



# Changes to APA Council: Historical Overview



Date	Action
1946	Council includes 9 reps from geographic regions, 52 from divisions, 2 from Conference of State Psychological Associations, 1 from an affiliated educational group, and 10 members of the Board of Directors (total = 74); affiliated state associations were to "be representative of all the kinds of interests in psychology in that state" <sup>1</sup>
1957	P&P Board's annual report suggests disbanding the Conference of State Psychological Associations (CSPA) and allowing state associations with at least 100 APA members a Council representative; smaller states could combine to meet the minimum size. CSPA functions would be assumed by a new Board of Professional Affairs; a Board of Scientific Affairs would also be added to governance <sup>2</sup>
1960	P&P Board's annual report proposes bylaws changes that include its 1957 recommendation regarding state association representation. In a footnote, P&P "regards a Council size of about 100 as the upper limit for effective discussion and will propose that Council adopt a rule calling for P&P to initiate redistribution and reduction of Council size to about 85 when its membership reaches 115." Proposed Bylaws add BPA, BSA, and an Education & Training Board; moves operational details from Bylaws to "Rules of Council" <sup>3</sup>
1961	Bylaws amended to include key elements of the 1960 P&P proposal
1970	10-vote per member apportionment process introduced to address concern that many members belonged to multiple divisions and others belonged to none <sup>4</sup>
1997	Added 48 seats to distribute among divisions and state associations that were not meeting the 0.5% vote allocation minimum in the apportionment process (the Wildcard Plan) <sup>5</sup>
1999	P&P 5-year report stresses the need for change within APA governance citing financial concerns and staffing issues with the workload placed on APA staff working with APA boards and committees. One suggestion is that Council restructure itself similar to the U.S Congress by creating subcommittees to carry out policy work

<sup>1</sup> Crawford, M.P. (2018). Rapid growth and change at the American Psychological Association: 1945 to 1970. In W.E. Pickren & A. Rutherford (Eds.) *125 Years of the American Psychological Association*, p. 185, 188.

<sup>2</sup> APA (1957). Report of the Policy and Planning Board: 1957. *American Psychologist*, 12, 491-498.

<sup>3</sup> APA (1960). Revision of APA bylaws. *American Psychologist*, 15, 135-154.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford, M.P. (2018). Rapid growth and change at the American Psychological Association: 1945 to 1970. In W.E. Pickren & A. Rutherford (Eds.) *125 Years of the American Psychological Association*, p. 189.

<sup>5</sup> Pickren & Rutherford (2018). Challenges to the American Psychological Association and paths for the future. In W.E. Pickren & A. Rutherford (Eds.) *125 Years of the American Psychological Association*, p. 300-301.

<b>2001</b>	Bylaw amendment fixed # of Division & SPTA seats at 162 which became effective in 2003. Beginning in 2003, the total of Council Representatives was 176.
<b>2002</b>	Added voting graduate student representative to Council and non-voting representative to Board of Directors
<b>2011</b>	Good Governance Project (GGP) initiated to "conduct a detailed review and recommend changes that would maximize organizational effectiveness of APA governance by assuring its practices, processes, and structures are optimized and aligned with what is required to thrive in a rapidly changing and increasingly complex environment" <sup>6</sup>
<b>2012</b>	Council receives GGP interim report and requests GGP return with specific proposals
<b>2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In February, Council votes to invite regional psychological associations to each send an observer to Council meetings.</li> <li>In August, approves several motions associated with final GGP recommendations. GGP presents Council with three options for change ranging from minimal to major restructuring; 59% of Council votes <b>YES</b> to a substantive change in Council structure; directs President to appoint an Implementation Work Group (IWG) to design and implement transition plans to APA Governance, including further development of Council restructure options getting most support in a straw poll.</li> </ul>
<b>2014</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In February, IWG presents three alternatives for a restructured Council. Council directs IWG to return with a model for structural change that takes into consideration its discussion of these alternatives.</li> <li>In August, IWG proposes a Council Structure of 137 members with one representative from Divisions, and SPTAs, BOD members, CLT, APAGS Chair and nine at large members appointed by a NASCC like committee. In a straw poll, 39% of Council agreed with IWG proposal and 32% indicated more options needed to be explored.<sup>7</sup></li> <li>CLT was tasked with developing a proposal (or process to bring forward a proposal) given results of the straw polls.</li> </ul>
<b>2017</b>	Changed apportionment process to move seats from SPTA to Division pool (or vice versa) as needed to guarantee each SPTA and Division at least one Council representative <sup>8</sup> Similar proposal defeated in membership vote in 2010.
<b>2019</b>	Policy & Planning Board devotes its annual report to resurfacing the matter of Council size and structure
<b>2020</b>	Council votes to add Ethnic Minority Psychological Association representatives (change from non-voting delegates); membership vote passes this change. <sup>9</sup> Prior efforts to do this failed in 2007, 2008, and 2012.

*Note.* This timeline provides a brief history of changes to the Council of Representatives. It is neither completely comprehensive nor detailed. It is designed to be a brief history to provide context regarding Council's continuing quest to best represent the members of APA and to do so in the most efficient and effective manner. The history illustrates both structural changes and ongoing discussions of how to carry in the Council's business. Understanding this history provides context as prologue to the work required today to move forward to successfully carry out APA's strategic vision for the future of APA and psychology.

Note that historical records related to Council size and composition, particularly dating before 2010, are not readily accessible. The Policy & Planning Board welcomes those who have some of this historical documentation available to them to share applicable information with us so that we can expand upon the information provided here. For example, other key dates that would be interesting to add to this timeline include removing geographical representation outside the state associations and adding representatives of US territories and Canadian provinces to Council.

It would also be interesting to provide a graphic to demonstrate how Council size has grown through the years and to be able to characterize how the diversity of Council membership, in terms of demographics, disciplinary focus, and other perspectives, has evolved over the years, but the requisite data are not available to do so.

<sup>6</sup> APA (2013). Good Governance Project (GGP) Recommended Changes to Maximize Organizational Effectiveness of APA Governance.

<sup>7</sup> Council of Representatives Meeting Minutes, August 2014

<sup>8</sup> Council of Representatives Meeting Minutes, February 2017

<sup>9</sup> Council of Representatives Meeting Minutes, August 2020

# Detail on Council Actions Related to Good Governance Project

## Recommendation on Council Structure

### August 2013

The Good Governance Project report suggested three potential models for restructuring Council. These models describe only variations on the 162 seats, with voting roles of Board of Directors and the not yet existing Council Leadership Team unspecified.

Council had previously endorsed (59% in Feb 2013?) a substantive change in Council's structure, so model 7A was dropped from discussion. The endorsement figures below are from a straw poll of the remaining alternatives. The IWG was instructed to give further consideration to variations on models 7B and 7D.

7A – Retain current structure (162 voting representatives with allocations determined by apportionment ballot)

7B – Structural modification of existing system (38%)

- 1 unit/1 vote for divisions and SPTAs on current Council (114)
- 20-25 additional seats for other perspectives
- Total size in the 134-139 range

7C – New structure: Six pillar model (19%)

- 15 delegates from each of five mission areas (education, science, public interest, practice, plus health)
- 15 delegates for an advocacy pillar
- Total size = 90

7D – Proposal offered from Council floor (41%)

- 1 unit/1 vote for divisions and SPTAs
- Additional seats “with pillar elements”

Abstain (3%)

### February 2014

The Implementation Work Group Offered Three Alternative Motions (see below).

#### *Motion A*

- Divisions and SPTAs as determined by apportionment ballot (162)
- Board of Directors as configured if Bylaws changes approved) (16)
- Members-at-large (9)
- Totals 187 voting members

#### *Motion B*

- Divisions (60) and SPTAs (60) each get one representative, with votes weighted by results of the apportionment ballot
- Representative for each directorate plus international (5)
- Early career representative (1)
- APAGs representative (1)
- Special needs representation as determined by Council or NASCC (3)
- APA presidential trio (3)
- CLT Chair and Chair-elect (2)
- Members without vote – treasurer, secretary, CEO (3)
- Totals 129 voting members and 3 nonvoting members = 132

### Motion C

- Divisions and SPTAs, with number of seats based on this formula
  - 1-999 = 1 seat
  - 1000-1999 = 2 seats
  - 2000-2999 = 3 seats
  - 3000-3999 = 4 seats
- Board of Directors as configured if Bylaws changes approved) (16)
- Members-at-large (9)
- Estimated voting member totals Divisions (90) + SPTAs (75) = 16 + 9 = 190

### August 2014

As described below, Council was presented a main motion and a substitute motion. Instead of voting on either motion, Council responded to multiple straw polls, as summarized below. CLT was tasked with developing a proposal (or process to bring forward a proposal) given results of the straw polls.

#### Implementation Work Group Main Motion

- One representative from each division (54) and SPTA (60)
- Board of Directors officers
- APAGS chair
- Council Leadership Team
- Nine members-at-large elected from general membership (slated each year to accommodate the specific needs of Council)
- Totals 136 voting members + 1 non-voting member (CEO) = 137

#### Board of Directors Substitute Motion

- Same as IWG Main Motion, but adds eight additional non-voting members – Six Board members at large, the APAGS past-chair, and the public member of the Board (i.e., the non-officer members of the Board of Directors)
- Totals 136 voting members + 9 non-voting members = 145

#### Poll #1

Where do you stand on having nine at-large seats designated by the NASCC each year based on a needs assessment?

- I support the IWG proposal – 39%
- I think more work is needed on other options, such as considering a different number or method of allocating at-large seats – 32%
- We need to develop entirely new models for at-large seats – 29%

#### Poll #2

Vote your preference

- Apportionment – 32%
- 1 vote 1 unit – 50%
- Weighted – 18%

#### Poll #3

Vote your preference

- Apportionment – 44%
- 1 vote 1 unit – 56%

#### Poll #4

Should additional seats (in addition to division and SPTA seats) be added to Council?

- No additional seats – 22%
- Additional 9 seats as proposed by IWG – 34%

- Other (e.g., Ethnic Minority or Regional Psychological Associations) – 12%
- Combination of IWG proposal and other seats – 32%