

# ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSON-CENTERED APPROACH

## Minutes of Annual Meeting

July 28, 29, 30, 2011

FINAL VERSION

Notes:

1. The first time a person's name is mentioned, both first and last names are given. The next time(s) that person is mentioned, only the first name is given.
2. Decisions and action items are highlighted in **bold face**.

First Meeting: Thursday, July 28, 2011

The session began at 3:13.

Jef Cornelius-White volunteered to serve as facilitator.

Susan Woolever distributed the initial agenda list that had been generated through the list serve.

## Preliminary Business Meeting Agenda ADPCA Chicago 2011

1. Maneuvering in a medical model world (*suggestion that this be tabled for discussion in other venues, suggestion that this be moved to the list serve*)
2. Raising up new person centered therapists (*suggestion that this be tabled for discussion in other venues, suggestion that this be moved to the list serve*)
3. Overcoming obstacles in behavioral oriented agencies, licensing boards, and funding sources (*suggestion that this be tabled for discussion in other venues*)
4. Desire/willingness of the community to have some or all of our conferences recorded (This might involve live streaming, and/or uploading audio, video or other document formats after the event; it might generate income - it would certainly provide invaluable archive material.)
5. Forum facilitation on the ADPCA website
6. Discussion about the Journal--choosing editors
7. Follow-up on possible grant for research on CCT in an EST framework (*short*)
8. Reaction to research that I (Bruce Allen) would like to do with ADPCA.
9. Choosing Conference venue for 2013 (*suggestion that it be held in the UK*)
10. Posting ADPCA business items to the website

11. Secretary's report (Howie)
12. Treasurer's report (*may not be available due to Bert's time constraints*)
13. Renaissance Editor's report. I (Jin) would like to enlist a co-editor.
14. It would be very helpful if key roles in the association (treasurer, secretary, newsletter editor (the journal already has a co-editor), webmaster, etc), had secondees so that we could share the responsibility of the role, help one another when personal needs get in the way and avoid leaving key areas of business temporarily paralyzed.
15. A report about the website (Tiane)

Additional items were suggested by the following people and added to the list, including:

- Revisiting our prior decision about posting Renaissance issues on the website – Bruce Allen
- Listserve report – Tanya Komleva
- 2013 Conference – Bert Rice
- 2012 Conference – Rob Richardson

Agenda items were prioritized. Items 1, 2, 3 and 5, while important discussion topics, were put at the end of the agenda as being less appropriate for a business meeting.

## JOURNAL

Jef, current *Person-Centered Journal* co-editor, reported that Rachel Jordan (present) and Steve Demanchick (not present) volunteered to assume the *Journal* editorship when Jef and Bruce step down after this year's issue is published. Jef and Bruce have shared a good deal of information about the journal with Rachel. Jef asked if anyone else was interested in editing the journal.

Kathy Moon: Is there a general philosophy about the journal? As editorship passes from editor to editor, it would be useful to understand this.

Jef said the journal was for scholarly articles related to the person-centered approach, broadly conceived, and peer reviewed. Then he read the statement published in each journal: "*The Person-Centered Journal* is sponsored by the Association for the Development of the Person-Centered Approach (ADPCA) to promote and disseminate scholarly thinking about person-centered principles, practices and philosophy."

Kathy: Must authors comply with reviewers' suggestions in order to be published?

Jef: Not necessarily.

Bruce: There are different levels of suggestions. If organization is confusing, it has to be addressed.

Kathy: What if I didn't do a review of the literature and the editors thought it needed to have a lit review? Must we conform to other academic journals? To what degree are reviewers' suggestions required to be followed?

Bruce: The expectation is that we'll publish the article. What I've wanted to do is work with the author as much as possible to get it in shape to be published.

Jef: It's developmental. There are different answers for different people who may be more or less skilled and experienced with academic writing.

Jerold Bozarth: The initial philosophy was "we accept everything, but we work with everyone to make it better." What was required depends on type of article.

Jef: Different articles require different types of review. An "In Memoriam" piece or book review doesn't require same type of review as scholarly articles.

Kathy: I did disagree with a request for a lit review from two editors, but as things change in the organization, I'd like to know. I value that our journal is unique to our organization, that it's open to new writers, not just experienced writers.

Bruce: Are you worried it's becoming too formal or orthodox?

Kathy: That's my background question.

Bert raised a question about the transition to new editors: to whom should articles or questions be sent?

Jef: Go through us (Jef and Bruce) for now (until next issue is published), but not necessarily. You can contact new editors if you wish.

Rachel: We don't have any revolutionary plans. We want to continue pretty much as it's been done. We have three reasons for volunteering: we love person-centered approach; service is important to our academic careers; and Jef and Bruce are ready to stop so we're glad to help.

Bruce: I'm uncomfortable with process. Let's decide who's going to be new editor before asking specific questions of Rachel and Steve.

Kathy volunteered to be book review editor.

Jerold suggested a section on letters to the journal editor.

Jef: Is there anyone else who wants to be editor?

No one responded.

Carol Wolter-Gustafson was interested in hearing a bit more about Rachel and Steve's credentials or background to be editors, aside from Rachel's excellent organizing of last year's ADPCA conference.

Rachel explained both are faculty members in counselor education programs, have had many journal articles published, and Steve has been a co-editor of a play therapy journal.

Bruce: In prior correspondence on another topic, I've been impressed with Steve every step of the way.

Junahli Hunter: Will we continue to publish literature in the journal?

Sue Wilders. Not personal to Rachel and Steve, but I'd feel more comfortable if anyone taking on the editing role would have an advisory group of people who have been around ADPCA for a long time to check in with as to whether what they're doing is consistent with the ethos of this organization.

Jef: There *is* a board of advisors for the journal.

Tanya: I'd like to slightly revise your (Sue's) proposition. Years of membership alone is not enough; experience with journals is also important.

Ray Adomaitis: Reiterated Bruce's suggestion that we follow the process of choosing the editors first, then discussing editorial issues. **He proposed ratifying Rachel and Steve as editors of journal.**

**Unanimously accepted.**

Kathy explained that the three journals that they sent the new Barbara Brodley book to for review (*PCJ*, *PCEP* and *PCQ*) each had different book review policies. She's volunteering to play a role similar to Beth Friere at *Person-Centered and Experiential Psychotherapies*, that is, choosing books to be reviewed and inviting reviewers to review them.

Someone said it would also be good to have other people suggest books to be reviewed and send in reviews.

Bert: The decision of whether to have a book review editor should be made by the editors, not the group.

Howie: Agreed with Bert. Assumes Rachel and Steve will want to take advantage of Kathy's volunteer energy and experience, but should have time to think of different ways book reviews can and should be handled, especially as a review editor could have a lot of power to decide what gets reviewed and who does the reviews.

Sue. Wouldn't editors have similar power? Why would it be a problem for this group to decide on a book reviewer now?

Jef: There are many potential editorial roles. It would be cumbersome to have community meeting group decide on all them.

Bert: We try not to micromanage volunteers. That's why I'm opposed to having the group decide this now.

Carol (to Rachel): I appreciate your transparency, and (to Kathy) I appreciate your offer and I hope you and the editors can work something out that will involve Kathy.

Jin said she was glad how it's happening, because community shouldn't impose a structure on volunteers. She said how, while she might herself ask for additional help as newsletter editor (and did), she explained how she'd feel if a new volunteer were imposed on her as editor.

Sue: I wouldn't feel that way if I were the editor. But thanks, Jin, for the sensitivity you brought to what you said. I withdraw my suggestion.

Ray: How are reviewers selected? I also have personal interest. I'm thinking how I might participate as reviewer.

Jef summarized the issues and suggestions:

- Jerold wants to see letters to the editor.
- Junahli wants literature to be acceptable in the journal.
- Ray is interested in review process. Since Rachel and Steve will be updating the outdated reviewers' list, this is a good time to volunteer as a reviewer.

Jerold: Thinks letters to editor should be an acceptable category.

Jef agrees. It's hard to predict how regular it will be.

Jerold: One ought to know if letters are acceptable.

Jef: Suggests clarifying this in author guidelines. Also clarifying that literature is acceptable.

Bruce: Will including literature be a problem for being listed in *Psych Info*? [an index of psychological publications—an indication that we're a respected journal. HK]

Jef: It's not clear. It could be, but it's not necessarily so. It's too complex to discuss now.

Rachel: wants to collaborate with Jin as newsletter editor.

Jef: Did try to get us listed in *Psych Info*. We were rejected [for some specific, remediable reasons] and can reapply in three years taking their feedback into account.

2013 CONFERENCE

Bert: Since there have been no proposals yet for hosting the 2013 conference, he proposes Jef announce to community meeting tonight that we need a proposal.

Sue volunteered to organize a conference in 2013 in the UK.

Carol recalled that we once adopted a policy to have the conference alternate between the U.S. and abroad, every other year.

Bruce: Yes, but then that policy ended. The last conference in the UK was a great success in terms of attendance and ADPCA's budget.

Sue: There are lots of disaffected and former BAPCA members looking for a home. Many might attend.

Jef: It would be helpful to give us more details, if possible, to help us make an informed decision. Suggests tabling it for later in conference.

Bert amended his earlier motion to: announce it tonight and mention Sue's proposal.

Tanya said she could also notify the listserve, so anyone not present could indicate his or her interest in hosting the conference. Jin agreed.

Sara Callen: Suggests we not overlap with BAPCA, which is having their bi-annual conference in 2013.

Sue revised her proposal to 2014.

Bert: Went back to his original motion.

Jerold: Questions whether we should go outside the U.S.

Jef: The ADPCA Albi, France conference was a disaster. The two in the UK were successful.

Sue: Is it an international organization? There are 100s of person-centered people in the UK who are without an organization and might join. We might become a *real* international organization.

Carol: There's an issue of retention of community when it's difficult for many members to attend a conference abroad.

Tanya: We should think beyond the U.S. and UK. We should think of the health of the organization.

**Howie: Do we agree with Bert's proposal for process [that Jef announce to the community meeting that we need a proposal for 2013]?**

**There was agreement.**

## TREASURER'S REPORT

Bert distributed a Treasurer's Report, including 2010-11 Income and Expenses, Balance Sheet, and Proposed Budget. The report is included as Appendix A at the end of the minutes. He highlighted some points.

- Membership alone is not covering expenses, when conference is left aside. We'll have to decide if we want to raise membership income or expect the conference to make a profit, so that we break even.
- Journal expenses were a bit higher than usual this year.
- Credit for past Illinois taxes is a one-time windfall.
- We have a healthy balance in our bank account(s).

Howie appreciated Bert's detailed, thorough and informative report.

Junahli would like to have clarity about whether 2012 conference needs to make money or just break even.

Laura Taylor: Why is cash amount so high?

Bert: One of CDs came due this spring. The cash was kept on hand to see if conference would need the money.

Howie: Regarding our current financial condition and budget, we're on about the right track. Membership fees hopefully will continue to grow, reducing the shortfall. Thinks the 2012 conference, as previous two conferences, can aim to break even.

Tanya: Disagrees. We shouldn't accept a budget that in the future might not break even. There are costs associated with each new member, so growing membership is not a solution.

Howie: It won't necessarily fail to break even over the next couple of years. Next year the tax refunds will cover the deficit. The idea of reducing the dues was to make membership more affordable. It was an investment. We hope/expect the investment will pay off.

Tanya: Not to make money, but to grow membership.

Ruth Moore: Thinks \$30 dues are too low. It costs almost \$10 to mail her a journal in the UK. Set dues too low and people don't value the organization.

Sue: There are two categories of membership [\$60 for Supporting, \$30 for Regular]. The website should better explain the different membership categories.

Jin: Budget okay for the next year or two. In the long run it's not sustainable.

Bert: Proposes a new agenda item--future financial goals/plans--but only after other reports relevant to finances are done.

**Consensus was the financial report was understood, accepted and appreciated.** [*Round of applause*].

### Second Meeting: Friday, July 29, 2011

Bakahia Madison facilitated.

### LISTSERVE REPORT

Tanya Komleva passed out a sheet with information on listserve use (Appendix B).

Tanya made several points:

- The question has been raised as to whether we should continue the listserve
- There is no longer any relationship between number of messages and people unsubscribing.
- People who unsubscribe mostly say they don't want to be party to the bickering.
- Her role is to enable people to communicate between meetings.
- It's for business, so it's for members. But what is a member?
- She doesn't remove people from the listserve when their membership expires. She could distinguish paid/voting members if there was a need for a vote or decision.

Bruce: So you have two issues. Should we keep the listserve and should we keep non-paying members on the listserve?

Laura: I don't mind people being on if they didn't pay, but I wouldn't want them to object or vote.

Bruce: I'm mixed on this. It's an analog to the business meeting where people are welcome to come [but not vote]. It gripes me to have a non-paying member have access the listserve when others are paying for it. That side of me says, "I'd like to limit it to someone who pays."

Tanya: It's not anyone who would be on the list. They once were a [paid] member. This does not cost us.

Bruce: It doesn't cost, but there are two classes --people who can afford to pay and those who just don't pay.

Tanya: People who don't pay usually ask for scholarship.

Bert: Feels extremely strongly that they should stay on if they want to.



Laura: Proposes that it's okay, but non-members shouldn't be able to vote.

Howie: The term "vote" isn't quite right. We don't typically vote, but we do make decisions. Occasionally we may make decisions outside the annual meetings; for example, Ian Mayes wanted to be the newsletter editor and we agreed to that. I have mixed feelings on this issue. I'd like to encourage communication, and also like to encourage people to be paid members. This is one of the benefits for being a paid member.

Laura: I don't have a problem with a non-paying member participating in discussions about decisions, but not "voting" on it.

Tanya: Shall we keep listserve for the coming year?

Robbie: I like the listserve and I like it the way it is.

Laura: I like and enjoy the listserve. But it should be confined to business. We should honor the purpose of those who created the listserve and confine the discussion to business without defining or having an enforcement mechanism for what is "business".

Bruce: Agreed.

**Group agreed to keep listserve for a year.**

Tanya: Proposed to continue participation for people who didn't pay, but will revoke "voting" for non-members.

Bruce: Let's just trust people to recuse themselves [i.e., not participate] when it's appropriate.

Bert: There's never been a listserve decision by consensus. Only the Executive Committee can do that. There has been occasion when the Executive Committee sought input on the listserve prior to making a decision, which some people may remember as using the listserve to make a decision.

\_\_\_\_\_: Are we agreed to keep it as now in terms of non-paying members?

\_\_\_\_\_: Except when decisions are made.

Tanya: I don't want to sever the connection between people

Bert: Can we have a statement that the purpose of the list is for business purposes only?

\_\_\_\_\_: Is there a consensus?

Rob: It would help me if there was a posting on the listserve about the other listserves.

Bert: For anyone who doesn't know how to access the other listserves, I can post this on the ADPCA listserve.

Jin: I can put it in *Renaissance*.

Howie: When people are put on the listserve, their "welcome" or invitation could include information about the other lists.

Laura: Remember we also have a forum on our own website. That should be mentioned, too.

Robbie: What I enjoy the most being on the listserve is being notified instantly if there's a message. I've done this by putting the listserve on my phone notification system.

Carol WG: Agrees a brief, one sentence statement about each of the other lists would be helpful.

**Bruce: Let's refer to our list as "business-focused".**

**Agreement.**

## SECRETARY'S REPORT

(Thanks to Jin Wu for some of the notes in this section.)

Howie distributed a spreadsheet showing membership patterns over the past three years (Appendix C). He highlighted a few points.

- Membership continues to increase, from 100 in 2009 to 174 in 2010 to 224 in 2011.
- The ratio of US/Canada to international has moved from 4:1 to 5:1, although as a result of this conference, where many international people attended and joined, the ratio may shift back toward 4:1.
- The old category of 5-year membership is now ended, but people may pay as many years in the future as they want. One member in China paid for 10 years.
- There's a bit of a regression to the mean in terms of membership levels, with somewhat fewer Supporting Members (\$60). Most members paid for Regular (\$30) memberships.
- There's been a huge increase of Student Members; these more than doubled in the last 3 years. Folks in the Chicago area are incredibly active in attracting students, but not just in Chicago. We'll see if, over time, the students will stay on after graduation, after being in the real world for a while.
- There's been a small increase of subscriptions to the journal.

Bert: Looks great. Regarding how supporting membership is declining, wonders if a different presentation of it may be helpful, e.g., "how wonderful to support ADPCA, etc."

Howie: Agreed. Some people brought that up yesterday. He'll make an effort to do that. He repeated how nonmembers who attend the conference can join the organization and have their

membership fee deducted from the full conference fee (since the member's discount is the same as the membership fee).

Howie's last question was over the definition of "member". Bert had pointed out in a discussion on the listserve that the by-laws say the only way one is not a member is to resign, die, or be expelled at a membership meeting. Howie agreed but said it's more complicated because the by-laws elsewhere define members as dues-paying members. Most organizations say "member" and "non member" based on paying dues or not. Do we want to spend time to talk about this?

Bruce and Bert have no problem with the Secretary using whichever term he sees fit. Wouldn't want to spend meeting time on this.

Howie: Was there any time historically that membership meetings expelled members?

Carol and Bruce: There was a conversation, no decision.

Thanks to Howie. [*Applause*]

## RENAISSANCE

Jin gave a report on the newsletter *Renaissance*. She:

- Thanked everyone for all the words of encouragement she's received.
- Reviewed history of how people indicated desire to get hard copy. This is what she's done, but also gave people an opt-out choice, that is, to get the newsletter electronically. But few did.
- Explained main costs are printing and mailing. Mailing costs more than printing. She won't print color anymore; will send it electronically, so people can print color if they want.
- Said she was sorry she didn't do the winter issue to achieve three per year. Actually she didn't have the content for more issues anyway. So do we want 2 or 3 times a year? "If I don't have the content, I'd rather have two than 3."

Laura: How much does mailing cost?

Bert: About \$420 for a mailing

Jin: Overseas mailings are costly.

Tanya: What if one person in UK could be sent the packet and mail them in the UK?

Carol: This is a perennial issue: The ideal of what newsletters can be versus the practicality of time, energy and cost. There's a relationship between content and price. Lots of pictures cost more. She supports three smaller issues, since it keeps a continuity of contact.

Chris Zivek: How do we know that we can opt out of hard copy? Perhaps explaining this on website would help more people understand this and opt out.

Mary Beth Napier: It would be good to give people an explicit choice. "Do you want electronic or paper?"

\_\_\_\_\_: Maybe people should have to pay extra for hard copy.

Bert: No, it should be benefit.

Tanya: It (extra payment) complicates it too much.

Jin: We are exploring options for how to make it clearer to members that they have a choice of hard copy or electronic.

Howie: If you got the help you asked for on submissions, and you had more submissions to work with, would you want to do three issues?

Susan Woolever: I'm happy to help you with this.

Jin: That's not a condition for 3 issues, but it would be greater insurance that three issues would come out.

Kathy: Susan, you should have a title if you like, to help feel acknowledged and possibly put on resume, etc.

Susan: I'll do it.

[Applause.]

Bert: Questioned the process. It's not for membership to micromanage editor's job and appoint new volunteers.

Bruce: Didn't see the problem. It's no great addition to a resume to be editor of our journal or newsletter.

Kathy: Had problem with Bruce putting down the journal that he worked so hard on. She really values our journal. We also shouldn't put down *Renaissance*.

Howie: As editor Jin should be empowered to ask for help and if titles for these volunteers help in that, that's fine. We're not creating permanent positions, so a group decision isn't needed.

Ruth: Would be happy to distribute *Renaissance* to members in UK if Jin sends her a batch.  
[Applause]. She thinks photographs are valuable. They encouraged her to come to this conference.

Bruce: Sees problems with *Renaissance* being on Internet. Gave example of someone knowing Yoko from seeing her picture in *Renaissance* on the website.

Robbie: Is there a way to post the newsletter on the website just for members?

Laura: Would like a policy that pictures not include names.

Bakahia Madison: Some people, like her, *like* to be identified on the Web, Facebook, etc. Helps in networking and marketing.

Jin: There are several issues here. Said she wouldn't, and hasn't, put names with pictures for random individual and group photos. But other types of pieces are different, e.g., an article by someone with their accompanying picture and email, an article about someone, etc. So one blanket rule doesn't work. But she will not use individual names or emails without that person's permission.

That seemed to be satisfactory and the meeting moved on.

[Note: Discussion about posting *Renaissance* on the website was resumed later. See below.]

Kathy said she wanted to add an agenda item re posting things from this conference on the listserve.

## CHICAGO CONFERENCE REPORT

Susan and Kathryn presented a written report on behalf of the conference committee. (Appendix D).

[I couldn't keep up with all the information presented quickly, so I will let the report speak for itself. I did get the highlight that.... ]

The conference will generate a surplus \$2-6,000 for ADPCA. [Later Susan indicated to me that the latest figures indicate the surplus may even exceed this].

There were extended applause, plaudits, and appreciation for the conference committee for organizing and executing an outstanding conference.

## WEBSITE

Kathryn Grubbs reported for Tiane Graziottin.

Kathryn reported that Tiane has created a "Conference Zone" on the website if anyone wanted their handouts, presentations, or other things from the conference to share with members or the world.

After consultation with and agreement with the website committee, a new website technical help person has been engaged to help her on maintaining the website. She will share with him the priorities for the coming year, which are:

- *PCJ* archives (getting them posted)
- directory of institutions
- site design, color, etc.
- data base that integrates members directory, conference etc.
- members only area
- Paypal/credit card payments to extend to online conference registration.
- Forum – getting people to start using it, making it more user friendly, etc.
- Resources section

Bert: Asked Kathryn to ask Tiane how much money she'll need for the year and whether she'll still need to maintain the old website registration. [Kathryn Grubbs had a laptop with her and was emailing Tiane in present time so that she could get an answer back before the meeting was over.]

The discussion shifted back to *Renaissance*, names with photos, and whether to include *Renaissance* in public part of the website.

Laura: Requests a policy that names don't go with photos.

Mary Beth Napier: This information can be public for years. Better to keep it (*Renaissance*) private.

Bakahia: People are different; some may be comfortable or want to be identified.

Jin: I'm okay with keeping *Renaissance* private.

Bert: Is there anyone here who thinks it should be kept public?

**No. Consensus was to make *Renaissance* on web just for members.**

Mary Beth: Proposes that for this year, until next year, names don't go with photos.

Susan: In some circumstances, a person might want their photo with an article, or an article about that person. That could be appropriate.

**Jin: How about this? 1. In general photos will not have names. 2. If I publish any photo with names or if photo might be able to identify person, I'll request permission from that person.**

**Agreed.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Irene Fairhurst Film.* Tiane reported that the film produced by Irene Fairhurst, titled “The Person-Centered Approach: Past Present and Future: Memories and Conversations,” will be launched at the BAPCA conference this year. Members agreed last year that ADPCA would contribute financially toward this film, which contains interviews Irene did with early figures in the person-centered approach

*A Research Project.* Bruce reported that his attempt to formulate a proposal for ADPCA to sponsor evidence-based practice research did not get off the ground because of lack of interested parties to work with him on developing the proposal.

*Conference Planning Documentation.* Kathy reported that she tried to get volunteers but there weren’t any to work with her on compiling a document of prior memos, email, reports, etc. that would help transfer information from one conference to the next.

Susan can forward to Kathy their documents, emails, etc. from this conference

Howie suggested including former conference programs.

Kathy: Without help, I’ll do what I can. If there is help, I can do more.

*ADPCA Legal Address.* Howie mentioned that last year the membership agreed to change ADPCA’s legal address from Kathy Moon’s address to the New Center’s address. This did not take place as Kathy decided it was fine for her address to continue to be the organization’s legal address.

Kathy explained that as long as Bert was Treasurer it made sense and was simpler to leave things as they were [since she and Bert live at the same address].

*Research on ADPCA Membership.* Bruce said he is interested in doing some research regarding members of ADPCA, e.g., profession, type of practice, credentials, how you became interested in CCT, etc. He wants to compare us with other person-centered organizations, then with other affiliative organizations. He wants to be sure no violations will be done. Is it okay? Any cautions? Is this an appropriate use of the ADPCA membership list?

Howie: One purpose of the list is to facilitate communication among members. Any member can send a message to the list saying they are interested in doing a professional project and ask other members’ help. It’s voluntary.

No one voiced a problem with this.

Third Meeting: Saturday, July 30, 2011

Susan Woolever listed the remaining agenda items.

Natasha Noorian facilitated.

## 2012 CONFERENCE – SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

Rob Richardson, committee chair announced others on committee [the following names include some that have been added after the meeting]: Junahli Hunter co-chair, Jerold Bozarth (e-mail), Ray Adomaitis (e-mail & on ground), Marge Witty (e-mail), Susan Pildes (e-mail) Bruce & Yoko Allen (e-mail), Jef Cornelius White (e-mail) Rob's partner, Yvette Gilliam (email), Kathy Moon (contribute via e-mail but not serve on the on-ground committee), [Tanyakom@hotmail.com](mailto:Tanyakom@hotmail.com) (e-mail), [pamelajht@comcast.net](mailto:pamelajht@comcast.net), Ken Barthels (on ground), Bobbi Richardson (Rob's mother-on ground), Christy Massalan (on ground), Pat Mooney (on ground) and Tamara Knapp Grosz (on ground and e-mail) – Also a daughter of one of my colleagues, Rebecca Branch is also on the committee and she is a freshman in high school and wants to become a psychologist. If I have forgotten anyone please let me know and I will add you to the committee.

Rob is adjunct faculty in the psychology program at Saint Leo University's – Savannah Center and several psychology majors have volunteered to help and will also be getting information out to others colleges and universities, i.e., Armstrong, Savannah State, SCAD, GA Southern University and West Georgia State University in Carrollton, GA.

If you want to come early, they'll be vacation rentals available at no charge if you'll help out with preconference arrangements.

Jef put in a plug for beautiful Savannah where he grew up.

The Savannah College of Art and Design has proposed letting us use their Crites Building- (which is a renovated synagogue now turned into student center and classrooms)-- for in-service training, groups, etc.-- if the college's counseling center staff can attend at no cost.

Working on getting CEUs for different professions. Anyone interested in presenting please send your resume and topic to Rob Richardson as soon as possible.

There's not much in-service training in Georgia. We could get a lot of other professionals involved.

Margaret: Preconference workshops are particularly helpful in attracting professionals.

Rob got quotes from two hotels for June, July and August. High season is April 1 to Memorial Day. Lower in June and July. Lower still after September 1.

Carol: To attract people involved in education, it should be after schools close. Reach out to Univ. of Georgia West Carrollton folks.



Kathryn: Understood June or September better for international travel.

\_\_\_\_\_: September is stressful for students and others.

Natasha: Lots of factors will go into the choice of date.

Carol: We should send you any information we have, Rob, about dates, and you should decide.

Howie said one important piece of information is what dates the members who come to conferences would find preferable. Asked for straw vote by members. July, June and August got most affirmative votes, in that order.

Sue: International traveling in early July is better than late July.

Alberto: July and August best for international university schedule, but most expensive time. Although July is expensive, first half of July is cheaper. June cheaper still.

Bert: Let me know when you'd like seed money.

Natasha: Yvette would like to be part of planning committee for next year.

## 2013 CONFERENCE

Sue Wilders had indicated earlier her willingness to host conference in England.

As of yet, there were no other bids for 2013. Bert suggested this group designate someone to bring the issue of 2013 to the community meeting later. And if we don't get a volunteer for 2013, we should say yes to Sue's proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_: Jo Hilton emailed Kathryn that Univ. of Edinburgh folks might be interested.

Sara: BAPCA will be meeting in 2013. It would be better not to compete with them.

Sue: I'm willing to do it in 2013, but better to wait to find someone in the U.S. for 2013, and then we'll do 2014 in UK.

Some comments that we don't need to rush decision. Give time for others to make proposals.

Bert disagrees: Strongly thinks it a big mistake to delay because a committee needs two years. "My anxiety would go through the roof if we don't choose a site."

Sara: If you schedule a different conference same year in the UK, it will impact on attendance. Many won't go to both.

Tanya: Most disastrous year in attendance was when we had conflict with Carl Rogers Centennial in 2002. Since attendance will be low from U.S., we'll rely on UK attendees and many won't go to both.

Sue: Would prefer to wait for 2014. But we should consider whether \_\_\_\_\_

Bruce: How about split the difference? If we can't decide now, we can decide on the listserve.

Carol: Understands Bert's anxiety, but we have had many conferences that were decided only a year before and they were mostly successful.

Alberto: This is very valuable association, but it's an American Association. There's nothing wrong with that. Rome conference [last year] was biggest conference in PCA history, because I brought 400 Italians. We need to hear ADPCA voice in other countries, but it's a clear risk that it will be small in terms of American attendance.

Jin: Shares Bert's anxiety. If we can't find people for 2013 by end of this conference, we should appoint a committee to actively work on it.

Margaret: Right balance is to have occasional conference abroad, i.e., once every 3, 4, 5 years.

Yvette: Agrees with Margaret: If there's a group in U.S. to assist students with finances, that would help the international representation work. She'd particularly like to go to Italy.

Bruce: How many people from States went to Warwick?

Bert: Many. [did someone say a specific number?]

Natasha: I'm worried it would diminish numbers if we had two consecutive years abroad.

Sue: Agrees with Margaret. If it's done occasionally, you'd have more people motivated and able to afford to go.

Kathy: Issue of fundraising and scholarships for going abroad is not just for students. I can't afford too many trips abroad.

Yvette: We gave scholarships here to both students and others. A large attendance abroad could support more scholarships.

Kathryn: Nobody's offered Italy. Sue's said 2014. Let's accept that and find someone else for 2013. We only have a few minutes left in the business meeting.

Natasha: Is there a person in the room to take on responsibility to notify listserve?

Kathryn: The committee could take on that task.

Bert: I'd want to be on this committee. If there is a committee, I'd want to be on it and resign from Treasurer.

Tanya: I'd like to be on committee, if I could get help with \_\_\_\_\_

Carol: Natasha and Tanya volunteer to be on committee.

Natasha willing to contact listserve to find someone for 2013.

Howie: Worried Bert's anxiety is leading him to too rash a conclusion. Rochester planned the conference in virtually one year.

Jo: Excited by Savannah in 2012. We've had both highest attendance (Manchester) and lowest (Albi) attendance when we've been abroad.

Howie: We shouldn't decide on 2014 now. There are other overtures. We should decide in 2012, giving a two-year lead.

Rob: Look for another site for 2013, but we'll do it two years in a row in Savannah, if need be. (*Applause*).

Bert: I'll withdraw from the committee and remain treasurer. But if we don't have a 2013 site by next year's conference, I will withdraw as treasurer.

**Yvonne De Pascual: Caroline Baretta and I volunteer to host the conference in New Jersey in 2013.**

**[*Huge applause.* I'd call it a decision by acclamation.]**

Sara: Now let's ratify Sue Wilders' proposal for 2014

Kathy: We should accept Sue's now.

Bert: Agrees with Kathy.

Howie: He has no problem with Sue's proposal, doesn't agree with the process. We asked others; there's interest, we have plenty of time; we should give them time to offer their proposals.

Carol: Accepting Sue's proposal now would not be inconsistent with how we've make decisions in the past. The person is willing and trusted, so we make a decision.

Jo: Did you have in mind to offer the conference when you came?

Sue: Yes.

**Kathy: Moved to accept Sue Wilder's proposal for 2014.**

**Accepted.**

Jo: We had a little extra money from Kutztown that we contributed toward publishing this year's journal.

Appendix A

TREASURER'S REPORT

ADPCA

**INCOME STATEMENT**

**JULY 1, 2010--JUNE 30, 2011**

INCOME

<b>Membership fees, w. conference registrations</b>	<b>\$ 670.00</b>
<b>Membership fees, other checks</b>	<b>\$ 2,360.00</b>
<b>Membership fees, PayPal</b>	<b>\$ 2,375.00</b>
<b>Donations</b>	<b>\$ 581.00</b>
<b>Interest</b>	<b>\$ 1,011.57(1)</b>
<b>2011 Conference registration fees</b>	<b>\$ 8,990.00</b>
<b>2011 Conference: other fees</b>	<b>\$ 64.00</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$16,051.57</b>

EXPENSES(2)

<b>Renaissance(3)</b>	<b>\$ 1,400.00</b>
<b>Person-Centered Journal(4) printing</b>	<b>\$ 4,000.00</b>
<b>Person-Centered Journal, other</b>	<b>\$ 1,861.54</b>
<b>Website, old?(5)</b>	<b>\$ 211.08</b>
<b>Website, new</b>	<b>\$ 1,711.79</b>
<b>Legal services fees</b>	<b>\$ 325.00</b>

<b>Filing fees</b>	<b>\$ 10.00</b>
<b>Membership administration</b>	<b>\$ 2.72</b>
<b>PayPal fees</b>	<b>\$ 88.60</b>
<b>Conference expenses</b>	<b>\$ 1,836.12</b>
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>\$11,446.85</b>
 <b>NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN RESERVES</b>	 <b>\$ 4,604.72</b>
 <b>Notes:</b>	
<b>(1) Includes a small amount of interest from late June, 2010.</b>	
<b>(2) Does not include payment of \$8,000.00 for ADPCA 2011 that was paid in June, 2010.</b>	
<b>(3) Two issues</b>	
<b>(4) One issue</b>	
<b>(5) Payments to pair Networks</b>	

**ADPCA**  
**BALANCE SHEET**  
**JUNE 30, 2011**

**ASSETS**

<b>Cash: Hyde Park bank account</b>	<b>\$12,956.64</b>
<b>Cash: PayPal account</b>	<b>\$ 1,317.56</b>
<b>Cash: 2011 conference bank account</b>	<b>\$ 8,468.88</b>
<b>Certificates of Deposit</b>	<b>\$32,699.76</b>
<b>Credit: Illinois taxes, 2006, 2007, 2008</b>	<b>\$ 2,776.20</b>
<b>Accounts receivable</b>	<b>\$ 219.01</b>
<b>Total assets</b>	<b>\$58,438.05</b>

**LIABILITIES**

<b>Accounts payable</b>	<b>\$ 4,663.51</b>
<b>Estimate for additional accounts to be payable</b>	<b>\$ 1,150.00</b>
<b>Total liabilities</b>	<b>\$ 5,813.51</b>

**RESERVES**

<b>Paid-in capital</b>	<b>\$ 9,286.00</b>
<b>Accumulated reserves</b>	<b>\$43,338.54</b>
<b>Total reserves</b>	<b>\$52,624.54</b>

<b>Reserves plus liabilities</b>	<b>\$58,438.05</b>
----------------------------------	--------------------

**ADPCA**  
**TENTATIVE BUDGET(1)**  
**JULY 1, 2011--JUNE 30, 2012**

**INCOME**

<b>Membership fees</b>	<b>\$ 6,000.00</b>
<b>Donations</b>	<b>\$ 600.00</b>
<b>Interest</b>	<b>\$ 750.00</b>
<b>Illinois tax refunds, 2006, 2007, 2008</b>	<b>\$ 2,776.20</b>
<b>Total income</b>	<b>\$10,126.20</b>

**EXPENSES**

<b>Person-Centered Journal(2)</b>	<b>\$ 5,000.00</b>
<b>Renaissance(3)</b>	<b>\$ 1,500.00</b>
<b>Website</b>	<b>\$ 2,000.00</b>
<b>Legal services fees</b>	<b>\$ 350.00</b>
<b>PayPal fees</b>	<b>\$ 100.00</b>
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>\$ 200.00</b>
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>\$ 9,150.00</b>



**Notes:**

- (1) Excludes income and expenses relating to 2011 and 2012 Conferences.**
- (2) Based on one issue.**
- (3) Based on two issues.**

**Note of thanks:**

**The treasurer wishes to thank all the people who helped in the preparation of this set of financial reports, especially Susan Woolever, Paul Blanchard, Howie Kirschenbaum, and Kathryn Moon.**

[illegible]

06/09 – 06/11

**Unsubscribed, opted out Members****December 2009 added 31 member**

1. Unsubscribed 6/04/09
2. Unsubscribed 7/10/09
3. Unsubscribed 9/30/09
4. Asked to be removed 9/30/09

**Jan. - March 2010 added 16 members**

1. Unsubscribed 3/22/10

**April – Dec. 2010 added 74 members**

1. Unsubscribed 4/10/10
2. Unsubscribed 4/28/10
3. Asked to be removed 6/03/10
4. Unsubscribed 6/06/10
5. Asked to be removed 6/19/10
6. Asked to be removed 6/21/10
7. Unsubscribed 6/28/10
8. Asked to be removed 6/30/10
9. Unsubscribed 7/1/10
10. Unsubscribed 7/05/10
11. Unsubscribed 7/05/10
12. Unsubscribed 7/06/10
13. Unsubscribed 7/07/10
14. Unsubscribed 7/10/10
15. Unsubscribed 8/25/10

3. Left group via email 5/8/11
4. Left group via email 5/10/11
5. Asked to be removed 5/11/11
6. Left group via email 5/12/11
7. Left group via email 5/13/11
8. Left group via email 5/13/11
9. Left group via email 5/13/11
10. Left group via email 5/14/11

**June 20-23 2011 - added 18 members**

1. Left group via email 6/21/11
2. Left group via email 6/21/11
3. Left group via email 6/24/11
4. Left group via email 6/24/11
5. Asked to be removed 6/25/11

**Dec. 2010 / Jan. 2011 – added 29 members**

1. Asked to be removed 1/1/11
2. Left group via email 1/7/11
3. Unsubscribed 1/10/11
4. Left group via email 1/10/11
5. Left group via email 1/17/11
6. Left group via email 1/20/11
7. Left group via email 3/17/11
8. Left group via email 3/18/11

**April 5-7 2011 – added 17 members**

1. Asked to be removed 4/5/11
2. Left group via email 4/13/11

## Appendix C

### Secretary's Membership Report

<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>		<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
-------------------	--	-------------	-------------	-------------

<b>Paid Up Memberships on</b>			31-May	31-May	31-May		
<b>Last Day of Membership Year</b>			2009	2010	2011		
			100	174	228		

<b>Memberships at Annual</b>			11-Jun	10-Jun	25-Jul		
<b>Conference in June</b>			2009	2010	2011		
(after registration)							
Current			40	119	162		
Just Expired on June 1			60	62	87		
Expired One Year Ago			35	11	25		
Expired Two Years Ago			65	12	9		
	Total		200	204	283		

<b>DOMESTIC and INTERNATIONAL</b>							
<b>by percentage</b>		31-May	31-May	31-May	31-May		
		2009	2009	2010	2011		
		All	"Current"				
		200	100	174	228		
Domestic		75	77	79	80		
International		25	23	21	20		

(continued on next page)

<b>MEMBERS BY TYPE</b>							
<b>by percentage</b>		All	31-May	31-May	31-May	By number	By number
		2007-09	2009	2010	2011	2010	2011
	(Number)	200	100	174	228	174	228
Supporting, incl. 5-yr		61.3	74	33.9	19.7	59	45
Regular		0		39.7	44.3	69	101
Student		12.4	6	14.4	26.3	25	60
Scholarship		20.1	14	5.7	3.6	10	8
Subscriptions		5.7	6	5.2	4.8	9	11
Institutional		0.5		1.1	1.3	2	3
	Total %	100	100	100	100	174	228

06/09 – 06/11

**APPENDIX D****Report from the Chicago Planning Committee**

Yvette Gilliam, Kathryn Grubbs, Bakahia Madison, Natasha Noorian, Jin Wu,  
and Susan Woolever

A special thanks to our consultants, who have provided time, energy, support, and guidance over the past two years! Also, much gratitude to our volunteers, for sacrificing your Sunday afternoons, email inboxes, and attendance at the conference to aide in the production of conference favors and CEUs. Live Oaks is assisting us in the offering of CEUs: thank you!! Finally, a special shout out to the Center on Halsted and Michael Valdez as well as Argosy University, for providing space to meet and plan. The planning of this conference has been a collaborative process and we are grateful for everyone's assistance.

The following are items we would like to share with the community:

**Finances:** Our goal was to provide an affordable conference and hopefully bring in a profit for the organization. As this last year went on, Loyola offered negotiations for reduced rental fees. As a result, we are able to drop our intended registration fee by \$50/person. With the number of pre-registrants, it seems that the conference will profit between \$2000-\$6000. Numbers were provided to Bert for a treasurer's report.

**Scholarship:** Based on the difficult economy, we were unsure of how many people would be able to attend ADPCA. In turn, we tried to be conservative in our financial decisions. We thoughtfully discussed ways to handle scholarships for the conference. We determined that we would like to try to work with each person who requested assistance. We offered a range of assistance, including extending the student rate to non-students as well as covering entire registration fees. We only provided assistance with registration fees. Thank you to all who donated to the scholarship fund!

**Membership:** We tried to follow more recent traditions of offering payment of membership dues with conference registration. A check will be made to Howie/Bert before the end of the conference to transfer necessary funds.

**Programming:** We worked to not impose any structures, themes, agendas, etc. onto the conference other than the schedule itself. The schedule of presenters was created based on presenters' requests for time, equipment accommodations, and availability to attend other presentations.

**Site:** While none of us in the planning committee are currently affiliated with Loyola University, several community members are alumni or know alumni. The site was chosen based on price, accommodations, and location. It was the most affordable, but we were also excited because it also seems to capture different elements of Chicago: shore of Lake Michigan, skyline, local neighborhoods, and educational opportunities.

06/09 – 06/11

CEUs: Carolyn Schneider and Live Oaks graciously offered to be our sponsor of CEUs. In turn, we are able to provide CEUs for licensed counselors and social workers. The presentations that offer CEUs was determined by the following criteria: 1) presenter must provide objectives for the presentation and 2) presentation must have a licensed psychologist, social worker, or counselor convening, who provided a copy of their CV. If presenters did not provide us with this information or meet the necessary criteria, presentations will not offer CEUs.

To the next committee: We have meeting minutes, budgets, and mailing lists to share as guides or aides if desired.