem of developing an approach to NCA. Dr. Isaksen withdrew his motion in favor of a new motion to incorporate Dr. Scott's ideas. Dr. Munger however declined to withdraw his second to the Isaksen motion and expressed the feeling that there is a need to move fairly fast toward discussions with NCA. Dr. Greenleaf commented that she believes we need to have an inter-organizational action before going to NCA. Dr. Williamson agreed that he did not feel joining with NCA is appropriate at this time.

Dr. Earle commented that he believed the need to go fairly fast is a problem but he did not believe that we have completely assessed all the facts. He felt that it may be premature when we do not have standards at this time. Dr. Noble then asked what associations we are referring to in talking about other groups to be involved. He asked how many organizations we are talking about and what kind of representation we expect them to have. Dr. Scott commented that it seems the Council is in agreement on the principle of inviting interested groups. He felt that is we agree on this then we should leave it to the Committee to spell out who the groups will be. Dr. Walz commented that in the development of standards, APGA is concerned with working closely with other groups. He suggested that we propose a structure that will not take effect in any area until there are standards developed. He felt it would be helpful to other groups to have experience of the

groups that have already developed standards. Dr. Callis commented that the Sub-Committee did not feel it their responsibility to make any proposals on time. Dr. Isaksen then proposed s substitute motion that: APGA appoint a committee to meet with representatives of other appropriate associations with the view to developing a proposal for accreditation and that this group be guided by the three points as follows: (include the three points mentioned by Callis in earlier remarks).

The substitute motion was seconded by Dr. Goldman. Dr. Scott then asked that the motion be amended to place reponsibility with the PPS Committee and Sub-Committee on Accreditation, and propose a substitute motion that: APGA request that its PPS Committee meet with representatives of other associations with a view to developing a proposal for accreditation in personnel and guidance. There was no second to this amendment and it was dropped. Commented that it might be better to simply have persons from the PPS Committee serve as representatives rather than designating the entire Committee for this purpose. Dr. Strowig indicated that he felt in agreement with the principle of bringing other organizations into the picture at this point. He indicated that this will prolong any move toward a proposal for accreditation. He indicated that delyaing would hurt those divisions that now have standards are are about ready to make definite moves toward accreditation and he indicated that he did not feel this action constitutes endorse-ment of the proposal presented. Dr. Callis expressed agreement with the comments from Dr. Strowig and indicated as the motion now stands is does not appear there is confidence in the PPS or the Sub-Committee to do the job the Council is asking to have done. At this point the meeting recessed at 12:10 p.m. and reconvened at 1:35 p.m. The afternoon session opened with a continuation of the discussion on the matter of accreditation. President Hoyt first asked Dr. Callis to comment and call attentioned to the fact that a motion is on the floor for Council action.

Dr. Callis commented that he did not feel the motion as it now stands is proper for action by the Council. He indicated that he favored the original motion more and felt that this should be one of the two next steps. He pointed out that NCA is the association of College and University Presidents. He indicated tha t the liaison committee we are talking about is to include persons from this group. Dr. Callis suggested that the motion now on the floor be withdrawn and the original motion be passed. He indicated that as a second step might ask the Executive Council to select the representatives from the various institutions. He suggested that a specific person could go to each of the organizations to provide information. He felt that both steps, contact with organizations, and contact with NCA should be taken up as next steps. He indicated that such action would not commit anyone to following the proposal as outlined on page 1-11 of the report. He further emphasized that in the explanation no one would be authorized to commit APGA to anything and that representatives should be so instructed. Dr. Goldman commented that we must recognize the different points of view. He asked whether we could be assured that the group, on behalf of APGA, which goes to NCA would be sure to represent the various points of view. He indicated that we should be sure the group represents all of thse view points. Following further discussion, the motion currently on the

the floor was withdrawn and at this point it was moved by Dr. Goldman and seconded by Dr. Koplitz that: APGA recommends (get wording from page 12 for the recommendations) that will be based on the following three points (also include same three principles as mentioned before by Callis) added to the motion the fact that APGA meet with other appropriate associations (the group to be picked by the Council) and that the Council designate specific liaison persons to meet with appropriate organizations to develop criteria. Dr. Tennyson commented that this seems to call for one committee as a liaison group with NCA and at the same time another group to work with other associations. Following further discussion it was suggested that the motions and amendments now on the floor be withdrawn and that a new motion be presented to combine all of these points. Dr. Goldman commented that Council members are thinking too much in terms of their divisional representation rather than as members of the APGA Council. He expressed the feeling that we are in a position where we must not think of specialties but rather of the Association as a whole.

The pending motions and amendments were withdrawn and it was then moved by Dr. Goldman and seconded by Dr. Isaksen that: APGA appoint liaison representatives to meet with NCA and other interested groups to explore the possibilities of accreditation of personnel and guidance. Such liaison representatives to be guided by these following points:

1. That a proposal should include provisions to maximize the influence, support and concern of the profession of personnel and guidance.
2. That all accreditation of preparation programs in personnel and guidance be under a single accreditation agency.
3. That such proposals provide channels for all ideas regarding standards and criteria to have representation.

Dr. Borow commented that it is very important to work on both fronts at the same time and noted the fact that we have a group that will explore possibilities and does not assume we will try to get ahead of other associations. He felt that if we simply tried to work with other groups first before meeting with NCA, it would only delay things. A vote was then called for on the Goldman motion, and the motion passed. (13 for - 2 against)

It was then moved by Dr. Williamson and seconded by Dr. Scott that: The Executive Council expresses its appreciation to the PPS Committee and to the Sub-Committee on Accreditation for the work that they have done and wishes to comment that the report of this committee is in keeping with the fine work of the PPS Committee over the years. Motion passed.

President Hoyt commented that it is now necessary to decide on the membership for the Committee and Dr. Scott suggested that this should be left in the hands of the PPS Committee. Dr. Noble expressed concern that the PPS Committee does not have on the Committee people who can best do the liaison work with other associations.

He suggested that possibly the Council should appoint people. Dr. Goldman suggested that the President draw up a slate of names and present these to the Council for action. Mr. McGough suggested that each Division President recommend a list of organizations and possible representatives to contact. It was agreed that this would be done.

President Hoyt then called attention to the position paper on Support Personnel that had been presented by the PPS Committee and indicated that this now requires action by the Executive Council.

It was moved by Dr. Williamson and seconded by Dr. Eharle that: This report be accepted with approval.

Dr. Noble expressed the opinion that at this point we are in a poor position to be naming activities of sub-professional technical assistants. He stated that he believes such a statement is premature. President Hoyt reminded the group that this statement has been prepared at the request of the Executive Council and commented that the Council is now being asked whether or not it can accept the report. Dr. Williamson commented that he feels this report does state the position of APGA but does not make any commitments. Mr. McGough agreed that he hopes this will be accepted. He expressed the feeling that on the preparation of support personnel it would appear that there should be a little more specific. He felt that there should have been on the committee some people who had been involved in the preparation of support personnel. Dr. Shimberg asked what acceptance of the report would mean, and President Hoyt replied that acceptance would mean that the statement could serve as a position statement to put the Association in favor of support personnel. Dr. Tennyson called attention to the statement on referral on page 12 of the report. He indicated the feeling that this is a professional function and should normally be carried out by a person with professional qualifications. He proposed an amendment to the motion on the floor that: The report be accepted with the exception of statement two on page 12 of the statement and that this should be removed. This amendment was moved by Dr. Tennyson and seconded by Dr. Noble. In commenting, Dr. Strowig advised that the document clearly states that the activities of support people take place under supervision of the counselor. He indicated that a second point is that the activities outlined are illustrative. The Committee did not intend to do more than put down some general principles. He indicated that the Council should not regard the illustrative activities as anything more than that. The vote was then called for on the Tennyson amendment and the amendment was defeated. (3 for - 10 against) Dr. Noble commented that he felt it was premature to try to distinguish between professional and sub-professional activities. Dr. Scott indicated agreement with this viewpoint and felt that the Association would be in a stronger position if we develop the kind of statement to indicate support personnel to work under close supervision of counselors. He felt that we should not get into detail such as there are contained in this report. Dr. Jaques commented that it is necessary to get a statement of policy on this matter since, in reality, sub-professional personnel are already functioning. Dr. Ehrle stated that he felt the Council should support this statement. He indicated that another issue is whether some functions of counselors

can be delegated to other partially trained personnel. He commented that actually this is really what is occurring now.

Dr. Scott commented that in the statement we are in effect saying that some of the aspects of counseling can be better performed by sub-professional personnel. Dr. Jaques suggested that the Council consider accepting the document up the middle of page six which would mean that the Council accept the principles but does not necessarily accept the document as presented.

It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Scott: This report on support personnel be tabled and brought up for action at a later time. A vote was called for and the motion was defeated.

A substitute motion was then made by Dr. Jaques and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Executive Council accept this statement of policy through page six without including the typical activities of support personnel. The intention of the motion is to delete the section on activities of support personnel contained on pages 6-14. A vote was called for on this substitute motion and the motion was defeated. (5 for - 9 against)

President Hoyt then called for a vote on the original motion to accept the statement with approval and the motion passed. (9 for - 6 against)

President Hoyt next called for discussion on the Constitution and asked that this begin with a report from Dr. Henry Borow who served as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Constitution which met on Wednesday evening.

Dr. Borow began his report by commenting that the group is variously referred to as Constitution Committee, By-Laws Committee, and Constitution Review Committee. He indicated that for purposes of this report he would call the group the Constitution Review Committee. He first brought up two procedural points. He indicated that it is first necessary to clarify the Council's role in receiving this report. He called attention to the fact that the Constitution Review Committee had been preparing a different kind of document for running the affairs of the Association. A report is now being brought to the Executive Council and the schedule calls for some kind of action on the proposed changes to take place at the Senate meeting at the Dallas Convention. He pointed out that under the present Constitution for action to be taken, the document must be in the hands of the membership by January. He indicated that the two documents prepared by the APGA attorney (the resolutions, and the memo to the Senate and members) are intended as models of the kind of documents that can be prepared on the recommendation of the Council to provide continuity between the old and new Constitutions. At the present time the Constitution Review Committee needs an endorsement in principle of the approach they are following. The Committee wants the Council to be particular about particular items but basically the task is to hear what the Committee has been doing and to then give endorsement of the principle with whatever specific recommendations the Council wants the Committee to consider. He indicated that the members of the

Sub-Committee of the Council that met last night had come to the meeting with ideas of better ways to state the items in several places in the suggested revision. In every instance, however, the Committee decided that the document now being presented is the best one that can be devised. He called attention to the reasoning in getting up a Constitution as it now stands and moving toward government by means of By-Laws only together with the Certificate of Incorporation will greatly streamline the operation and procedures. He indicated that the Council now has a draft of a set of revised By-Laws which include many of the items from our present Constitution plus a large number of proposed changes.

He indicated that last night's meeting had included discussions about the need to change the role of the Senate. He stated that the Sub-Committee is in agreement that the present Senate is not performing the role it should perform. Much of the work of the Constitution Committee centers on this point to permit a more effective role for the primary policy making body which is the Senate. The group last night dismissed the Executive Committee but kept a Senate and an Executive Council. The Executive Council would be renamed as the Board of Directors. The meeting had to do with what a body such as this is charged to do as part of its functions. The APGA attorney had recommended this as a name for the group to provide better definition of what its role should be. This group would be responsible for operational policy. All voted on the suggestion for the composition of the Board of Directors and indicated that it was the feeling that this should be composed of the President and Past President of each Division. The intent of this was to get the best informed people possible and the committee felt the President-Elect could be learning while he was in that position and would then go on to the Board of Directors at the time he becomes President of the Division. The Board of Directors would also include the Past President, President, and President-Elect of APGA and would also include the Treasurer of APGA as a voting member of the Board. The Executive Director of the Association would be an ex-officio member of the Board of Directors and would not have a vote. In addition, there would be four elected Senators selected by the Senate membership would serve two year terms on the Board of Directors. This would give a body of about 25 Directors on the Board (16 from Divisions, 4 elected Senators, and 5 APGA officers). This group would be essentially the same as the present Council but the proposed revision provides no flexible arrangements for the Divisions to decide who their representatives will be.

Dr. Borow further reported that the Sub-Committee was in agreement with the proposal to have two Senators from each state branch of this Association. This would mean each branch would have two elected Senators; when a membership in a state exceeds 2,000, it would have third Senator; when it exceeds 3,000 it would have a fourth Senator. No state would be permitted to send more than four Senators. Dr. Borow stated that the Committee did not intend that the additions to the Senate in terms of growth of state memberships would cause the Senate to grow too large within the near future. The Senate would also include the five APGA officers, sixteen divisional presidents and past presidents, and the

APGA Past President who would be a member of the Board of Directors. It was recommended that the APGA Past President serve as the speaker of the Senate. The group felt that this would provide good contact between the two bodies.

Dr. Borow further commented that the recommendation for two year terms for representatives to the Senate provides for building experience and have continuity in Senate representation. The Sub-Committee has endorsed the principle that election to the Senate would be for two year terms. An exception would be the speaker who would be the speaker for just one year. The Sub-Committee also stressed that there would be an important need to make it possible to inform the new Senate as fully and as far in advance as possible about the issues on which action would be called for. It was noted too that under the new Constitution the term of the APGA Treasurer would be at the pleasure of the Council rather than a set three year term as at present.

Dr. Borow further commented that the Sub-Committee saw the work of the Senate as involving a three day fiscal meeting at the time of the Convention which would come before the program part of the convention begins. There could be additional meetings by a majority vote of the members of the Senate itself or by petition. It was felt that the cost of such meetings should be borne by the state branches for those Senators who represent state branches. This same form of subsidation should hold for any additional meetings the Senate feels it should have. For those members of the Senate not representing branches APGA would pay extra expenses for the extra days necessary but the person would be expected to pay his own travel expenses to the Convention site. In the case of those persons who could not come to the meeting if they had to pay their own expenses, the Sub-Committee felt we should encourage their institutions to pay their expenses. Another possibility would be for APGA to pay the expenses of such people. Third possibility might be to put \$200 per Senator into a contingency fund which averaging out should pay for expenses for all Senators.

Dr. Borow reported that the sub-committee had also discussed ways of increasing the role and influence of the Senate while still maintaining a balance between the duties of the Board of Directors and of the Senate. It had been suggested that the matter of formulation of policy recommendations was a correct and proper function for the Board of Directors but the question of policy determination should be a function of the Senate. There was a question as to whether this kind of separation could be made in actual functioning. Realistically, both bodies will be engaged in formulation of policy. It was felt that the Executive Director should bring matters to the attention of these bodies which also in a sense constitute policy recommendations. The Board of Directors should formulate policy recommendations and will actually take action that will be subject to review and final approval of the Senate. The Senate is able at its physical meetings to formulate, to review, and to take action on matters of policy. The group believes the Senate is the final voice of authority on policy matters and the decision of the Board of Directors would be subject to final review of the Senate.

It was suggested that the actual separation of duties and functions within the broad statement of policies and that the particular assumption and discharge of functions will be determined over the years with experience. Dr. Borow expressed the opinion that it would be a mistake for the Constitution Review Committee and the Executive Council to go too far in defining the particular functions of each of the bodies, the Board of Directors, or the new Senate.

Dr. Borow next directed the Council's attention to a series of points contained in the proposed By-Laws themselves. (changes that were made will be inserted in the final draft of the minutes)

Attention was called to the item on nominations and elections procedures and it was pointed out that this applies only to the APGA elections and in no way affects the Division nominations or elections operations. It was noted, however, that there is a problem on Division nominations. Division were urged to continue studying their present methods in an attempt to provide improvements. The By-Laws might not need to provide much detail but rather they should permit a separate guidelines or manual for operational use. Dr. Dugan commented that the APGA attorney had advised that much detail in the By-Laws should be eliminated and that there then should be operational guidelines for such specific actions in a separate document. Dr. Borow commented that the proposed changes would change the relationship between APGA and Divisions. Attention was directed to the section on publication and it was indicated that the group felt that to remove the publications powers from the Divisions would be to strip them of most of their power. Attention was called to the November 10 memorandum passed by the Publications Committee which indicated that the Council Sub-Committee felt that this motion should replace Article II of the proposed By-Laws. The recommendation of the Publications Committee comes to the Executive Council and to the Constitution Review Committee as a resolution, therefore, the Constitution Committee should re-draft this statement to replace what is now in the suggested By-Laws.

President Hoyt asked for comment by Dr. Vermilye, staff association for the Publications Committee, and on this motion from the Committee. Dr. Vermilye reported that the wording of the document now being discussed was not available to the Publications Committee when they met. The Publications Committee had discussed their chief concern which was to split the present large Publications Committee. Dr. Vermilye indicated that he does not feel the Publications Committee is anxious to take over Divisional responsibilities. They realize they have only recommending power in terms of Division publications. However, the present group would like to have two groups, the Publications Committee and a Board of Journal Editors.

Dr. Borow commented that the changes in the proposed documents were the result of deliberations last night. The Constitution Committee should be strongly

supported by the Council and should continue the kinds of specific recommendations given to this Council. Dr. Jaques commented that in principle this Committee recommends endorsement of the document. They would like to recommend certain changes for the Constitution Committee to consider. She stated that she does not believe there is anything basically different from the proposed document and noted that the statement now presented represents the APGA attorney's wording.

Dr. Scott then spoke concerning the lack of agreement on the role of the Senate and role of the Board of Directors. He indicated he believes there should be further study on this matter. He indicated that he does not believe the Senate can be an effective body if it simply reviews items from another body. He felt the Constitution Committee should study further the question of functions of both the two bodies. Dr. Borow responded that he feels there is a danger in being too specific in spelling out functions of these two bodies.

Dr. Isaksen commented that we have not had any discussions about when Senators would take office and we might want to consider having them take office on May 1 and then sit in on Senate meetings as observers so they will have some idea of the procedure before taking office.

Dr. Borow then commented that he feels the Branches are treated very fairly in the recommendations for primary policy making body of the new Senate. He indicated that we must also remind ourselves that we are still a federation of autonomous Divisions. He mentioned that we have moved from the idea of appointing a President Elect to appointing a Past President as speaker of the Senate. Therefore, this person can devote more interest to APGA rather than Divisional affairs. Dr. Noble expressed the concern that this will move all of the power into the state branches and also called attention to the fact that in the proposed By-Laws the Senate has the power to dissolve Divisions. It was noted that wording must be revised for both the dissolution of branches and dissolution of Divisions.

Dr. Goldman commented and questioned whether the change would cause state branches to dominate the Senate. He indicated that the odds are still in favor of the Board of Directors since that group is much better organized. He stated that the thought Senators would continue to see themselves as rubber stamps no matter what we do, and that the Board of Directors would continue to hold a balance of power. Dr. Hoyt noted that there will be many state branch Senators who will have been elected with more votes than member of the Executive Council received to be nominated.

Dr. Black commented that if we put this much emphasis on the Senate we will block out representatives of higher education. He indicated that state branches have much more representation from school people than from higher education. Dr. Fitzgerald responded that many states have an agreement whereby one year there is a school person and the next year a college person as the branch president. Dr. Jaques also commented that this kind of spread of representation is provided for

in the guidelines for forming a state branch. It was suggested that college personnel should become much more involved and active in state branch associations.

Dr. Noble noted that when a person joins APGA he is given membership in a Division but not in a state branch as part of his membership. He suggested that possibly the branches should send in dues to the national office and indicated that there is a need to provide safeguards that people in state branches who are not national members cannot vote for the branch representatives. Dr. Goldman suggested that there may be a possibility for election of APGA representatives being open to every member in the state whether or not they belong to a branch. This kind of think could be handled by a ballot being sent to every member to elect Senators in the states in which they reside, such balloting could be handled through the APGA national office. Dr. Isaksen commented that it would be necessary to provide for nominating power to reside in the branch. He suggested that the Constitution Committee should give some thought to enabling legislation to provide for transition from the old to the new Constitutional structure.

Dr. Goldman called attention to the sections on the By-Laws on page 3 and 4 concerning severance of membership. He expressed the feeling that there should be eliminated the provision for requiring two signatures and the Ethics Committee should serve as the fact finding body but the Board of Directors should make final judgment for expelling a member. Dr. Goldman further agreed that he felt this Executive Council should endorse the new set of By-Laws. He indicated that the Council should comment to the Constitution Review Committee and should make recommendations with the indication that we would be happy to see these in the revision and then endorse them for action by the Senate. Dr. Jaques asked clarification of what should go back to the Constitution Committee. She stated that she felt the Committee would consider suggestions and revision to the document in connection with the Committee's decision. Then a revised document would go to the Senate meeting in Dallas. Dr. Noble indicated that one piece of advice the Council might give would be that we do not feel there is time to come up with a finished document to be voted on at the Dallas Convention. He indicated that he does not think the report at Dallas should ask for action. It should spell out the possible revisions and then give people a year to think about the recommendation. Dr. Jaques commented that it would be necessary to get a document to the Senate members in January or February in order to have action at the Convention in Dallas.

Dr. Black questioned whether the Council Sub-Committee that met last night addressed itself to the question of the direction to which APGA would go if these By-Laws were accepted in terms of emphasis on branches and de-emphasis on Divisions. He also asked whether it would be consideration of the other items that had been brought up in today's discussion. Dr. Black further asked whether it would be advisable to point out some of the concerns and feed this to the committee for consideration so when the report to the Senate is presented there can be included

with the recommendations a description of what some of the changes would mean.

Dr. Scott commented that we should recognize that greater responsibility in the Senate will of necessity decrease responsibilities of the Board of Directors. Dr. Noble questioned whether the Senate should not establish its own committees rather than simply approve committees that are established by the Board of Directors. It was again pointed out that the proposed document does not list the conditions under which Divisions or branches could be dissolved and it was indicated that it is very important that such conditions be spelled out. Mention was made of the elimination of an Executive Committee and Dr. Borow indicated that the group that met last night did not feel strongly on this point. Dr. Noble pointed out that the new By-Laws would establish a situation where the only person able to act between meetings would be the Executive Director.

Dr. Dugan pointed out the fact that the proposed revision recommends a small number of standing committees. He advised that this had been suggested by the APGA legal counsel and that the recommendation of the attorney had been that there be a very few standing committees and that any other committees be designated as special committees. He indicated also that there probably should be an adequate definition of the function of the several standing committees as well as their purpose. There was specific mention of the policy committee as indicated in the revised By-Laws under standing committees and it was generally agreed that the role of such a committee should be clarified as a resolutions committee or the committee should be eliminated. Dr. Goldman indicated that he felt we need another year to complete the Constitution revision. He stated that he felt this should now go back to the Constitution Committee for whatever changes should be made. This should then be sent out prior to the Dallas Convention as a preliminary draft and gone over at the Senate meeting and Executive Council meetings in Dallas with the intention that it will come up for final action at the 1968 Senate meetings.

Dr. Hoyt reminded the Council that when this matter goes to the Senate that they can take action to approve the By-Laws as they are presented during the 1967 meeting.

It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Executive Council recommends to the Constitution Review Committee that they take the Council's suggestions and rework the document and get it out as a working paper to the Senate for discussion. It was the Executive Council's recommendation that action not be taken until 1968. Motion later withdrawn.

Dr. Scott commented that the Constitution Review Committee should bring its next revision to the Executive Council in Dallas and should go the Senate with any advice from the Council. A report to the Senate could go with the information that

it will be discussed in the Council and the Committee's final report to the Senate may be affected by Council action. Dr. Scott indicated that he does not feel this is ready to be sent out to the Senate in January. Dr. Noble commented that a communication to the Senate should be marked as a working paper but felt that we do need to give Senate members the information. Following this discussion, the motion made by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Munger was withdrawn.

The second session recessed at 5:30 p.m.

Executive Council
Third Session, Friday, November 18

Third Session, Friday, November 18, in attendance as on the previous day.
The third session opened at 9:10 a.m.

President Hoyt opened the meeting by calling attention to the fact that one major item remaining for Council action is approval of the revised budget. He advised that it would be necessary for the Council to take action on any items that might affect the budget, before final approval can be given. He suggested that the discussion begin with consideration of the International Relations matter. Dr. Hoyt begin the discussion by calling the Council's attention to the reports that had been given on Thursday evening. He stated that the Council must now consider the question of whether or not to continue membership in the International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance.

It was moved by Dr. Scott and seconded by Dr. Black that: The item of \$1,000 now in the budget and designated for dues in the International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance be transferred to the International Relations Committee and that responsibility be placed with the Executive Committee for determining how this money should be used. (Motion later was tabled)

Mr. McGough commented that he felt before taking action such as this that we should explore the alternatives. He indicated that he felt the results of the IAEVG Conference held recently indicated a fair representation of the countries involved. He stated that he does not feel this IAEVG is as weak as reports had indicated and stated that he feels it is premature to withdraw from the organization. He stated that there is a feeling that this country tends to talk at people from other countries and he indicated that he agrees we do get more from sitting down with people from other countries and developing more understanding. He stated foreign persons want involvement rather than someone standing and talking at them. He concluded by stating that he does not believe we should be in too much of a hurry to withdraw from this international organization. It was then moved by Mr. McGough and seconded by Dr. Hardee that: The motion made by Dr. Scott be tabled and that the Executive Council again take this matter up next spring in Dallas, at which time there be a report given by Dr. Super. The vote was called for on the motion to table and the motion passed (8 votes for, 5 votes against).

Dr. Jaques suggested an addition to this suggestion for having a report from Dr. Super that in the meantime the International Relations Committee should study the various alternatives in the international picture and should bring a full report to the next Executive Council meeting. Dr. Scott agreed that he felt we should have all of the information that can be gathered by an impartial group before the Council for action at the Dallas Convention. Dr. Ehrle commented that he feels the Association is confirming its commitment in the international area. He stated the belief that the International

Relations Committee in addition to finding ways to strengthen and participate should also be concerned with seeking ways to get funds from Foundations, government and so forth to support international activities.

It was then moved by Dr. Scott and seconded by Dr. Ehrle that: The Executive Council wishes to go on record as favoring the sentiment that APGA increase its activities in the area of International Relations. (Motion passed).

It was understood that this motion did not intend to imply that any more money be spent on international activities. Dr. Isaksen commented that he felt the International Relations Committee has a plan and the Council should give them support and assist them in locating funds to implement their plan. He stated that we should make an immediate survey and publish the results of our international activities as members of APGA. He suggested the possibility of including a questionnaire in the Personnel and Guidance Journal or in the Guidepost to get information for members and that results of such survey could then be compiled assistance to the committee in working towards development of international activities.

Dr. Walz commented on the invitation from the Japan Vocational Guidance Association to send representatives and he expressed the personal feeling that we might provide representation to that Conference with the suggestion that Henry Borow President-Elect of NVGA and Edmund Williamson, President-Elect of APGA, be designated as the representatives.

Following this discussion President Hoyt called for a vote on the motion to increase international activities. A vote was taken and the vote passed.

President Hoyt then called for discussion on the ERIC matter and first called for a report from Dr. Walz. Dr. Walz opened his report by outlining the background of ERIC and indicated that it had been set up in an attempt to solve the problem of retrieval of research information. He indicated that this had been supported by the Congress to develop a national information system to make it possible to identify an index and distribute information on matters related to educational research and educational resources. Guidelines that have been set up include the fact that they will not specify in what areas information centers will be set up and how they will operate. It will encourage people around the country to submit proposals on what areas they feel would profit and how such a center will operate. He indicated that the University of Michigan had become interested in how to improve information processing and had felt that one of the best ways was to provide means whereby every counselor or researcher could quickly obtain all available information on a particular concern. A person can use resources of the ERIC system to get this information. Michigan submitted a proposal for ERIC guidance and counseling and it was supported. Michigan is now one of 12 ERIC information centers now existing as part of the ERIC program. Basically this program is the idea that one will have available on microfiche a wide range of resources information on a given subject area. When someone raises a question the system is

searched and the person can obtain all available information on the subject. Basic to the system is the ability to retrieve the available professional literature. In our area much of the information is in the form of articles in professional magazines. Dr. Walz further indicated that they had spoken to all the APGA and Division editors about providing ERIC with copies of the Journals to be put into the ERIC system then anyone could go to the available index and locate everything published on a given document. The editors had responded to the request with enthusiasm. Such a system would eliminate such things as reprints that could be costly.

It appears that now the question was in the matter of copyrights. The issue is that unless the ERIC system has access to the published professional literature it really does not constitute a system in that particular subject. Unless the information is available on microfiche form it becomes a real information system. Dr. Walz stated that he believes the other professional areas are providing their assistance with all available professional literature and the issue is what kind of service APGA wants ERIC to provide for it.

Dr. Dugan clarified that this is a pressing issue for APGA and all the Divisions in terms of their publications. It is an issue with every major professional group that has research literature under copyright restrictions. The issue is whether APGA makes available not only research literature, but whether we make available all other documents which are contained in the Journals. Dr. Dugan then asked Dr. Vermilye to elaborate on the points.

Dr. Vermilye commented that there is a basic copyright problem involved. He pointed out that a variety of agencies have asked the Association to wave copyrights on materials available for sale and that in these requests the material is intended to be used in many ways. ERIC is an example of this kind of thing. He indicated that we have discussed abstracting of articles and he does not feel there need be any question raised with regard to this. He indicated that this is a concern only in the area where full documents are reproduced in entirety. The question the Publications Committee wants help on is whether we are right and fair as an Association to wave our copyrights on a publication to another Association who will in turn reproduce the entire thing and make it available at minimal cost to others while we have it available for sale. He pointed out that a full microfiche card would be available through ERIC system at about \$.09 per card.

Dr. Vermilye called attention to another request to establish a school research information service. They had asked us to provide them with certain copies so they can disseminate abstract and total reproductions.

Dr. Vermilye also pointed out that copyright laws are badly out of date and that we have no idea or guide as to what is happening in copyright laws at this time. He indicated that there is nothing in the present copyright bills to cover this kind of problem. He indicated too that amendments will probably be passed in the next session of Congress (1967) that will be a big step forward for people concerned with wider release of educational material under proper safeguard. To date however, there is nothing on the problem of copyrighted materials that can be reproduced and made available under these means. Dr. Vermilye concluded by saying that the Publications

Committee would like to have an Ad Hoc group explore this problem without intending to deny any system such as ERIC the privilege of reproducing this but to see what should be done.

Dr. Walz responded that what ERIC is asking is a reproduction release. He emphasized that this does not mean a release of the copyright but rather that the material can be reproduced. He stated that anyone who might receive the microfiche is not in a position to release the material. This would be a reproduction release only and not a release of the copyright. He stated also that it is important to realize that microfilm will never be competitive with the actual document. Microfiche must be used in a special reader and these are quite expensive. There would also need to be a separate microfiche card for each document reproduced since this is the only way the material can be indexed.

Dr. Noble asked whether it would be possible to order wither a microfiche or a printout in the case of ERIC and felt that this might change the situation. He stated that we should probably make all research available but wanted to know if it was ture that there will probably be a printout of the microfiche part put into effect. Dr. Walz replied that it is true that this can be done but at the present time the cost is about \$.10 per page. Dr. Noble asked whether if we give up our copyright on the materials can we change our minds about this at a later time.

Dr. Walz responded that the Association could certainly choose not to continue the arrangement but that he did not believe that copyright on back items could be retrieved.

Dr. Isaksen asked whether immediate action is needed on this request or whether it can wait for action by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Dr. Vermilye responded that the Publications Committee feels under no pressure but has held off answering certain requests received. He indicated that some material has been sent to ERIC upon specific request, but that this has been sent with some restrictions. He indicated that the Association has not responded to a general request for all articles.

Dr. Walz commented that we need to know in terms of staff training and work focus whether or not ERIC will be involved in this so that ERIC can plan on the work load. He indicated that any long delay would be a handicap in terms of the program. He felt that a decision is needed in terms of what ERIC will do. Dr. Black asked whether there is any guarantee as to how long ERIC will be funded.

Dr. Walz responded that the response to this system has been extremely good and the Office of Education feels this activity has very good support and on the basis of this response the Office of Education is very likely to continue to support the system. Dr. Black questioned that if we do this kind of thing for ERIC, whether we are committing ourself to do the same for other associations. He asked whether the Association should distinguish between a federal government project and some other group that might seek similar information.

Dr. Vermilye commented that another problem that has never been

42

dealt with is to what extent we grant other organizations to take articles and include them in books of readings. Dr. Isaksen suggested the need to have a policy on the sale of published materials to people who will make money on them in published books of readings.

Dr. Goldman remarked that we must make available the best distribution possible on our publications but that he does see a major problems here. He pointed out that possibly as libraries learn that they can get copies of materials on something such as the microfiche they may choose to get the materials in this way at a lower cost then to buy them from the Association in our published form. He indicated that this kind of thing could affect our entire budget arrangement. He indicated that he hoped action on this matter could wait until a committee could study the whole matter and could consult with other organizations.

Dr. Walz commented that he does not believe having material available on microfiche would affect the sale of publications to libraries. He indicated that he feels microfiche is a way of providing for particular persons doing research but that it does not fill the same need as having the document available. He also indicated that he feels that if a committee is appointed, action may take a long time and may hold up the program considerably.

Dr. Williamson felt that the Association has nothing to lose but a great deal to gain in the possibility of making material available for wider distribution. He expressed the feeling that we should make a distinction between publication of Journals and the problem of monographs. He suggested that in taking action these two items should be separated.

It was then moved by Dr. Williamson and seconded by Dr. Black that: The Executive Council authorizes the officers to sign the agreement with ERIC with regard to microfiche reproduction only of all journal publications including those of divisions with the possibility of establishing a provision for periodic review and that we authorize the Executive Committee to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to study the second problem of the microfiche reproduction rights and process with regard to materials other than Journal articles. (This motion was intended to cover agreement with the ERIC clearinghouse on guidance and counseling only). (Passed as amended).

Dr. Tennyson commented that he felt the Council should specify when a report should be made by the Ad Hoc Committee. Dr. Williamson commented that the Ad Hoc Committee should be made up of members of the Executive Council and that the matter should be brought up for further discussion at the next meeting of the Council in Dallas.

In speaking against the motion, Dr. Borow commented that he feels this action is in opposition to the stand of any other professional organization. He stated

that we are only giving permission to put their material on microfiche. He did not believe that our loss or profit would be great. He stated that he believes many of the people who could have material available on microfiche would still want to buy the actual monograph publication from us. Dr. Williamson commented that he personally is in favor of releasing all of our materials but did not believe that kind of motion would get through the Council. He therefore had proposed to compromise at this time and felt that the Council would be willing to vote positively if they had before them a report from the Ad Hoc Committee.

It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Scott that: The motion regarding ERIC be amended to provide ERIC with authorization for all of our publications and research and for the AD Hoc Committee to make decisions on similar requests from other organizations. (Motion amendment was passed).

Dr. Walz suggested that the best resolution might be for the Executive Council at its meeting next year to review the impact in terms of things actually being done. Then the Council could review what has occurred and if there were then concerns other decisions could be made. Dr. Goldman indicated that he will vote against the amendment to the motion but that he wanted the record to show that this does not indicate that he is against releasing material to ERIC but rather against taking action on short notice. He indicates that he believes we really need the time it would take for a Committee to discuss the matter and make recommendations.

Following the discussion President Hoyt called for a vote on the amendment to the motion and the amendment was passed. President Hoyt then called for a vote on the motion as amended and the motion passed. President Hoyt next called for action on matters relating to publications, called attention to the Publications Committee report. He asked Dr. Vermilye to present the report.

Dr. Vermilye first called attention to the recommendation that the structure of the Publications Committee as now specified in the Constitution be modified and amended. He indicated that it would be helpful if the Executive Council would ask the Constitution Review Committee to see if action can be taken on this at the Dallas meeting. It was moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Council endorses this report and refers it to the Constitution Committee. Motion passed.

Dr. Vermilye then called attention to the recommendation to have the Publications Committee appoint an Editor of Publications that are not Journals. He indicated that the Publications Committee feels that in the past many decisions about what should be published other than Journals has been made without reference to the Publications Committee. This committee feels it is their responsibility and they feel concerned who should approve recommendation on editors of non-journals publications. Dr. Dugan clarified the point that this does not relate to Divisional monographs only to APGA publications. It was then moved by Dr. Jaques and

seconded by Dr. Fitzgerald that: Executive Council approve the recommendation of the Publications Committee to appoint Dr. Dyckman Vermilye as editor of the first APGA monograph in the series on "Contemporary Thought in Guidance".

(Motion passed)

Dr. Vermilye next called attention to the item which calls for the endorsement of the Council for a position to be filled in the Headquarters Office when funds are available. Dr. Dugan spoke in favor of this recommendation and indicated that one of our major needs is a consultant staff member in the area of publication development and promotion. He indicated that this should probably be stated as a professional consultant position and that the job title should be left to be developed. Dr. Vermilye indicated that this recommendation reflected the Publications Committee concern that there is help in the Headquarters office that is not normally found in a typical professional staff member. Dr. Scott questioned whether we should act on this kind of an item except in relation to the budget, and Dr. Dugan assured him that what is desired is not approval of a position but rather endorsement of the concept. It was then moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Executive Council endorses the concept that we appoint such a consultant person when financially feasible to the organization.

Dr. Tennyson questioned whether this action would attach to much importance to this kind of position in relation to other position in the Headquarters office. Dr. Dugan replied that this would merely indicate general support for further development of APGA publications capability. Dr. Tennyson indicated that he would like to see a similar recommendation to ask for similar support for the encouragement of our legislative operations. Dr. Scott commented that he feels that it is the proper function of the Executive Council to determine priorities and that the Council should help to decide what areas to expand first. Dr. Noble agreed that the Council should set priorities when dealing with the budget but he did not see that the Council should support one area more than others.

President Hoyt then called for a vote on the motion in support of Publications and the motion was defeated (2 votes for, 5 votes against).

It was then moved by Dr. Jaques and seconded by Dr. Hardee that: The Executive Council accepts and supports the report of the Publications Committee.
Motion Passed.

Dr. Vermilye then called the Council's attention to recommendation No. 4 on Page 2, "In order to carry out the functions of the Publications Committee, the Committee has set out for itself procedural guidelines. These guidelines assume Executive Council approval of our recommendations regarding reorganization of the Committee. They also require the Committee to be considerably more active than it has been in the past.

In view of these factors, the Committee request funds to hold another meeting for the ten members and one Headquarters staff liaison man before the Dallas convention. Our current thinking favors a meeting in January, 1967.

Further, we anticipate for the 1967-68 year, a need to meet two times in addition to the convention meeting. Assuming approval of our reorganization recommendations, there will be eight people involved in these meetings." and asked that this item be considered when the budget is taken up.

CONVENTIONS

President Hoyt next called for action on the Convention and for a report from the Sub-Committee on Convention that had meet on Wednesday evening. Dr. Black opened his report by indicating that the sub-committee had talked about the advantages of having Conventions in different areas of the country. These advantages are:

1. To bring APGA to specific regions and to get the people in those regions involved.
2. To get people from other regions to interact with people from the Convention area.
3. To afford travel opportunities to people who are in other cultures in other parts of the country.

Called attention to the recommendations of the Convention Committee particularly the suggested dates of Conventions for the years 1968-1973. He indicated that the sub-committee had suggested several changes and though the Convention locations as finally recommended by the sub-committee were as follows:

1968	-	-	-	Detroit
1969	-	-	-	Honolulu
1970	-	-	-	New Orleans
1971	-	-	-	Montreal (or) Atlantic City
1972	-	-	-	Las Vegas (or) Chicago
1973	-	-	-	Possibility of Las Vegas

Dr. Black advised also that the sub-committee wished to recommend to the Council the possibility of changin the dates of some of the Conventions. The recommenda-
tion was that the Council consdier holding the Conventions on periods of Friday through Tuesday rather than Monday through Thursday. He indicated that Convention rates are usually lower for meeting over the weekend. Although the dates are set for the 1968 Convention, he indicated that such a change might be considered in the 1969. He also pointed out that the conflict with the holiday situation in several years and that this also had a bearing on the idea of moving the Convention dates.

President Hoyt next called for a further report on Convention from Ted Driscoll, the Convention Manager. Mr. Driscoll first called attention to the list of Convention sites and indicated that at the time he signed the agreement for the Convention management that these dates were given to him as a tentative list. He noted that at the request of Dr. Dugan he had examined these sites. He learned that the two cities of Seattle and Kansas City were unable to handle a Convention of the size of APGA. Therefore, it was necessary to reconsider the location for these two Conventions in 1969 and 1970. That the APGA Convention requires a minimum of three thousand rooms before we can consider going into a city and at the present time there are only four cities on the West Coast that could handle a Convention of this size. He indicated further that there are greater advantages in setting Convention sites five to seven years in advance since it is then possible to begin to obtain much better terms. Mr. Driscoll then discussed the capabilities of the several cities on the proposed list for the next few years and indicated that in any event it is definitely necessary that the Association consider a location other than Kansas City for 1969. It was moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Isaksen that: The Executive Council ratify the decision to cancel Kansas City as a location for the APGA Convention in 1970. Motion Passed.

Mr. Driscoll continued with the discussion of the reason for suggesting several cities in the various years.

It was moved by Dr. Black and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Association hold its 1969 APGA Convention in Honolulu, subject to being able to work our satisfactory negotiations for space, facilities and services. Motion passed.

It was next moved by Dr. Black and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Association holds its 1970 Convention in New Orleans. (This motion to be worded the same as the previous one on Honolulu in 1969.) Motion passed.

It was next moved by Dr. Black and seconded by Dr. Munger that: This will be the same motion concerning holding the APGA Convention in Montreal, 1971. In the discussion on this motion Dr. Scott commented that there were several issues to be considered. (1) He felt that there would be a higher attendance if the Convention was held in an Eastern United States city. (2) He wondered if there were enough available persons now in the Montreal area to help run the Convention. Two other locations under consideration had been New York City and Atlantic City and Dr. Scott indicated that the New Jersey area would be most willing and able to handle detail of a Convention and he suggested that we might better consider holding the Convention in Atlantic City. Dr. Isaksen suggested that since we have approved holding the Convention in Honolulu in 1969, that it might be better to wait a few years before holding a Convention outside of the continental United States. Dr. Black withdrew his original motion and Dr. Munger withdrew his second. It was then moved by Dr. Black and seconded by Dr. Munger that: This will be the same motion as those other cities 1969, 1970 and so on.

Motion that the Association go to Atlantic City in 1971, and the Passed

27

It was then moved by Dr. Scott and seconded by Dr. Noble that: And the same motion concerning that the Association go to Chicago in 1972. (Motion passed.)

It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Munger that: It is the same motion that we go to Las Vegas in 1973. (Motion Passed.)

Dr. Black asked whether the Council could next take up the question of the dates for Convention meetings. He suggested again that the Council consider having meetings covering periods Friday through Monday rather than Monday through Thursday. Mr. Driscoll suggested that the Council might best vote some degree of flexibility to the sub-committee pending Council approval on dates that might be suggested. It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Isaksen that: The Executive Council ask Mr. Driscoll to look at Convention negotiation with an open end idea on dates and report to the Council in Dallas regarding alternatives. (Motion Passed.)

At this point Dr. Borow commented that he felt that it should be understood that the Las Vegas decision for a Convention in 1973 should be tentative, that this should be reviewed at some future time. It was then moved by Dr. Borow and seconded by Dr. Scott that: The decision to hold the 1973 Convention in Las Vegas be taken as a tentative decision on the part of the Council and that this should be reconsidered at a later time. Mr. Driscoll commented that this would still unable him to proceed with tentative negotiations and the Council would not be bound to hold their decision on Las Vegas. An amendment was then proposed to this motion by Dr. Walz and seconded by Dr. Scott that: Not only does the Council feel that Las Vegas should be a tentative site but that the Council expressed some concern about considering Las Vegas as a site for the APGA Convention. After discussing this amendment was withdrawn and President Hoyt called for a vote for the original motion minus the amendment. The vote was taken and the motion was passed. (Approval of Las Vegas as a tentative site.)

Following this vote President Hoyt expressed thanks to Mr. Driscoll on behalf of the Council for his report and expressed thanks also to the Convention Sub-Committee for reporting on Convention matters.

The meeting then recessed at 12:00 noon and reconvened at 1:25 p. m.

President Hoyt opened the afternoon session by calling for action on the budget. He called attention to the \$1,000.00 item for payment of dues for IAEVG and also to the request from SPATE for a subsidy. Following discussion, it was moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Koplitz that: The item of \$1,000 for membership dues in the International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance be left in the budget, but that payment to IAEVG be deferred until after the report from the International Relations Committee at the time of the Dallas meeting. In commenting on the motion Dr. Borow stated that he felt that the Council

should be aware that both the figure and the date of payment are flexible. President Hoyt then called for a vote on the motion. (The motion was passed.)

Dr. Noble then took up the matter of the subsidy to SPATE. He indicated that a previous Council had agreed on a \$1,000 subsidy to SPATE for its Journals. He indicated that this was authorized to SPATE during the last year but SPATE did not receive the amount. He further indicated that he had written to the Headquarters Office to raise the question about this and had received a reply that it was impossible to make payment at that time. Dr. Noble suggested that this matter be taken up at this present Council meeting and be requested that the subsidy be authorized at this time.

At this point Dr. Munger called attention to the fact that ACES had had the same situation concerning a subsidy that had been approved for ACES in the amount of \$900.00. He indicated that ACES had not received this payment. Dr. Walz commented that the Executive Council had agreed several years ago on a procedure to subsidize divisions: to get their Journals started with the assumption that subsidies would be gradually decreased each year until the division could finance its own publication. In the discussion on this matter of subsidies and in particular the two subsidies in question, it was generally agreed that despite the financial situation that this money had been commented to the two divisions and therefore it was an existing obligation that it be paid.

It was therefore, moved by Dr. Fitzgerald and seconded by Dr. Koplitz that: The Executive Council authorizes payment to the two divisions ACES and SPATE the money that were commented to them at the November, 1965 Council meeting. Motion passed.

It was pointed out that this motion means that the expense figure in the proposed budget is increased by \$1,900.00, and it was further pointed out that this motion on a \$500.00 contingency fund for a branch work shop further increases the expenses.

In connection with the proposed budget revision, Dr. Johnson commented that in accordance with the Council direction of last Spring and the Finance Committee directions over a period of time, the revised budget represents considerable reduced expenses in several areas. He pointed out that this does mean some possible reduction in some services, but that the Finance Committee felt that the budget must be prepared on a very realistic basis.

After further discussion, it was moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Munger that: The Executive Council adopt the revised budget as amended. (Motion passed)

President Hoyt then called for a report on the Membership Task Force and and this report was presented by Dr. Fitzgerald who had served as the Chairman of the sub-committee from the Council. He indicated that the sub-committee would first like to commend the Task Force on Membership for its concern, initiative, and foresight. Dr. Fitzgerald then took up the group of recommendations that had been made by the Membership Task Force and commented on each one in turn. Recommendations on these specific items are as follows:

1. The sub-committee felt that the idea was good but it needs to be re-stated by the Membership Committee.

The sub-committee would like the committee to look over their suggestions and suggest that this committee be appointed by the President to present APGA as a whole. The sub-committee also felt that it would like them to re-state their responsibilities.

2. The sub-committee suggested this item be re-worded as follows: that the Committee on Membership be charged with the responsibility for preparing promotional materials for APGA membership, that will offer ~~service of consultant~~ and assistance to divisions. *services*

3. The sub-committee felt that this statement should be re-worded as follows: that a Manual of Membership Operations be prepared by the present "Task Force on Membership" in tentative form and used for study at the 1967 APGA Convention in a Workshop for Membership Committee personnel; the Manual to include a statement of policy relative to membership, procedures, and make-up of Membership Committees, responsibility of officers for appointments, operations of Committees, time schedule, and suggested effective promotional activities; that continuous revision of the Manual be made possible by a loose-leaf arrangement, with the purpose that both the Committee review it annually to keep it currently applicable.

4. The Committee felt that this statement should stand as is. The statement read: that the Membership Committee, in cooperation with the Branch Committee, devise a reporting system for Branches, Chapters and Divisions that would yield data usable in decisions, policies, and operations of APGA, its Branch and Divisional structure, and membership activity.

5. Sub-committee felt that this recommendation has already been taken care of by Council action.

6-7 The Committee felt that these recommendations should stand as is. Recommendations are as follows: that the Membership Committee should initiate a study of present and potential members in each Division, and the other organizations within and outside APGA to which they do or are eligible to belong, in order that the facts about overlapping membership can become the basis of consideration by APGA of its functions, policies, and services, and information to its members and potential members. That each Division encourage membership efforts by recognizing the work of the National and State Chairmen at the Convention and in Divisional Publications.

8. Sub-committee felt that there is a need for recommendation for some sort. They are not sure however that the way suggested is the best way. The Committee would like to have the committee consider further this item and consider the possibility of some type of certificate or similar item to replace the lapel button as suggested.
9. The sub-committee feels that this should be the responsibility of the Constitution Committee. They do not feel that it is the membership Committee's responsibility.
10. The sub-committee feels that rather than an contributing membership that a voluntary membership going into a specific fund should be recommended. The sub-committee feels that we should stay away from complaining about life subscribers getting away free. They recognize that at the time the person took out a life subscription it was a drain on his finances. If the committee wants to set up a voluntary contribution this is a good idea but the sub-committee of the Council believes that we should stay away from life subscribers in doing so.
11. The sub-committee feels that the recommendation to consider the possibility of an institutional membership should be referred to the Constitutional Committee for their study. The Constitution Committee should be given information on the practices of other Associations. The Sub-committee felt that there might be some value in having institutional memberships but thought that it needs much further study. This might also be a profitable arrangement in relation to the thinking on accreditation.
12. The sub-committee felt that this statement should remain as it is . Statement reads as follows: that Student memberships be limited to one year per person and that this information be clearly stated in the promotional materials and on the application blank. (These memberships now constitute approximately 12% of total membership, at half the regular rate. There is evidence that many students hold student membership for several years, and little evidence that they continue regular membership in the year immediately following such student membership.)
13. The Sub-committee felt that the Executive Council should study this as a whole without the Committee making any recommendations.
14. The Committee feels that this should have the same action as item 13.
15. The sub-committee felt that this should be referred to the Publications Committee.

Dr. Fitzgerald also commented that the sub-committee would like to refer to the Membership Committee the possibility of providing for a sur-charge to be placed on members for late dues. The sub-committee felt that something could be

worked out to benefit the Association and that the Membership Committee should also study the possibility of having a re-application charge for persons with dues in the rears with the possibility of making them pay at least the past dues before they could be re-instated.

It was then moved by Dr. Fitzgerald and seconded by Dr. Williamson that: The Executive Council adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Task Force on membership as amended by the sub-committee of the Council, with the additional recommendation that the Task Force Committee study the possibility of a sur-charge for late dues and a re-application fee for membership.

Dr. Noble stated that he felt that the best action of the Council would be to thank the committee and say that they have done the job they were asked to do. The Council should say that the ideas of the committee are being referred to the appropriate sources for action. Dr. Noble further commented that he did not think that the Council should accept the report as such. Rather the Council should let the committee know that they handled the job assigned to them. Following further discussion, Dr. Fitzgerald withdrew his motion and Dr. Williamson withdrew his second.

It was then moved and seconded by Dr. Noble and Dr. Munger that: The Membership Task Force Committee be commended for the work that has been done and in the communication it be indicated to the committee that the ideas presented in their report are being forwarded to the appropriate committees for their study and action.

Dr. Noble stated that he would hope the committee would not only be thanked for their efforts but that they would be told what had been done with each of the items in the report.

Dr. Walz commented that it is apparent that of the funded programs for counselor preparation that only a very few of these students became members of the Association. He indicated that in some way we should communicate with these people in an attempt to have them become members. Dr. Jaques commented that she did not believe we should simply refer the report of the Membership Task Force to the Constitution Committee. She indicated that she did not believe any of the items are misrepresented for the Constitution Committee. She stated that she believed that it is the job of the Membership Task Force to determine the direction of the membership policy. Dr. Noble brought out the point that this question as to whether the Membership Committee should be a standing committee or a special committee. Dr. Fitzgerald agreed that both items 9 and 11 of the report need to be considered by the Constitution Committee. Dr. Jaques indicated that she would like them direction from the Council on the decision to be made. President Hoyt then called for action on the motion to thank the committee and to advise them about the position on their recommendations. Motion Passed.

It was then moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Fitzgerald that: Item 12 of the report (this is the recommendation that study membership be limited to one year) be excepted.

Dr. Black questioned what the original intent was in having student membership. He indicated that it would seem it would be wise to have this for a two year period or have it for one year plus renewal privileges for another year. Dr. Noble suggested the possibility of having a reduced rate membership for everyone for their first year of membership and suggested that this might be better than having a student rate. Dr. Black commented that he felt that as long as a person is not a full time employee that APGA should allow him to have study membership rates.

After this discussion Dr. Noble amended his motion to state that student membership be limited to full time students during the academic year with no limit on the length of time they may remain student members. Dr. Ehrle commented that he agreed with the idea of having a regular membership with reduced rates for a certain number of years. Dr. Black seconded the amended motion of Dr. Noble and in doing so commented that he did not believe we should reduce dues for everyone for the first or second year. Mr. McGough called attention to people who are trying to up-grade themselves but who cannot be full time students. He expressed concern that they would be excluded from student membership under this type of provision. Dr. Goldman questioned the different definitions in various institutions of what constitutes a full time student. It was generally agreed that it be left to the administrative officers of the schools themselves to determine student status and that if an institution indicated a person was a full time student the Association would except the institutions decision.

President Hoyt then called for a vote on the motion that student membership be limited to full-time academic students. The vote was taken and the motion passed.

Dr. Dugan then mentioned the Joint Commission on Mental Health Careers, and indicated that the Association had been asked to become a member of the Commission.

It was moved by Dr. Munger and seconded by Dr. Ehrle that: The Association join the National Commission on Mental Health Careers. (Motion passed.)

Following these two actions, Dr. Goldman asked how representatives to such Commissions are designated. He indicated that he felt that it should be the prerogative of the President to designate representation. Dr. Black suggested that the Executive Director should notify the President but not necessarily wait for the President to make an appointment to represent the Association on these Commissions. It was generally agreed that such responsibilities should be the area of the President but that he could designate the Executive Director to appoint representatives if he so desired.

Dr. Dugan indicated that in connection with the Dallas Convention he is working on the matter of getting major speakers. He called attention also to a meeting with the deputy administrator of NASA concerning the possibility of making an award to an Astronaut. He indicated that NASA felt favorable toward this idea and that he was very hopeful of such an award being worked out. He indicated that this has further merit in terms of selecting people each year and eventually coming out with a publication in this connection.

It was then moved by Dr. Munger and seconded by Dr. Noble that: The Council approve the idea of making an award to an Astronaut at the 1967 Convention if this can be worked out. (Motion Passed.)

Dr. Fitzgerald then brought up the matter of the proposal that had been received from the Encyclopedia Britannica and indicated that he would like to see this proposal accepted. Laura Mae Kress was called upon to give some background on the proposal and following this information it was moved by Dr. Fitzgerald and seconded by Dr. Soott that: The proposal from the Encyclopedia Britannica be accepted. (Motion Passed.)

President Hoyt asked whether there was a report to be made from the sub-committee of the council to study Placement and Miss Kress advised that the present report is only a brief report. She indicated that there is no recommendation for action at this point but that the committee expects to have firm recommendation by the time of the Dallas meeting.

Attention was called to the report from Dr. Harold Cottingham, Chairman of the Committee on Committees and it was moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Scott that: Executive Council commend Dr. Cottingham on his report and assure him that this matter will be on the agenda for the Executive Council meeting in Dallas. (Motion Passed.)

Attention was then called to the item on Cofix which had been submitted by the AVCO Corporation. In commenting on this, Dr. Dugan advised that AVCO is a private corporation and that there may be some duplication between this and what ERIC is doing. He indicated that he would like to see APGA cooperate but he does not feel that we should endorse the proposal at this time. He felt the APGA is not yet in a position to make any kind of firm commitment at this point. Dr. Noble suggested that there be a further report on this at the Dallas meeting.

Attention was called to the request from the California Committee on organizing a State Branch for \$500.00 to subsidize their activities. It was moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Scott that: The Executive Council deny the request of this group for the \$500.00 subsidy. In the discussion it was felt that such a subsidy might set a precedent and Miss Lawlor pointed out that such a precedent had already been set for the group in New York State. Borow commented that he did not believe the group should be given the money and he felt that it would be unfortunate to pass the motion now on the floor. He felt that the Council should vote on the principle of whether or

574

not we want to finance state branches and stated that he really felt that state branches should pay their own way. After this discussion, motion was withdrawn by Dr. Isaksen and the second by Dr. Scott.

It was then moved by Dr. Isaksen and seconded by Dr. Noble that: The Executive Council adopt a policy of not subsidizing the development of branches by direct cash grants but we encourage their development through a greater use of APGA staff as possible. (Motion passed.)

Dr. Dugan reported briefly on the recent APGA-AVA Conference and called attention to the report on this in the Council record.

Attention was called to the recent report to the APGA Western Office and it was moved by Dr. Noble and seconded by Dr. Scott that: The Executive Council adopts the policy on a Western Office to not activate as outlined in the report. Motion Passed.

At this point Dr. Black requested that the Council go back to the NCA accreditation motion. He indicated that we have voted to request this liaison committee from NCA and indicated that we now need to determine the procedures involved in appointing representatives and to make any agreements. He stressed that the representatives should report back to the Executive Council at the Dallas meeting. Dr. Scott suggested that this be left with the PPS Committee to designate people that are to be placed on a sub-committee. Further, he suggested that this might be the existing sub-committee and that we should not necessarily create a new accreditation committee.

Dr. Black commented that he did not think it would be wise to have the entire sub-committee to represent APGA. He suggested that there should be a new committee perhaps with some members of the sub-committee on it. President Hoyt indicated that we might think about having Dr. Callis, and Dr. Strowig on the Committee. He stressed that there must also be ACPA representation and that there was a need to communicate with some of the other groups. He further indicated that he had received suggestions from organizations to contact representatives from some of the division presidents and ask that other presidents submit any further suggestions that they had to him.

Dr. Greenleaf suggested that the Executive Committee could appoint people within APGA who have a contact with the related groups or they can ask related groups to appoint within their group. Dr. Black suggested that as groups are being contacted that they be asked to appoint persons to represent their groups.

Dr. Noble remarked that there is a need to clarify what the committee should consist of. He asked whether we will appoint a committee that will go out and talk with other groups rather than a committee consisting of members who are in other groups.

President Hoyt stated that he sees this as a small committee that will contact NCA and will contact other Associations to get information and to keep them informed. Recommendations will then be brought to the Executive Council in Dallas.

Attention was then called to the report from the Resolutions Committee in view of the fact that there was not time to consider these in detail at the present meeting, Dr. Isaksen suggested that Council members should all respond to the Resolution Committee Chairman with thoughts and comments. He indicated that he felt a copy of their letters should be sent to the President. It was general agreement that this should be done and Council members were requested to make this communication.

Dr. Dugan called attention to the Federal Relations Committee and noted the five recommendations of that Committee.

This report was recognized but it was not possible to take action on the report at this meeting.

Dr. Isaksen suggested that in the future there may be a need to hold a four or five day meeting of the Council and he expressed the feeling that a three day meeting is not sufficient to take care of all the business at hand. Dr. Williamson suggested that it might be more profitable to limit Council discussion to major items in this way all business could be taken care of within the three day time.

It was moved by Dr. Williamson and seconded by Dr. Black that: The meeting of the Executive Council be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.