

Board Meeting May 12, 2011 Omaha, Nebraska Conference

Attended:

Renee Matlock (Membership Chair), Sue McLean (Vendor Chair), Brendan Webster (Board Member), Jen Malone Priest (Board Member), Sally Stram Hays (Past President), Denise Dougherty (President), Barbara Samuels (Past President), Cheryl Campbell (Treasurer-elect), Melanie Waters (Guest), Marian Sheehan (Guest), Eileen Devaney (Board Member), Janet Krebs (Past President, Nominations Chair, Website Chair), Rebecca Laskin (Guest), Lorraine Priceman (Guest), Laurie Botstein (Vice President), Anita Werner (Secretary)

Review of Minutes

Anita Werner moved Eileen Devaney seconded; unanimously approved

Identification of proxies:

Denise Dougherty for Roberta Kornfield
Jen Malone Priest for Allyson Weinstein

Reports

President – Denise Dougherty

Business Institute - Several speakers spoke highly of AAPPSPA in their presentations – Steve Bourne and Kelly Hoelzer presented two sessions each. Both repeatedly mentioned AAPPSPA. I spoke on making the Transition to Private Practice and a speaker who has a consulting business for private practices – a physical therapist – waved our card and mentioned an organization people should take advantage of. The booth received a great deal of traffic on Saturday, not as much on Sunday – but all booths had less traffic. A number of individuals stopped by saying they had picked up our information at another conference but had not yet joined but planned on it. Several of our members attended – Karen Gonzales sat at the booth with me during breaks and lunch to discuss our organization. Our postcards and pens were displayed as well as a summary of this year's conference speakers and topics.

ASHA's Renee Tross reported at the exhibitor meeting that they had to turn away vendors because of lack of space. We indicated our interest in continuing to exhibit there. Next year is Memphis Tennessee, the week before our conference – April 28-29. The following year – instead of returning to Rockville, MD, the conference will be held in Orlando. ASHA is moving to larger facilities for this conference.

ASHA Online Private Practices Institute – I was disappointed at our lack of involvement in this endeavor and was not aware this was planned until the email announcing registration. In communicating with ASHA, there was some miscommunication. At the business institute, I did receive an apology from Arlene, who said it could have been handled better. I also had a chance to speak with Karen Niles, who was key in planning the conference, as well as our ASHA liaison, Janet Brown. All voiced interest in continuing to work together for the good of both organizations to serve private practitioners. We were notified by Karen that our members would be able to register at a discounted rate. This is NOT being planned for 2012.

As a follow-up, we were invited to participate in a conference call with ASHA, a representative of the special interest group dealing with business, and CORSPAN. The CORSPAN rep did not attend, the SIG rep pushed hard for supervision sessions. I had requested topic suggestions from our members and those were briefly discussed as well as emailed to the group. I reported our members want more than generalized content – more specific information – and did not feel that sessions on supervision would be a draw for our members. This was a first step in planning the next year's conference.

VP – Laurie Botstein Spring Conference

Due to the economy, we do not have the anticipated numbers that we had at previous conferences. We usually have about 60 attendees and this year we have 32 registrants. I believe updated number is 35; last year we had 48.

Some of the sessions are concurrent sessions. There will be 2.4 CEU's available, which is the most CEU's we have ever had.

As we did last year, there will not be handouts – power points were sent to Nadine who put them on the website and they were password protected.

Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska received mailings and about this conference. Advertising was done in ADVANCE Magazine. Others suggested that the low attendance was due to graduations and the location also has been a factor.

Brendan Webster stated that she sees next year's date is earlier so graduation will not be a factor to contend with.

Barbara Samuels stated that discussing that would be out of order as it is related to new business.

Treasurer - Mindy Newhouse (Orally reviewed in the meeting by Denise Dougherty)

Treasurer's Brief Summary

January through December 2010

Total Income \$ 46,254.15

Total Expense \$ 45,060.35

Net Income \$ 1,193.80

January through current 2011

Total Income \$ 36,123.52

Total Expense \$13,015.25

Net Income to date \$23,108.27 NOTE: Institute and Conference expenses not yet paid.

Balance in account as of 5/12/2011 \$ 59,114.03

We filed a tax return this year.

Secretary - Anita Werner

The minutes from the board meeting have been prepared and are ready to be presented at our Spring Conference. Additionally, ballots were sent out and collected for new board positions.

Results of the vote:

Initial vote request was April 11, 2011 with a follow up email labeled "Last Chance to Vote" on April 22, 2011

Board: seven votes; one negative six positive

Membership 24 all votes positive except one

Bylaws state it is the majority of people who voted. 5% considered a good response. Twenty-four of three hundred members voted. It was asked by Sally Stram Hays if the twenty-four votes were sitting at the table for this meeting and the response from Anita Werner was that was even some those sitting at the table for the meeting did not respond to the vote.

Laurie Botstein asked, "What is the number of people that need to approve the vote?" Response by Barbara Samuels, "It is the number of people who vote. That's what our bylaws state."

Sue McLean asked, "Now how does the board get voted upon?" Barbara Samuels responded, "It is the majority of those who vote." Sue went onto ask, "Who picked this slate, because it is a change from what it was suppose to be?" Barbara responded, that this will be discussed in the nominating committee report.

Laurie Botstein asked for a clarification, "So if one person votes, than it would be ok, because that is the majority of people who voted?" Barbara responded, "Theoretically, yes, but there has never been a situation, in which one person has voted."

Laurie Botstein questioned, that "So we have 7 people that voted, but we have three hundred members." Barbara Samuels clarified, that we have 7 board members that voted out of 12."

Renee Matlock asked, "Is this the typical response to a slate?" Janet Krebs responded, "Yes, to any vote or any poll we send out. I think 5% is a good response, and that is usually what happens."

Brendon Webster moved to accept the executive committee reports, Jen Malone Priest seconded

HCEC - Denise Dougherty – no report

CEU REPORT: CEU COMMITTEE Roberta Kornfield

For the period 1/2/2011 to 4/18/2011 AAPPSPA registered our 2011 Clinical Institute (#1010) and 2011 Spring Conference (#1011) with ASHA. We registered only one cooperative continuing education program (#1012) for The Speech Team.

Exhibits – Ken Anderson

After ASHA in Philadelphia, Denise Dougherty took display to her office since the next time it would be used is ASHA Business Institute. Currently the display is at Denise's office and will be shipped to ASHA in San Diego to Ken Anderson.

Table has been reserved for ASHA; we were able to identify 4 choices of location and we will be notified about location at a later date

Vendor – Sue McLean Vendor Report 2011

Exhibitors:

SuperDuper Speech Company: 10% discount, \$350 plus \$400 in donations (they will be using 3 tables)

Pearson Publishing (paid \$250 for table)

Sue has not unpacked, but it is all here.

Donations:

Book from Joan Green	Speech Buddy
Photo Card Deck	Thumballs (6) from Answers in Motion
Pearson Higher Ed donated books	Poorani Doonan donated 6 apps
Geek SLP-Smartly Ears donated 3 apps	Linguistystems donated items
Tote Bags from ClinicSource.	Books from Jones and Bartlett
Griffn Laboratories promised to donate a portable voice amplifier SoniVox (it has not arrived yet)	

Parliamentarian – Barbara Samuels

No report

Membership - Renee Matlock

Committee Report as of 5/03/2011

1. Current membership: 257 last year 302 this year
 - Life: 28
 - Full: 228 last year 273 this year
 - Affiliate: 1
2. New members:
 - 5/1/04 to 12/31/04: 20
 - 1/1/05 to 12/31/05: 45
 - 1/1/06 to 12/31/06: 34
 - 1/1/07 to 12/31/07: 63
 - 1/1/08 to 12/31/08: 60
 - 1/1/09 to 12/31/09: 62
 - 1/1/10 to 12/31/10: 50
 - 1/1/11 to present: 20

2010 Members Referred by:

- AAPPSPA Member/Colleague: 4
- ASHA: 1
- ASHA Business Institute: 2
- Internet Search: 8
- Returning Member: 3

- Unknown 2
- 3. Pending applications: 2-3
- 4. Functions of the Membership Chair are as follows:
 - Maintain current membership list
 - Process new member applications
 - Welcome new members to AAPPSPA via email
 - Coordinate efforts with AAPPSPA office Bookkeeper, Webmaster and Website Coordinator
 - Send welcome letter and membership certificate to new members
 - Follow up on membership inquiries, via phone or email

Honors – Mindy Newhouse

May or may not have honors

By-laws – Terri Rossman – no report

She would prefer if we found someone to replace her as she does not have the time right now. She has not resigned as of yet.

Nominations – Janet Krebs

The current slate was submitted in its final form on 4/11/11, after meeting and discussion among the nominating committee: consisting of chair, Janet Krebs, and members Mindy Newhouse and Barbara Samuels. According to the schedule set out in the Bylaws, the slate was supposed to have been submitted to the Board at the fall board meeting, which did not take place until January 2011. Unfortunately, this schedule was not followed (for the past few years) and the slate was not officially presented until 4/11/11. Concerns were expressed as to why it was so late. Although this did not allow for a great amount of time to peruse this slate, there is nothing in the bylaws stating a contingency if the timeline is not met; therefore the slate can still be accepted and voted upon. Although the nominating chair was considering the accession of the vice president to the office of president for the 2011-12 year, information was brought to light and discussed which ended up in a vote to nominate the current president, Denise Dougherty for a third term and a new Vice President, Eileen Devaney. The slate was presented to the board and was passed.

Laurie Botstein questioned the interpretation of the bylaws. Janet Krebs stated that since there is no contingency or statement about the voting not being done 90 days in

advance, then there is no reason not to vote. Janet stated that Kelly Hoelzer, AAPPSPA attorney, reviewed the bylaws and interpreted them as such.

Laurie also brought up that the bylaws state that in order to make additions to the board, it needs to be done by April first.

Janet Krebs, stated, "Again, due to the fact that there are no contingencies if this does not occur then, it is allowable.

Laurie Botstein asked, "Why do we have bylaws, if there is no contingency? What purpose do they serve?"

Janet Krebs stated, "Laurie, if you would like to make changes in the bylaws you can bring up suggestions and be involved in a committee to review the suggested changes. We have to work out a statement of what would change and the board has to vote on it. If the board approves it, then the membership has to vote on it.

Renee Matlock asked, "Doesn't Robert's Rules of Order take effect in situations like this when information is not contained in the bylaws? She stated that as she has participated in her city's Chamber, many situations have come up in which specific information is not contained in bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order take effect.

Janet Krebs stated that by appointment of the president, vacancies in the board can be filled. If in fact the board is not presented in a timely fashion and the board chooses not to vote on these, the nominating committee then said

Barbara Samuels stated that technically, the bylaws state the nomination is made and approved by the board. The board can at any time fill a vacancy.

Sue McLean stated, "Are we filling vacancies, I am confused."

Janet Krebs stated, "For Nicky and Vicky- those were filling vacancies. This is up to presidency."

Laurie asked, "Can you read again, my transgressions?" Janet said, "Can I read your transgressions?" Laurie stated, "This is-

Barbara Samuels stated, "Madam President- this is out of order. If you wish to have-

Laurie stated, "It said, Janet just read that I am not ascending to the presidency because of certain things that came to light. I would like her to read that again so that I can address that. That is not out of order. I am addressing something that Janet has just

spoken about, so therefore I am not out of order. I am asking her to repeat what she has said, so therefore I can address it. Go ahead Janet”

Barbara Samuels: “According to Roberts Rules of Order, you are not the presiding officer. It is not your decision who speaks. According to Roberts Rules of Order there is no discussion on any issue unless there is a motion on the floor to be discussed.”

Laurie Botstein: “I move that Janet repeat what she has said about the ascension to presidency.” Brendon Webster seconded.

Janet Krebs stated that, “Although the nominating committee considered that ascension of the office of the vice president to that of president in the 2011-2012 year, information was brought to light and discussed which ended up in a vote to nominate the current president, Denise Dougherty for a third term and a new Vice President, Eileen Devaney.”

Laurie Botstein asked, “Am I allowed to ask about the new information that came to light? Am I entitled to due process? Is there anything in the bylaws about that?”

“Barbara Samuels stated, “It is scarcely due process. If you wish to make a motion to you to discuss this...”

Laurie Botstein: “I make a motion that the information that was brought to light be discussed- about my inability to ascend to the presidency.”

Janet: “If there is a motion on the floor, you should be asking for a second.” Sue McLean seconded.

At this point we have to have a discussion, should be discuss.

Barbara Samuels, “Excuse me Jane, it is not required that you discuss. It is not appropriately necessarily for you to speak. Laurie has made a motion and it therefore up to Laurie to explain her motion.”

Laurie Botstein: “I am sorry, I didn’t get that. I didn’t hear it down here.”

Barbara Samuels: “Didn’t hear what. What was the motion that you just made?”

Laurie Botstein: “Anita will you reread the motion?”

Anita Werner, “I have- Laurie moved that Janet reread the motion again and Brendan seconded. Then, Laurie moved that the information brought to light her inability to ascend to the presidency be discussed.”

Sue McLean stated, "I don't know. We have been doing this a long time. Let's just put everything on the table and have an open honest discussion. We are all adults. I don't run my practice like this or my life. We just need to put things on the table and discuss this like adults."

Brendan Webster added, "Some transparency is in order."

Sue McLean stated, "On not just this issue, but on others as well."

Barbara Samuels, "The matter or other issues, is decidedly out of order."

Renee Matlock, "Perhaps that can be brought up during new business. I don't know what she is referring to, but..."

Barbara Samuels, "I don't either."

Renee Matlock, "but could it be brought up under new business?"

Barbara Samuels: "Yes, anything can be brought up under new business."

Janet Krebs: "Ok now, here's the question that I ask and that is, "Are discussions among the nominating committee, necessarily for board consumption?"

Barbara Samuels: "There is no reason nor precedence for that occurring."

Laurie Botstein: "I beg to differ. I was slandered. I guess what I will do is I will reveal what happened. I was um- Janet and I were having discussions about the board and I got an email from Janet that asked me if I could have a conference call on Tuesday April 2. Well I get on the conference call and the first thing I hear is Barbara Samuels who says, 'This is the nominating committee and we have decided that you are not qualified to become president of AAPPSPA.'"

Barbara Samuels: "I am sorry, that is not what occurred."

Laurie Botstein: "This was a recorded conversation. It was a conference call that was recorded."

Barbara Samuels: "I was not the first speaker on that conference call."

Janet Krebs: "That is true. I was the one who introduced the entire topic. I take exception to the fact that you recorded without my knowledge."

Laurie Botstein: "Georgia allows it. What I am coming down to... the basics pertain to that I had breached protocol, because it was assumed that I had emailed Janet Brown(

Director, Health Care Services- SLP) who is the ASHA liaison to AAPPSPA when the reality is that Janet Brown emailed me.

Laurie read the following series of email from Janet Brown:

Friday, March 25, 2011

Hi Laurie,

I'm hoping to register for your conference in Omaha but needed to check first—as the ASHA liaison, may I register at the member rate?

Hoping to see you there!

Janet

Sunday, March 27, 2011

Hi Janet,

As liaison to AAPPSPA, you are considered an associate member, and therefore you may register for the conference as a member. How would I describe the job description of ASHA liaison to AAPPSPA to our membership?

Laurie

Monday, March 28, 2011

Hi Laurie,

Thanks for the clarification—I will register soon!

Staff liaisons serve as the point of contact between ASHA and other organizations with whom we have a relationship, and are the conduit of information between our two organizations. After attending your meeting last year I could share more information about AAPPSPA with my other colleagues in the Speech-Language Pathology Cluster so they would also be better informed about your organization and can share that information with other members.

Janet

Monday, March 28, 2011

Hi Laurie,

With whom were you able to share

Our information? I think that it would be good for us to make contact with them, in light of the fact that

only one person, and a non-board member, was involved with the new private practice programs that ASHA is presenting. Seems like we should all be able to play together.

Laurie

Tuesday, March 29, 2011

Hi Laurie,

I feel that ASHA and AAPPSPA's relationship has other benefits in addition to professional development programs. Attending your conference and meeting your members gave me a better perspective (which I shared with my coworkers) to provide more information about your organization to members who call ASHA about private practice. Last year, for example, I asked Denise for recommendations of members who could be interviewed on accent modification based on a request from the media. I also sent Denise information that I thought would be of interest to your members about Medicare and private practice and grass roots advocacy.

I went back through my exchange of messages with Denise last year and saw that she sent a message last year through AAPPSPA yahoo groups soliciting ideas and speakers for ASHA. The only responses I received were from Denise, who was invited to be a speaker at the Business Institute on starting a private practice; and Janet Krebs, who was invited to be one of two coordinators of the virtual private practice conference. We solicit ideas from many groups each year to develop professional development programs and carefully consider your suggestions among the others that we receive.

Janet

Friday, April 1, 2011

Hi Janet,

We appreciate all that you have done for AAPPSPA in your position as liaison, but have some difficulties with lack of recognition by ASHA. Both Denise and Janet wrote articles for the ASHA Leader, and in the references section, no mention was made of AAPPSPA, and at the end of the articles, non-members were referred to for further information. Again, I will refer to the upcoming private practice webinar. While Janet Krebs was asked to be a presenter, there was no other contact made to Denise, as president of AAPPSPA, the largest private practice body of ASHA members. We asked how AAPPSPA could become more of a presence in ASHA, and we were told to become more involved as members. As individual members, we are on multiple committees, but the amount of recognition remains the same-nil. As incoming president, I am looking for a better way that we can become more of a presence in ASHA, and I am looking to you as our liaison to help us increase our presence in situations in which we are not able to be present, but should be recognized and remembered. I would appreciate the names of the people who are in charge of the webinar, so that I can communicate with them, and possibly we can coordinate the next one, and AAPPSPA and ASHA can have a united front. Looking forward to seeing you in Omaha.

Laurie

Laurie Botstein: So that was part of my downfall. This is the letter I got from Denise. It is a “cover your ass letter, ladies.” Laurie read this letter.

“The AAPPSPA Board of Directors has decided it is in the best interest...”

“Laurie, Laurie, Laurie, Laurie- from Barbara Samuels and Denise Dougherty. That was prepared for you.

“As you know the AAPPSPA Board of Directors has decided it is in the best interest of the organization to remove your name from the ballot 2012 officer elections. In recent months your communication with ASHA representatives ...

Barbara Samuels: Laurie

Laurie Botstein:

--- admission as a relations with ASHA has brought into question your effectiveness as the official leader of the organization. In response with your concerns shared with Janet Krebs, no one involved in this matter has ever questioned your ability as a practitioner or your professionalism, however I do need to point out that I was also told (and I am not sure where this came from) that the Executive Director of ASHA requested that I not- also requested- I do have to clarify this with her, I was told she was in Thailand- and I will contact her when she gets back- that she did not want to work with me- that she did not think that she could work with me as president of AAPPSPA. In response to your concern- this is not action taken lightly and the nominating committee carefully considered all options (I don't know what they were) and AAPPSPA protocol before issuing the ballots.

Now I responded to a email from the liaison. However, over two weeks ago, Kathleen Davis wrote an email saying she had emailed ASHA. So I am thinking... she broke protocol. Did she not know that as an AAPPSPA member no one is allowed to write to ASHA without going through the president.

Barbara Samuels: Wait a minute.

Laurie Botstein: I am not finished.

(Numerous people talking)

Denise Dougherty: Time out. Just time out.

Laurie: Janet can you not speak.

Denise Dougherty: Ok, I have a comment.

Janet: First of all there are other correspondences that have occurred into that which are not in there. I don't have any with me.

May I

Barbara Samuels: I have one from you to me.

Laurie Botstein: I have that one too, I'll read it.

Barbara Samuels: That was dated Sunday,

Laurie Botstein: Ok, here it is.

Hi Barbara... (Lots of simultaneous talking)

Denise Dougherty, Barbara Samuels: Laurie you are out of order.

Denise: Barbara has the floor right now.

Laurie Botstein: Go ahead.

Barbara Samuels:

Hi Barbara;

I know that you are busy so I will try to keep this brief. *How did AAPPSPA start under the old private practice program? (Hard to decipher from tape this sentence)* I decided to see how far I could get with private practice people. I have already told the liaison that I didn't think she was doing her job and as liaison, she needed to let the people know more about us. I am about to write the president and I wanted to tell him the reason AAPPSPA was founded and I wanted to give him the correct information. Would you be able to provide me with a brief synopsis. Thanks and I look forward to seeing you in Omaha.

And when I received this my response was what Laurie was doing was not within appropriate protocol. The interrelationship between ASHA and AAPPSPA should come from the president. As an individual member of ASHA, of course, has any right to write to ASHA, but not as a representative of AAPPSPA unless that is the president of the organization. Therefore, I sent this message to Denise.

Laurie Botstein: The response was Laurie, (Reading email) I was shocked and dismayed at your email. I understand your frustration with ASHA but for several reasons you are wrong. In the first place, you are the vice president, it is not your place to do so.

It is up to the president to communicate with ASHA or with any other organization as the official voice of AAPPSPA. In addition, many of our presidents have spent many hours building a more positive relationship with ASHA, especially with our liaison. To tell her she is wrong is the worst way to accomplish anything. As the old saying goes, you catch more with honey than you do with vinegar. I would guess that when you talk to the parent of a patient, even though you would like to throttle the parent, you approach the situation tactfully. The same is true here. In a convoluted way, ASHA is our parent. Protocol is important to any organization, otherwise they would be chaos. In a school, the students are responsible to the teacher and the teacher is responsible to the principal who in turn is responsible to the school board. In any organization, there has to be a hierarchy. In AAPPSPA all board members are essentially responsible to the president who maintains order. --- (couldn't clearly hear) have responsibility to keep things running smoothly. It may be appropriate for a president to contact a liaison, but to go over the head of the president is guaranteed to sour our relations --- (couldn't clearly hear) and probably with ASHA

as well. Like it or not we are dependent on ASHA for space to hold meetings--- that is one of the ways we get new members.

Mon, Apr 4, 2011 My response was that I was going to wait until May until I am president and I wanted to inform people in ASHA about where AAPPSPA has come from and what it has accomplished and try to see if we can build a road together. Right now, it is the opinion that ASHA is in competition with AAPPSPA for the same people. I always put the honey before the vinegar. After all, if you can't beat them, join them. I'd like to have them join us.

Denise Dougherty: Janet will you please take the floor.

Janet Krebs: I feel that the statement of or- I don't know that exact word- used about the correspondence with Janet Brown being innocuous is not the case. It started out that way, but I think that as you went on you were critical of the way things were being done at that point. That is the first part of the departure from what is appropriate for you as a vice president. You have spoken on many many occasions to- somewhat less here- about how displeased you are with how ASHA has been handling things and how you plan to make sure they understood and it did not-

Laurie Botstein: I never said that.

Janet Krebs : Those may not have been the words but that was what the intention was. I have been a part of a tremendous amount of conversation of that with you regarding that. There's been a lot of anger in terms of the steps that ASHA has been taking for the Private Practice Institute, the webinars and so on. And we've had a lot of discussions

about that. The concern that I have here is that you were not respecting the chain of command here and that you were more concerned about what you felt was the best interest of AAPPSPA – no question in my mind that you were acting out of what you felt was the best interest of AAPPSPA- but what you were potentially doing was throwing away the hard work of several years and that was where that concern came from. Whether or not you want to accept it or embrace it the communication we got from ASHA was very negative about the possibility of dealing with you and we felt that we had no –

Sue Mclean: Who though?

Janet Krebs: Well she ---

Sue McLean: What kind of interactions?

Janet Krebs: The emails are the only things that are written on paper, but there are a lot of interactions that occurred over the years at various different times. Whether or not anything was intentional but there were observations that were shared from ASHA in terms of what they felt the agenda was here.

Several people speaking at once

Laurie Botstein: I think that this should not be mentioned.

Several people speaking at once

Janet Krebs: Laurie, Laurie, Laurie

Several people speaking at once

Laurie Botstein: This is just hearsay---

Janet Krebs: Laurie we are not talking about a law suit here.

Laurie Botstein: We are not accept that a lawyer was involved in this situation.

Janet Krebs: And a threat was made on your end that you were going to sue asses off for libel and that you were going to walk out of the –ucking conference and--- oh yes you did in your anger, you don't remember some of these things that were said. I did not record them because I would not have done that without notifying you because I think that is ---

Laurie Botstein : Excuse me I said that I was going to see this conference through.

Janet: You said that afterwards. You said that afterwards when you had time to cool down. That is not what you said at first.

Laurie Botstein: Your right and you said that you would do the same thing.

Janet Krebs : I said to you, You know what- I might walk out on this conference if I were in your shoes. I said that to you, absolutely. And I also said to you- I don't know what you're going to do, but whatever – I started by saying that you have a right to do whatever you think you should do because you have to make that decision, it is your choice. Absolutely and I was in a very difficult position because I felt that I had to play both sides here... a friend as well as a colleague. Now, just as you feel that you that you were making decisions on what's best for AAPPSPA, that's what we felt that we had done.

I will say to you all that we did have a conference call with Laurie, that we did have a good amount of discussion, and Denise was not involved in this at this point. Just Mindy, Barbara and myself- and we did have a good deal of discussion. Before the conference call, we had a conference call, we gave Laurie an opportunity to present- to answer the questions we had and then we come together and we discussed. We put off our decision for a week at that point because we felt that we really needed to sit on it and discuss it. It was not an easy decision, but none the less that was the decision that was made. Do I feel happy that this has happened- no, I'm horrified that this has happened, but I still feel that this was a good decision.

Brendan Webster: May I ask a question?

Laurie Botstein : What do feel is the general consensus of AAPPSPA's members about the relationship with ASHA. If you think about what the list-serve actually responds to things that ASHA does...

Janet Krebs: We never get more than 5% response and so as far as – you talk about hearsay- I have no idea. I know a few people who were extremely vocal about it and they post many many times. Whenever they post, I get a half a dozen responses from other members privately saying to me- Can you please put a stop to this because I am so sick of hearing this ASHA bash. It is really inappropriate, it's unprofessional and so why don't we do something proactive to provide what we want. We complained about the fact that ASHA was not giving any attention to private practice and now they are looking to give continuing education for private practice. Is it competition for us- absolutely- however they are doing what we have asked, they are recognizing private practice as a resource. Will they join together with us? If we handle it the right way, I believe they will.

Brendan Webster: Point of information. I am sure this situation has never come up and hopefully will never come up again, but does the punishment – does the crime justify the punishment?

I don't think it's a punishment (unknown speaker)

Barbara Samuels: It's not a function of crime or punishment

Brendon Webster: Well those are words I am using

Barbara Samuels: There the words

Brendan Webster: Does the infraction that you see taking Laurie out of the vice presidency position as opposed to talking with her about it.

Janet Krebs: Well, we discussed that at length- that aspect. And we did talk with her about it, but I don't think we felt satisfied afterwards that she was any less angry about this and feeling any differently. Instead of feeling, wow, I'll handle ASHA differently, I'd really like to have a good relationship, I think that she felt that she was giving us the idea that she was denying that she had been adversarial with the relationship. Therefore, she was not seeing the nuances that are necessary to establish a positive relationship.

Laurie Botstein : I felt that I was not being negative about ASHA, but that I was being positive.

Janet Krebs : ASHA thought you were being negative and up the line from there although they may not have had any direct contact with you – that was the general consensus as well. My feeling at this point was if this was negative and we were throwing away all that we had done then AAPPSPA would be the body that would suffer and yes I felt really badly about it – and it wasn't just me there were three of us here doing this- and we all agreed on this. There was no dissention on this at all.

Sue: It seems odd to me the reaction from the email and the email is cc'd to Denise. It's not like she didn't see this.

Janet Krebs: There were verbal conversations as well.

Sue McLean: And so- an what- you know I am reading back- from ASHA on that email, it didn't sound really negative to me. I am not getting this from this email- oh we can't work with Laurie. Well, how do you even know Laurie- I think there's just-

Janet Krebs: I think they feel that they know Laurie.

Sue McLean: How?

Laurie: I have never met anyone from ASHA except Janet Brown.

Janet Krebs: Exactly.

Laurie Botstein : I just spoke with Janet Brown today and she said that she was totally unaware of this whole thing.

Janet Botstein: Do you really think that she was going to stand there and tell you in your face, how she felt about this. I don't think that is necessary for her to do so. I believe that we have gotten a very different side from ASHA. And the different side from ASHA

Sue McLean: And who did you speak with from ASHA

Janet Krebs : Who myself, personally.

Sue McLean: or Barbara or Denise

Janet Krebs : I think according to Kelly, this is not necessary for us to have any further discussion. We toyed with the idea of having our attorney present at this meeting. We decided not to do so, so that it would not be any more adversarial than necessary. However, we have been advised, that there is no reason to betray a confidence to- in a situation like this- because it would do more harm than good and that's really where we're going.

Barbara Samuels: Laurie, you don't have the floor.

Laurie Botstein: I'm sorry, I didn't realize that that I didn't have the floor, please take the floor

Barbara Samuels: The president does. I don't and you don't.

Denise Dougherty: That is the kind of sarcasm that came through the entire process. That is why our attorney is the one who wrote the letter. Our communication has been cleared through our attorney.

Laurie Botstein : I'm sorry that it would embarrass other people but basically, I am here and I am the one being asked again to have the due process.

Denise Dougherty: There is no due process- other than it was Kelly's opinion after looking at the situation is that AAPPSPA board has the wide business latitude to make the decision on how to respond to work best with ASHA. We have the ways, we have the ability to make this call if it looks like it's going to be a positive more and that's what

happened in the decision. So we are taking the advice of our attorney. We are done with the discussion.

January 2011 Fall 2010 Board Meeting – Board of Director Slate and Nominations

The Board of Directors who will continue to serve for the spring 2011 through spring 2012 term includes the following with term ending in spring of the stated year.

- Brendan O'Connor Webster (2012 – 1st term)
- Jen Malone Priest (2012 – 1st term)
- Anita Werner (2012 – 1st term)
- Allyson Weinstein (2013 – 2nd term)
- Eileen Devaney (2013 – 1st term)
- Denise Dougherty (2012 – 2nd term)
- Laurie Botstein (2012 – 2nd term)

The following board members have agreed to continue on for a second term ending

- Cheryl Campbell (2014-2nd term)
- Roberta Kornfield (2014-2nd term)
- Laura Reisler (2014-2nd term)

The following board member has requested to not have a second term at this time

- Terri Rossman (2011-1st term)

The following have agreed to serve on the board

- Vicki Bourne (2014-1st term)
- Niki Stagias-Couliandis (2014-1st term)

The following person has resigned her position as treasurer and board member immediately as of Feb 2011

- Landria Seals (2012-1st term)

The following Slate of Executive Officers is offered for the 2011-2012 term

President: Denise Dougherty

Vice President: Eileen Devaney

Secretary: Anita Werner

Treasurer: Cheryl Campbell

Publicity

Laura Reisler stepped down from publicity and it has been handled by several individuals – Denise Dougherty, Pat Gill and Janet Krebs. Mailing lists were purchased for Iowa. Nebraska does not sell lists but would post conference information on their website. Missouri posted conference information on their website for a small fee. Ads were taken out in three issues of Advance. Janet had checked into ASHA Leader ad – much more expensive – and it was not followed through.

Website - Janet Krebs- It has been static this year. The list serve has been quiet and not many transgression have been noted. Warnings have been issued.

While we came close to censoring a member, that person has been quiet for some time.

Old Business

Janet Krebs– checking into organization subscription for Dysphagia Journal- they were not interested because a small number would be assessing this. She has nothing in writing thus far.

Denise Dougherty discussed last year's review of selling handouts – was approved by the board for a cost of \$35 with no ceu's available. Nadine posed a question that was not addressed – so before any forms are posted for members to purchase, wanted to review this again. Since we charge different fees for Institute Only, Conference Only or Institute and Conference, Nadine questioned if there would be that distinction when purchasing the handouts – institute only, conference only or or both institute and conference. There was no distinction when this was approved at our last meeting – should the cost of \$35 stand for all, or should there be a different fee structure?

Renee Matlock stated it was too inexpensive. The content and the information in the handouts is tremendous. This could deter people from attending and I think it should it be higher. A lot of interest has been expressed.

Denise Dougherty asked if we should open this up in the form of a motion.

Someone asked if there had been a great deal of interest in this. The response was yeas, a great deal.

Brendon Webster suggested that a survey be done to see what others are charging. Janet Krebs stated that Teri Rossman had done this and said that \$60.00 was the average. She felt that we should not be as expensive as them, but somewhere in the ball park.

Janet Krebs stated she does not think that the handouts will deter people.

Motion: Brendon moved to we do a survey to assess current rates for handouts.

Discussion: Janet stated, that she can check with Terri to see what the survey was, but she is pretty sure that is what it was.

Sally Stram Hays stated, doing a survey is great but we need to get this out now. Eileen Devaney suggested that we could do \$35.00 be for conference and \$35.00 for institute. It was also discussed that we do not want to much money in the bank and to have to pay taxes.

Barbara suggested that the institute and conference be different rates.

Cheryl stated others are not getting anything other than the handout, no audio is available.

Sally said, it is the first year, so go with the lower rate. Sue said that some people may want to get the handouts and not attend.

A brief discussion occurred about bringing in too much money and possibly losing our nonprofit status. It seems that we don't need the money. We are a 501C3, a nonprofit. Renee Matlock said that as a member of her Chamber, which is also a nonprofit, they had hundreds of thousands of dollars put away in CD's so there has to be a way around this.

It was discussed if we have too much money, there should be no problem donating some of it or using it for the conference fees.

Discussion continued over the amount that should be charged for the handouts.

Motion: Brendon Webster moved (following Barbara's suggestion) that we charge \$35.00 dollars for conference and \$25.00 for the institute. Eileen Devaney seconded the motion.

Denise asked, How long should it be available?- one month was discussed.

Who should the request go to? Nadine has the form prepared already.

New Business

Denise Dougherty stated:

1. Kelly has updated the large bound book she did for us a few years ago on legal issues for private practice. She may be bringing new bound copies for us - but we do have permission to provide it to our members as an e-book. I will work with Nadine to get that on our website. This will be a great benefit of membership.
2. Next year's conference location and date have been determined. The decision was made to move the conference to a city that has been a draw in the past – it may be in Phoenix, the first weekend in May 3rd. 4th. 5th. They

looked at a city that has provided more participation. We are currently in contract negotiation for this.

A couple of board members have asked if we are not set in stone on this we might want to consider Las Vegas. Denise stated that she considered this but was worried that some would play and not attend the conference.

Anita Werner stated that in the southwest, Las Vegas is popular and easy to get too. Some stated that their families would attend.

Denise stated that we do not have a contract that is signed. Janet said she will follow up and check with Hilton.

3. Outsourcing work to assist with checking membership information, licensing, certification and helping with paperwork for ASHA CEU credits. Renee Matlock, membership chair, stated that some of the work is clerical based. She thinks we need a professional reviewing the application. She has her office staff do basic forms for her. Looking at the applications requires a speech pathologist or audiologist to do this. As the organization grows, it may be possible to pay the administrative staff. It was discussed that if someone else was paid to do the administrative work, it would not necessarily be easier to get it to that person. It is easier to use the staff that we currently have working for us. It could be worked out to send the work to one person if that is what is wanted. Renee stated that she is not complaining about the time. She has it down to a system and it works for her.

Barbara provided history of the organization stating how it has grown. She said that the duties were originally all done by members, however as the organization grows, using monies to pay for some of the administrative costs may want to be considered. This would be a good use of the monies.

4. Webinars - several years ago I approached a member who does webinars to get information, but this individual did not prove helpful. Given the fact that our conference attendance is going down, and ASHA has moved into online webinars for private practice – should we look at this as an option? Janet Krebs has mentioned this as a possibility. There are two companies I've communicated with – for information. Go To Webinar and ILink. ILink is cheaper – yearly subscription is under \$1000 while Go To Webinar is \$399 a month with each allowing us to archive webinars for members/non-members to access at their convenience.

If we move in this direction, it will increase the amount of time required for ceu's and submission of paperwork for ASHA. In talking with Roberta Kornfield, she reported she is busy with her business and some health issues and would not be willing to take on the extra work. Roberta was not sure the long distance arrangement would work for her if work was outsourced. There are also more requirements from ASHA for this type of learning to obtain CEU's. She will research how to handle a webinar if the board is interested in moving in this direction.

Proposals received from ILink and Go to Webinar. Go to Webinar is more expensive and does not have the video link possibilities or telepractice capability with licensing.

Many of our members are reportedly very interested in this.

One of the concerns that was expressed is that the webinars will cut into the spring conference attendance. Janet Krebs said we do not have a choice. Younger members prefer this. If we appeal to them on this level, they may become active with our group in other ways.

Denise talked about some of the information she has discovered thus far. She asked for anyone who has additional information on conducting a webinar though a company they use or have heard is good should send it to her.

5. Beverly Gough deals with our paperwork in Michigan. It is becoming more complicated and now requires a signature of a chairperson. It is recommended that she be appointed Chairperson of the Corporate Status Committee. This information will be on the website. The appointing of the committee does not require a vote.
6. Clinic Source wants to have a banner advertising their product on our webpage and is willing to pay for the advertising.

Discussion that this is popular. Research shows that that is a great way to get the word out. Discussion was that there would need to be rules, companies would have to be investigated. It might sound as if we were endorsing any company we allowed to post. . We don't need the revenue. We have a corporate sponsorship for those that participate in our conference. ASHA does not do this as well and most volunteer organizations do not do this.

It was agreed that we were not going to do this.

- A question was asked, when someone resigns from the board, how is that addressed.

Barbara Samuels stated that anyone who resigns from the board is asked to provide a letter with the date of which the resignation will take affect. It is up to the board to fill that vacancy.

What happens after that? Is it the president's responsibility to tell the rest of the board that so and so has resigned, the reason why.

Barbara responded that the resignation is accepted but the rational is not necessarily discussed.

Laurie Botstein asked if she can make a motion that if a board member resigns that the board be told why?

Barbara responded that that would be a modification of the bylaws. That would require bylaws modification to put that into practice.

- Brendan Webster asked for clarification on numbers 6 and 7. How do we have it now?

7. Barbara Samuels has suggested that the nominating committee structure be altered to include three members – past presidents or others who have no intention or desire to run for office. The bylaws state the past president is a chair of the nominating committee. The venue is that if someone wants to be on the board, they or someone else can submit their name.

Discussion in response to Brendan's request:

Barbara Samuels- it only states in the bylaws that a past president is a chair of the nominating committee. In the past sometimes there has been a committee and other times not.

Brendan asked about being "nominated". She stated that she has never known anyone to "run for office", it has always been a nominated position.

Barbara responded, there is no question that it has always been a nominated position, but there have been times when individuals who have sought to be nominated, have been members of the nominating committee.

If someone wants to be president or vice president, do they submit their name? Barbara clarified this and said, anyone who wants to run can submit their name to the nominating committee.

Motion: The nominating committee should be composed of three members who have no intention or desire to run for office.

Second: Eileen

Motion: passed

8. Barbara Samuels has suggested that the Honors Committee be composed of at least three members who are not eligible to receive the Honors. No one is technically not eligible. It is presented to those who have gone above and beyond. It is not a matter of a single years contribution. Sometimes the committee is of one and sometime the committee of three.

Discussion in response to Brendan's request for clarification:

Barbara Samuels responded that there is no one who is technically not eligible for the honors. Honors are normally presented to individuals who have gone above and beyond in their contribution over many years.

Brendan asked if you want the committee to be comprised of three members, how many are on it now? Barbara responded, again, at times there have been committee's and other times just a chairperson.

Motion: Brendon stated that she moves that nominating be composed of three members who are not eligible to receive the honors.

Seconded: Eileen Devaney seconded. Motioned passed.

- Brendan wanted to acknowledge Sue's desire to bring up a new item for the agenda.
- Sue McLean wants to discuss issues and how they are discussed. She feels that if issues come up there needs to be better ways to deal with them.

Sue said that she always thought the vice president was going to be president and then you just get this slate that is different. Things like Landria quitting her position as treasure. She thinks these are things that the board should have known about and they need a venue for discussion. People were hurt and this things did not need to go down this way. Why can't we have an open an honest

discussion and why are things left in the dark to everyone except three people? It's almost like the board doesn't have a say in it.

Barbara Samuels: If you are referring to the slate presented by the nominating committee, and it sounds as if you are,

Sue McLean: that's one of them

Barbara Samuels: Issues that need to be determined by the board are brought to the board. Matters such as the situation with respect to the slate, were discussed by the nominating committee and it would not be appropriate or particularly desirable to have scheduled a board conference call to discuss the issue. That would be the board plus past president, which would not include the assembled in the meeting today.

Renee Matlock asked, "Shouldn't the executive committee be involved with these major issues, maybe not the entire board?"

Barbara Samuels: The executive committee consists of 5 people. Four elected officers and the immediate past president.

Janet Krebs: It was discussed among those except Anita as secretary. I think the executive board was aware of what was happening. After the fact this was discussed. Anita was not aware of this.

It is not just the slate that we are discussing. Sue brought out the fact of Landria resigning. Landria said to Denise she was resigning due to things on the list serve, but others indicated that she resigned because of "financial ethical " goings on.

Denise Dougherty stated that there have never been any concerns over discrepancies in the finances.

Laurie Botstein stated that she talked to Landria who stated that she had faxed Denise concerns.

Denise stated that she was resigning because her practice was growing and she had issues with one person on the list serve stating that you have two businesses and you funnel people to this company to get reimbursed.

Janet Krebs: At that time it was dealt with and we stated that it was not the academies position.

Laurie Botstein stated, that when she spoke to Landria, she mentioned that I understand that you resigned because of “Hope”, she stated, “Hope who?” And then she said that she resigned because of financial ethical considerations were going on and she was disappointed and as a business woman she could not consider continuing as treasurer of AAPPSPA because of what was happening with the finances.

Denise Dougherty: There was nothing ever mentioned about finances and discrepancy.

Renee Matlock: I think it would be best if the executive committee be involved.

Barbara Samuels: If someone resigns and says, “it is for your eyes only” that the president should not take it to the board.

Sally Stram Hays: I want to take exception with you Barbara. The president may have to bring it to the board, even if someone says it is for “your eyes only”. In her capacity of president she may deem that this needs to be discussed.

Renee Matlock agreed and stated that there is a very closed knit group that is making decisions. I know that we can't have 14 people making decisions. I feel we need to use our executive committee to function as an executive committee. I am concerned that we can be liable if we do not follow our bylaws. It is a legal document.

Barbara stated that technically a modification should have occurred to the bylaws, when the group stopped meeting at ASHA.

Renee stated that we need to look at infractions to the bylaws and not say we did it this way the last three years, we need to deal with them at that time.

Barbara stated that where conference calls started, there was the expectations that this was an anomaly and would not continue. We have had three or four board conference calls because there was not a fall board meeting at ASHA. In regard to conference calls they have recently occurred in Spring. At this point, it makes perfect sense to amend the bylaws to say it is a conference call in the Spring.

Janet stated that we can put a contingency in the bylaws. Renee said it does not need to be in the bylaws. She stated that when an infraction occurs then a temporary amendment may be made to set aside that. Then it's passed .

Barbara stated it is no longer feasible to have the full meeting at ASHA. We can still meet at ASHA and Skype in those.

When we have a new board there should be some training in regard to the bylaws. These are legal documents and new board members can learn this and they can keep each others in check.

There is a mini in-service of Robert's rules of order. It is traditional that the incoming board members are invited to attend the spring board meeting with others .

Need a committee to look at bylaws. Brendan Janet and Barbara will be on the bylaw committee.

Brendan acknowledged Laurie for all her hard work.

Motion to adjourn: Anita Werner: I move that we adjourn
Second: Eileen Devaney

Adjourn meeting