The answer to that question is simple! Nobody knows! That being said, let’s have a brief discussion of what holding a hybrid meeting entails – and for that matter, what a hybrid meeting actually is.

At the last AIP Annual Session, approximately 1/3 of the attendees were present in Oklahoma City; but 2/3 of the attendees participated virtually, via Zoom.

First, does it feel like a meeting? Being involved in a hybrid meeting still feels like a meeting but it is also impossible not to notice some striking differences. With the advances in some of the virtual meeting platforms, like Zoom, in a virtual-only meeting, voting and other applications of parliamentary procedure are relatively easily modified to comply with the basic standards of treating all members equally much the same way you would in an in-person meeting. Last year’s Annual Session was, in effect, a virtual-only meeting.

This year, AIP met in a hybrid setting, and we proved that it is much more difficult to do. Modifications have to be made to both the in-person AND the virtual attendees’ methods of recognition, speaking and voting to ensure that all parties are treated equally. Combining methods for most operations is simply not an effective solution. Voting by voice or voting cards for the in-person attendees and using a zoom poll for the virtual attendees might seem like a simple and cost-effective solution. But timing up and sharing the results between the two locales may be difficult; further, the preciseness of one vote compared to the imprecision of voice voting and voting cards in the other could lead to a lack of clarity amongst ALL attendees that the outcome of the votes was presented fairly; particularly if the virtual attendees vote one way and those in the room vote another. Of course, voting by voice in both locations is an absolute disaster unless there is unanimous consent. If the body is small enough and a fixed and static membership, roll call votes are the simplest method available provided everyone has access to a microphone that feeds into the virtual portion of the meeting. But for many organizations, roll calls are time-consuming and inefficient.

The solution for larger meetings is to use an outside voting software so that all parties are voting utilizing the same platform. The fairness, relative speed, and equality of this method are all major benefits – but there may be negatives or potential negatives to this approach. Member’s inability to operate the platform, the requirement for all members to have an internet connected voting device, loss of internet access either in the room or
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at remote locations all can grind the meeting to a halt. To alleviate such problems, it is strongly recommended that you have as many practice votes and practice sessions as possible. Sadly, it is likely that the members who require the most assistance also are the ones who least likely to attend and participate in the practice sessions. This leaves many things to possibly go awry that are simply out of your control. How well will the wi-fi work in the room and at home? How long will it take to get every member though the initial vote? How long will subsequent votes take? Last and possibly most importantly, what do we do if a member is simply unable to vote? In essence, the leadership needs a plan for each of these eventualities.

The perception of many members who have never planned such a meeting will be that holding a hybrid session is less expensive and easier than either an in-person or a virtual meeting. This couldn’t be further from the truth. Let’s analyze the logistics from a meeting planning aspect. You need the space to accommodate the in-person attendance and also to stream the virtual segment. This means that you have the same obligations to rent space and provide meals to the in-person attendees as you would for a regular in-person event; but you also have to have the hardwired internet connection for the operation of the streaming system and provide an in-room internet connection to the in-person attendees so they can vote. Most hotels or other meeting locations are not just giving these options away. Also to be considered is that most attendees now need an electrical connection in addition to their internet connection. Fortunately, most of these systems can be used from a smart phone by the attendees. But in essence, you are planning two simultaneous events, with different attendees, each of whom thinks “their” needs are the most important.

The amount of technology that you need to camera switch, mike switch, monitor chat and recognition lists as well as other facets of the meeting is staggering. Having a team to provide and operate said equipment with the knowledge and skill required to pull such a meeting off is something that AIP has been blessed with at the moment. There are companies that provide such services, but I will submit to you that there are not aware of the parliamentary requirements of such a meeting and they are not inexpensive.

One of the things that we discovered in this hybrid annual session is that it is sometimes helpful for the presiding officer to narrate what is going on in the room. Of course, this is outside common parliamentary parameters, and the presiding officer must be careful not to mischaracterize the activities, but this service is useful. It is the little idiosyncrasies like this that we just haven’t had the time to develop with years of vetting.

You may ask, “As a parliamentarian, it is not my job to plan the meeting, why do I need to know all of this?” That question is partially true but who do you think will get blamed when members cannot vote or the meeting stalls for a couple of hours. It is understood that as parliamentarians we may not be given access to the planning and execution of the meeting processes, but it is also a good idea to inquire and make suggestions at the slightest opening or invitation to the planning process. In other words, don’t be shy!

Many may be wondering about the need to attempt to hold a hybrid meeting. The one thing that is clear about the last two years is that by the use of virtual attendance, almost all organizations have experienced a growth in participation. What is sorely missed in these virtual attendance meetings and conferences is the camaraderie and networking opportunities that are just not easily facilitated in a virtual setting. I liked have the virtual Annual Session last year but I much preferred having the option of being together this year while at the same time allowing members that are not as comfortable with traveling to attend and participate.

Al Gage CPP-T, PRP, PAP

2021 Annual Session Recap for Communicator

The 2021 Annual Session adjourned sine die on August 7, 2021. This historic event saw another year of record-breaking attendance; but, it also likely introduced a new model for meetings going forward. This Annual Session was not in-person event or a virtual event, it was both. The hybrid Annual Session can serve as a model for any organization that is looking to engage in-person and online.

The parliamentary issues facing a hybrid meeting will be further discussed in a future article in the Parliamentary Journal so I won’t go into much of those details here; instead, I will focus on what happened at the Annual Session.

First, every Annual Session starts off with a pre-Board meeting. This Board meeting was hybrid since many of the Board’s members were onsite at the Skirvin Hotel in Oklahoma City. The Board approved an increase in word count for the Find a Parliamentarian ad service (if you are an AIP credentialed member, sign up to advertise here: https://aipparl.org/directory-application/), amended the Board policy manual, and selected Kay Allison Crews, CPP-T, to serve as the 2022 Annual Session Coordinator.

Second, the Annual Session approved the audit report, elected officers and directors, considered bylaws amendments, and updated the parliamentary authorities use for the accreditation exams.

Third, there were 13 proposed amendments to the bylaws and standing
orders. Those proposed amendments were noticed in the Summer 2021 issue of *The Communicator*. I won’t go into great depth here, other than to report the outcome of each amendment:

- Bylaw Proposal #1 – Adopted
- Bylaw Proposal #2 – Not Adopted
- Bylaw Proposal #3 – President declared this grammatical and ordered the bylaws committee to update the language.
- Bylaw Proposal #4 – Adopted as amended
- Bylaw Proposal #5 – Adopted
- Bylaw Proposal #6 – Adopted
- Bylaw Proposal #7 – Referred to Bylaws and Standing Orders Committee
- Standing Order Proposal #8 – Adopted
- Standing Order Proposal #9 – Adopted
- Standing Order Proposal #10 – Adopted as amended
- Standing Order Proposal #11 – President declared this grammatical and ordered the bylaws committee to update the language.

Standing Order Proposal #12 - Adopted

Fourth, one of the great aspects about any Annual Session are the workshops. This year was no different; but, the workshop presenters were incredible. A special thanks to Al Gage, CPP-T; Barry McCarty, CPP; Rachel Miller-Bleich; Kay Crews, CPP-T; Brandon Walters, CP; David Jackson, CP; Laura Meade, CP; and Craig Henry, CPP-T.

We also had a panel discussion led by Kay Crews, CPP-T; Michael Malamut, CPP-T; and Glen Hall, CP-T; on the second edition of the *American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code*.

The next time you communicate with one of these presenters, please be sure to thank them for their incredible contribution to the Annual Session.

Fifth, the Annual Session adopted a motion proposed by the Accrediting Department that changes the updates the parliamentary authorities used for the CP and CPP exams from *Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised Eleventh Edition* to *Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised Twelfth Edition*. This change becomes effective for any exam after January 1, 2022.

Sixth, at the conclusion of Annual Session, there is always a Board meeting. The Board ratified the election of the AIPEF trustees, elected Dr. C. Barry McCarty, CPP-T, to the Professional Standards Committee; elected W. Craig Henry, CPP-T, to serve as the Education Director; conferred the Order of the Blue Dot on W. Craig Henry, CPP-T, and C.J. Cavin, CP-T, for coordinating the 2021 Annual Session; and approved a request from the NIPA Chapter to coordinate an event with the 2022 Annual Session.

Finally, I want to express my personal thanks to W. Craig Henry, who served as the co-coordinator for this Annual Session. Doing anything new is hard. It is even harder when you are doing something new for those who are your professional colleagues, but who are also your friends. While not everything was perfect, I believe the 2021 *hybrid* Annual Session will serve as a model for hybrid meetings going forward. I want to extend my thanks, in no particular order, to a few people that made the event possible, but also maybe helped with my sanity: Kelsey Huber with the Skirvin Hotel; Brandon Walters, CP; Daniel Foster, CP; Kendra Flood; Glen Hall, CP-T; Shawn Paine; Seth Rott; Ramona Hill; Valoree Althoff, CP-T; Nilda Rivera; Clyde Waggoner; Barry McCarty, CPP; Kay Crews, CPP-T; and Al Gage, CPP-T. I’m sure I’ve forgotten someone and for that I apologize.

The 2022 Annual Session is just a year away and planning is already underway. Kay Crews, CPP-T, is planning a fun and exciting event in Lexington, KY. While a final decision has not been made on whether it will be in-person, virtual, or hybrid, I know Kay will do a fabulous job in any situation. It is not too early to sign-up to help with the planning or sign-up to present a workshop - believe me, it is NEVER too early.

CJ Cavin, CP-T

2021 AIP Annual Session Coordinator

---

**Announcing the 2021-2022 AIP Officers**

The 2021 AIP Annual Session included elections for officers and directors.

- President Al Gage, CPP-T, PRP, PAP; Vice President Bob Peskin, DDS, CP; Secretary Atul Kapur, MD, CPP-T, PRP; and Treasurer C. J. Cavin, JD, CP-T, PRP were all successful in being returned to their offices for another one-year term.

- Newly elected Director Brandon Walters, CP, PRP joins three directors who were re-elected for another two-year term: Valoree Althoff, MHA, CP-T, PRP; Helen McFadden, JD, CP, PRP; and Nilda Rivera, Esq., PRP. They join Cameron Decker; Daniel Foster, PhD, CP, PRP; Ramona Hill, D. Arts, NSA, PRP; and Weldon Merritt, JD, CPP, PRP who are entering the second year of their term.

At the Board meeting following the close of Annual Session, Helen McFadden and Nilda Rivera were elected to the Executive Committee and W. Craig Henry, CPP-T, PRP was elected as the new Education Director. Communications Director Larry Cisar, PhD, CPP-T and Accrediting Director Kay Crews, CPP-T, PRP continue in their terms and AIP Parliamentarian Glen Hall, DDS, CP-T was re-appointed for another year.

AIP thanks all those who ran for the elected positions and extends a particular thanks to departing Director Adam Hathaway, MPA, PRP and Education Director Joe Theobald, PhD, CP-T, PRP who completed their terms.

AIP is stronger because of the willingness of all these volunteers to contribute. There are always many more opportunities for you to strengthen AIP and also gain valuable experience that will benefit your other parliamentary and leadership activities. Please contact AIP President Gage at president@aipparl.org.
Accrediting Department Update

The Accrediting Department has previously reported that we were investigating examination software to use for the Certified Parliamentarian exam. After completion of a thorough set of standards and reviewing a number of programs, the Department, under the leadership of Craig Henry, opted to move forward with software provided by Caveon. Although there is no charge for the software, there was a one-time $4,000 set up fee. The Department is grateful to the AIPEF for their financial support to AIP which allowed us to move forward with that software.

From the time the contract was signed in May 2021, the Accrediting Department entered the first of the test bank questions (112 multiple choice, 73 short answer, 14 narration/scripting), generated the June 2021 examination, did a quality assessment and administered the computer-based exam to eight candidates. The exam can be taken anywhere that a good internet connection is available. The software itself reviews the technical setup of the candidate’s computer and their internet connection to ensure that the software will work appropriately.

Grading the June exam was completed by July 10th. The multiple choice questions were auto-graded. The short answer and scripting questions were manually graded as previously, but were organized and easy to grade online or to download and grade. Of the eight candidates taking the computer-based exam, five passed. Only a few minor connection issues came up but they were rapidly taken care of.

The software has made developing, giving and proctoring, and grading the CP examination much simpler and more efficient than has been done in the past. It also allows the accrediting department to have exam results in a more timely manner. Comments from several of the examinees and proctors have been very positive; every candidate taking the exam in October has requested to take the exam using the new system.

In light of the success of this program, effective in January 2022, the exam will only be offered using this new software, unless a student requests an accommodation.

Although the CP Exam software has been a significant change for the Department, it is not the ONLY change. At the Annual Session, a motion was adopted that the authorities used for both the CP and the CPP exams, effective January 2022, will be based on Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised 12th edition, as well as continuing to use AIP Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. The CPP will also continue to be based on Cannon’s Concise Guide to Procedure. The CPP will also continue to be based on Cannon’s Concise Guide to Procedure.

As always, the members of the Accrediting Department urge all members to obtain their credentials, or to upgrade to a higher credential!
AIPSC2 Team Progress - An Update On Our Parliamentary Authority

Question – How can you tell if a parliamentarian is excited?
Answer – You may have to ask them.
So may I tell you without your having asked, I am excited - excited to be a part of the authorship team reviewing and updating the current text of The American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (AIPSC) from cover to cover.
The entire authorship team is addressed as just that – the TEAM, and is headed by a Project Manager – the PM.
In beginning this work, the TEAM is guided by seven basic principles found in Alice Sturgis’s original volume of The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure where she declared that a code following these principles would make a modern parliamentary text more usable. Those seven basic principles are:

1. Completeness
2. Simplicity and Clarity
3. Conciseness
4. Usability
5. Common Procedures
6. Conformance to Court Decisions
7. Up-to-dateness
   - The TEAM is divided into Squads of two persons each which have been assigned specific chapters to review and update following these seven principles.
   - Work is still in progress.
   - Most of the chapters have been reviewed by the various squads and the project manager with some now being considered by the entire team. Some teams are still working toward submitting chapters to the Project Manager, and some have been returned to the squads for continued work.

The TEAM has received and considered questions, comments, and suggestions through emails, personal conversations, and at plenary sessions of American Institute of Parliamentarians (AIP) practicums. A live update was also given at this year’s Annual Session by the Project Manager who also took feedback from the attendees. This new information is also being circulated among, and considered by, the TEAM members.

More and more clubs, societies, and associations are looking to this book as a modern parliamentary authority. The project is still underway, and the organization welcomes your input. If you have any questions, comments, or suggestions, please submit them to aipsc2@aipparl.org.

Glen D. Hall, D.D.S., CP-T

Education Department Update

The 2021 Annual Session is “in the books” and taking on a new position as Education Director seems daunting, but achievable. It is my goal for the AIP to continue to expand and improve its educational offerings for both the membership and the public. We owe a great deal of gratitude to the persons who have chaired and supported the Education Department in the past and set it on a solid foundation. I look forward to working with them, and new AIP members as well. I especially thank my predecessor, Joe Theobald, CP-T for a helpful, smooth, and speedy transition.
The Education Department is finishing the review and update of our existing materials to keep them relevant. AIP’s Education Department will continue helping to plan our educational workshops for future annual sessions and practicums. We have just finished our first hybrid Annual Session that had both in-person and remote instructors interacting with both audiences. We are working with our fellow board members and colleagues to develop a framework that will organize and align our educational offerings across all of AIP. The idea is to arrive at a structure that offers a complete educational program for our members and, increasingly, our customers.

A first goal of the department is to standardize the curriculum and teaching guides for the AIP Teacher’s Course that can be given either virtually, in-person or as a blended offering. This is currently underway and the announcement for a revised “T-course” will be forthcoming. By the way, course participants must be credentialed in either AIP or NAP and we need at least ten persons to hold the class. We will keep you posted on our progress.

I am looking for any ideas to accomplish AIP’s educational mission. If you have any suggestions or opinions about the educational materials or offerings, please drop me an email at education@aipparl.org. It always good to hear those thoughts. If you who would like to be active with a commitment to excellence in the Education Department, I would love to hear from you as well.

W. Craig Henry PRP, CPP-T
AIP Education Director
“Discipline: Warning, Naming, Removal and More” will be explored using both the American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure and Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised and possibly other materials. This practicum will provide all attendees a wonderful opportunity to explore a topic that is difficult for many members to deal with. All levels of instruction will be presented and practiced.

The Alexis Park All Suite Resort in Las Vegas, Nevada, will again be the venue for the 41st annual AIP West Coast Practicum. The hotel is conveniently located about one mile off the Las Vegas Strip and a little less than two miles from McCarran International Airport. Rates vary (six levels available) based on the suite level and the night of the week reserved. Rates range from $59 - $129 on Wednesday and Thursday nights to $99 - $189 plus tax on Friday and Saturday nights plus a resort fee of $14 per night per room. Even with the resort fee, the room rate is reasonable. The resort fee includes free local phone calls from guest suites, open signal WiFi in the hotel public areas as well as guest suites, access to all recreational facilities. To make reservations call 702-796-3322 or 800-582-2228 and give the code “AIP-West Coast Practicum 2022” or “AIP2022.”

As always, this practicum will offer presiding sessions designed to assist attendees with the opportunity to improve their presiding skills many times over. AIP practicums always provide a safe environment to learn and practice parliamentary skills.

Join us in Las Vegas, Nevada, for an enjoyable and exciting learning experience! The practicum will begin promptly at 8 a.m. on January 13th and conclude after the banquet on January 15th.

Curriculum Director Mary Remson, CPP-T, PRP is planning an educational program that you won’t want to miss!

Dollie McPartlin, CP-T, PRP
General Coordinator
At the recently concluded AIP 2021 Annual Session, members adopted an amendment to AIP Standing Order 25.1 providing that the Parliamentary Journal will be published at least three times per year. Members made it clear during the session that they have a great fondness for the “PJ!” Several vowed on the spot to begin writing articles for the Journal. That will be a great help since the most important thing PJ editorial staff needs is a steady stream of new articles.

In recent issues, PJ Editor Roger Hanshaw has done a tremendous job selecting previously published articles to reprint. Those members new to AIP appreciate this opportunity to read the “best of the past.” At the same time, we recognize the need to continue to produce fresh articles, especially during the pandemic which has spawned new ways of meeting – and thus new challenges for the use of fair meeting practices using parliamentary procedure.

We need AIP members to help us produce the best 21st century articles on parliamentary procedure, law, and education. You can help! The following are the submission dates for the next issues beyond those currently in progress. Please use Times New Roman 12-point font. The Chicago Manual of Style is the style guide reference for the Parliamentary Journal.

We look forward to seeing your great articles!

**Article submission deadline: February 15, 2022** – for the April 2022 issue – Issue topic: Parliamentary Procedure and the Preservation of Democracy

**Article Submission Deadline: May 15, 2022** – for the July 2022 issue

**Article Submission Deadline: August 15, 2022** – for the October 2022 issue

---

**Please submit articles by the relevant deadline to:**
Roger Hanshaw, Editor, Parliamentary Journal – pjeditor@aipparl.org and
Libby Willis, Assistant Editor, Parliamentary Journal – pjeditor@aipparl.org
Congratulations to you all!

The AIP Accrediting Department is privileged to award David Jackson, CP, #445, Jason Morgan, CP, #446, Brandon Walters, CP, #447, Lee Woodward, CP, #448, Daniel Foster, CP, #449, Tom Havelka, CP, #450, Helen McFadden, CP, #451, Bob Peskin, CP, #452, and Laura Meade, CP #453 their CP credentials.
When were your chapter’s bylaws last reviewed?

Jason V. Morgan, CP, PRP
Bylaws and Standing Orders Committee member

Your chapter of the American Institute of Parliamentarians (AIP) may be good. In fact, it may be among the best. And the best organizations are always finding new areas for improvement. As such, your chapter may have either amended its bylaws in recent years or is considering making such amendments in the future.

But have you made sure that all amendments accord with AIP’s bylaws? Specifically, have you made sure that your chapter has submitted and will submit its proposed bylaw amendments to the AIP Bylaws and Standing Orders Committee (“Bylaws Committee”) so that the Bylaws Committee can review them “for compliance with AIP bylaws and other rules,” per Article XII, Section 2.3 of AIP’s bylaws?

If you haven’t, don’t panic! AIP does not have secret police who will bust down the doors of your chapter’s president. But don’t ignore the issue either. Having proposed chapter bylaw amendments go through the Bylaws Committee is important for maintaining AIP’s cohesiveness as an organization.

Make it a goal to ensure that your chapter complies with AIP’s bylaws by making sure your chapter’s leadership reviews its records and has evidence that the most recent bylaws amendments were properly submitted and reviewed by the Bylaws Committee. If your chapter does have unreviewed bylaw amendments, then submit them as soon as possible to the Bylaws Committee at bylaws@aipparl.org.

To make sure that your chapter stays in compliance in the event that it adopts additional bylaw amendments in the future, your chapter should adopt an amendment to its bylaws explicitly requiring review by the Bylaws Committee. An example section might read:

**Review by AIP.** No amendment to these bylaws shall go into effect until it has been reviewed and approved by the AIP Bylaws and Standing Orders Committee. Technical and conforming recommendations from the AIP Bylaws and Standing Orders Committee may be accepted without another vote by the chapter’s membership.

Including a section like this will ensure that when your chapter’s members review the bylaws for purposes of following the amendment procedure, they take the critical step of submitting proposed amendments to the Bylaws Committee.

The Bylaws Committee is there to help your chapter stay in compliance with AIP’s bylaws. Make sure that your chapter’s proposed bylaws amendments, both past and future, receive proper review and approval.
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