President’s Message:  
*Free Speech versus Decorum!*

The American Institute of Parliamentarians along with the National Association of Parliamentarians may be one of the last bastions of civility in the world! The meeting protocols of decorum in debate are just no longer present in a great majority of society. There are certainly no or very little rules when it comes to social media or any other method of public commentary. These keyboard warriors feel very safe hiding behind their Twitter or Facebook Profiles to “influence” the general public. I have very rarely observed this to be very effective but let’s analyze why the “parliamentarians” are the “watchkeepers” of civility.

I have been rebutted many times in meetings when the presiding officer and I softly (at least at first) corrected a member for crossing the line of either impugning the character or motives of another member or candidate. The scolded party always brings the argument that free speech allows them to say whatever they want, whenever they want. This is not true, even if you are not in a meeting!

The U.S. Constitution guarantees that “Congress will make no law . . . . or abridging the freedom of speech.” This guarantees that it will never be against the law to disagree, openly and publicly, with the leaders of the government. The Canadian Charter of Rights contains similar provisions. I do not profess to be a Constitutional Law expert, but I know that there are exceptions to an absolute freedom of speech. The most common example is the prohibition against yelling “Fire” in a crowded theatre. I would also submit from a friend that talking about “The concert was the bomb!” will get you diverted at least temporarily from the TSA Pre-check lane. Both are good examples of the limitation of free speech but there are others.

Libel and slander arise from the exercise of your free speech options to the point of damaging another individual’s reputation or business. While the fact that what you said happens to be the truth, is an absolute defense against these counterclaims, nobody wants
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to spend their time in court in a slander lawsuit. More importantly, the information that you share or allegations that you make, in most cases, will not effectively sway anyone’s mind. In parliamentary procedure, this really is not what we are talking about.

When a member joins an organization, they agree to be bound by the governing documents of that organization. In essence, this is a contract between the member and organization. The member agrees to abide by the rules of the organization and the organization agrees to provide the benefits of membership. These two elements represent the consideration that is required to form a contract.

As part of that contract, the member agrees to be bound by the parliamentary authority of that organization if it is listed in the bylaws. Both Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised and American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, the two most prominent authorities, as well as many other include provisions that dictate decorum or behavior during debate or within the confines of a meeting. Even the U.S. Congress has rules of what can and cannot be said on the floor. In a sense, the member has waived part of their right to absolute freedom of speech in order to become a member of the organization.

RONR lists several requirements for decorum in debate including not being able to question a member’s motives, avoiding the use of names and directing all remarks through the chair to assist in maintaining decorum. It also says that a member has the RIGHT to be protected from allegations against their good names. AIPSC requires debate to be impersonal and directed to or through the chair. It also strictly prohibits attacking the motive, character, or personality of another member as well as improper language and actions. How would present day politicians survive in such an environment? Easy, they Tweet during the meeting. In an additional folly, AIPSC also states that the debate is supposed to be to persuade people and not for the pleasure of the speaker or the entertainment of others. We have all been to the meeting where that unenforceable rule was violated.

Many people see parliamentary procedure as a last bastion of democracy. While I struggle to completely agree with that statement, I do agree that it may, in fact, be the last bastion of civility and decorum. What do I mean by civility and decorum? If you are from the city, perhaps a better word is respect! If you are from the country, it may simply be referred to as manners.

In one example of civility, in one of the first paying parliamentary jobs I every did, I unknowingly waded into a State association of a lineage society that literally was at war with itself. I participated in a conference call meeting in preparation for the full state meeting and it was a circular firing squad and there were no leftover bullets. These ladies cussed and fussed at each other like a bar full of sailors and Marines. I was completely at a loss of how to even survive this meeting, so I called their national parliamentarian and this is how Kay Crews and I became friends.

I explained the entire problem and Kay knew a little bit about the situation from her national work as this State Association had a bit of a reputation. She also knew that I coached high school students and came up with the most brilliant non-parliamentary solution ever. She told me to take two of my young lady students to the meeting with me as junior parliamentarians and to make sure that they dressed to the nines.

The two young ladies played their part to the hilt even including showing up with a parasol, pearls and white gloves. This state association meeting lasted about two hours and you would have thought the whole time we were at high tea. Not a foul word or cross look was exchanged and the contentious business was settled. These ladies had bowed to the social construct that it was improper to act out in front of these two young, impressionable girls. Our world needs a little bit more of this kind of social pressure.

I have coached many teams over the course of my career even before I was a professional parliamentarian and we always prep them the same way when it comes to that point of decision or the announcement of the outcome. We teach them to "win with grace AND lose with grace"! Wise words for almost every situation in the world.

I recall being at a very hotly contested state convention that my clients thought would likely last for at least 14-15 hours on convention day. There was a huge social media build up and many allegations and bombs being thrown from one side to the other. The convention was pretty close to evenly split and hostilities were manifesting themselves as verbal arguments almost leading to fights in the hallways. We had several hundred pages of “What if” scripts (the editor wouldn’t let me use the real name) preparing for convention day. The first test was to be the election of the permanent chair. There were several points of order about the credentials and rules
but without too much delay we got to the election of the permanent chairman of the convention. The side that won made reconciliatory remarks and the side that lost was peaceful for the rest of the meeting, realizing they simply did not have the votes.

This is not always the case and some individuals insist on taking every opportunity to simply burn down the house. Maybe they think they are representing their constituency or changing people’s minds but they are not. Invariably, these individuals final result is to return to their “Keyboard Kingdoms” in the Twitterverse to vent to their like-minded followers.

At least the rules of parliamentary procedure prevent this from occurring in a meeting or if it does occur in a meeting, provides a remedy for that occurrence as well. If their intention is to persuade people then they are much better served to remain in the meeting and debate the merits of the action or inaction and not the personality of the person proposing the action. I don’t know about the rest of you but vitriol and anger do nothing to persuade me to alter my position. Sooner or later a large majority of these individuals will figure this out!

We must as professional parliamentarians and as students to prevent the line of decorum in meetings from creeping toward the current atmosphere. It does not matter whether it is for the Presidency of a Sorority, a Non-Profit or a Political Party or for the breed characteristics of a pet club, the rules of decorum, decency, manners and above all respect remain the same in parliamentary procedure.

Al Gage CPP-T, PRP, PAP
The Planning Committee recently held the first ever Presiding Practicum December 9 – 12, 2022, virtually. The inaugural event was capped at 30 participants and focused on the art, science, and practice of presiding. Participants attended plenary session on the following topics:

• Value of presiding skills;
• Presiding philosophies;
• Finding Your Cadence;
• Conflict Management;
• Script Writing; and
• A panel discussion with instructors.

Additionally, participants had the opportunity for over seven hours of presiding practice with our trained facilitators. This successful pilot event is now a permanent practicum and we intend to offer it multiple times per calendar year. Stay tuned for an upcoming announcement about the next presiding practicum.

I would like to thank Curriculum Director Ramona Hill, D. Arts.; President Al Gage, CPP-T; Education Director W. Craig Henry, CPP-T; Kay Crews, CPP-T; and Lucy Anderson CP-T for providing leadership and teaching plenary sessions for this event. I would also like to thank Jodie Sanders, CP, for serving on the Planning Committee and making this event a success!

Finally, I would like to thank the presiding facilitators and co-facilitators that made the event a success. They include:

**Presiding Facilitators and Co-Facilitators**

Kay Crews, CPP-T  
Lucy Anderson, CP-T  
Laura Meade, CP  
Jason Morgan, CP  
Ann Guiberson  
Glen Hall, CP-T  
David Jackson, CP-T  
Mary Remson, CPP-T  
Atul Kapur, CPP-T  
Shannon Sun, CPP-T  
Al Gage, CPP-T  
Ramona Hill  
Craig Henry, CPP-T

**General Coordinator**  
**Presiding Practicum**  
C.J. Cavin, CP-T
The 2023 AIP West Coast Practicum faced a challenge that had not happened since September 11, 2001 – all air travel was halted the day before the practicum commenced. Luckily, 49 participants were able to attend the practicum.

Curriculum Director Mary Remson, CPP-T, PRP along with instructors Atul Kapur, MD, CPP-T, PRP and David Jackson, DHSc, CP, PRP planned a wonderful learning experience for the 45 participants. “Getting Things Done!” was the theme of the practicum. The main motion, as you know, is where the work begins, then what can be done with the main motion. So it was with this practicum.

In addition to the various classes, there were three presiding sessions. Each instructor covered one skill level and one parliamentary authority (RONR or AIPSC), participants were encouraged to stretch themselves in this safe environment. Much growth in presiding skills and parliamentary knowledge was evident at all levels.

Dollie McPartlin, CP-T, PRP

---

**AIP Past Presidents at WCP**

AIP Past Presidents: Jim Lochrie, Elvis Aaron, Kay Crews, Mary Remson, Al Gage

AIP Past Presidents and WCP Class Past-Presidents

*Photo credit: Mark Schilansky*
SAVE THE DATE

2023 Annual Session

The AIP Board of Directors approved the 2023 Annual Session to be held in fabulous Reno, Nevada. Make sure you save the dates of August 10 - 12, 2023 at the Grand Sierra Resort, 2500 E. 2nd Street, Reno NV 89595; 775-789-2000. To reserve your hotel accommodations: Click here on the hotel link for AIP's special rate https://book.passkey.com/go/AIP23

Plans are being made especially for you to attend and enjoy outstanding educational presentations, participate in business meetings, and engage with parliamentary experts.

Look for the Annual Session Registration form which will be coming soon to the website.

For more information, contact 2023 Annual Session Coordinator: Mary Remson, CPP-T, at annualsession@aipparl.org

REGISTER HERE

2023 East Coast Practicum

The 2023 East Coast Practicum is right around the corner. The educational content will focus on governing documents; however, the instructors have not been announced yet but we are working on providing another exceptional educational opportunity, including plenary educational sessions and presiding practice sessions.

Make sure you block off June 1-4, 2023 to your calendars! More information, including registration information, coming soon!

C.J. Cavin, CP-T
General Coordinator
East Coast Practicum


Notice of Candidacy Request

In accordance with Article VI, Section 1 of the AIP Bylaws, AIP Standing Order 9.9 says:

"Notice of Candidacy.

Any person wishing to give notice of candidacy for office at the annual session shall send to the AIP Secretary a statement setting forth the notice of candidacy. This notice shall be not more than one hundred twenty days prior nor less than seventy-seven days prior to the annual session. The secretary shall forward these notices to the editor for publication in the pre-annual session Communicator."

If you wish to give notice, please send it to secretary@aipparl.org during the notice period, which begins on April 12 and ends on May 25 (as the Annual Session is scheduled to start August 10).

Please note that this notice is not a requirement to be a candidate for an office.

Bylaws Proposal Request:

“All proposals shall be submitted by March 31st and include the specific wording, rationale, financial implication, and signature of the maker. A petition signed by five (5) members may submit proposals to the Bylaws and Standing Orders Committee at: Bylaws@aipparl.org

Ref.: AIP Bylaws, Article XVI, Section 4; and AIP Standing Orders #20"

AIPSC2 Update

The work of the “AIPSC2” Authorship Team has continued at an ever-increasing pace. The Team meets regularly to review changes, and intends to have the manuscript to the publisher in late Spring. Currently, the Team has invested almost 3000 man-hours in reading the manuscript aloud to each other. This review, while lengthy, has allowed us to hear inconsistencies and determine areas of final checks for the manuscript.

The Project Manager remains grateful to the hard work and dedication of the Authorship Team!

Kay Allison Crews, CPP-T, PRP
Project Manager
New CPs

The AIP Accrediting Department is privileged to award Todd Brand his Teaching credential. In addition many individuals have earned their CP credentials: Nilda Rivera, CP #466 and Justin Schmid, CP #467.

Congratulations to you all!
Preparing for the CPP Oral Exam – Part 3
Colette Collier Trohan, MS, CAE, PRP, CPP-T

The daily study program outlined in this series is an hour, divided into three parts of 15, 15, and 30 minutes. The first part is 15 minutes of intensive study of motions, described in the first article of this series. The last part is 30 minutes of conscious reading, described in the second article. Now we’ll connect those two parts and describe the second 15-minute segment: the oral practice.

The oral practice session allows you to get comfortable with answering questions on the fly. Parliamentarians are often asked to explain things to an assembly; being able to give clear and concise explanations is critically important. Remember, coming from the assembly, the questions will not be deeply theoretical parliamentary concepts – they will be simple, such as “What articles should we have in our bylaws?” or “What do you mean by scope of notice?”

At the time of my study, I had a book on my bookshelf that has since disappeared. I recall it was published by AIP, had a yellow cover with a black plastic binding, and was titled something like “Parliamentary Study Questions.” What I loved about the book was there were questions on one side of the page and answers on the other. Seek out questions in books and make your own aid by printing the questions on one side of the sheet (cardstock will work well so you can hold it) and the answers on the other. Check out the AIP bookstore for the AIP Study Guide. There are some short answer questions in there that you might use.

For this second segment, stand up and set a timer for 15 minutes. Then, read a question out loud and give the answer as if you are talking to a group of people. You will stumble and probably forget parts of the answer. Do it again. Don’t dwell on this question; after three attempts, move on to another question. Listen to yourself reading the question to get used to using your aural learning skills. Listen to yourself giving an answer. Does it make the questioner feel that their question was interesting and has value, or do you sound as if you’ve answered this one so many times you’re just rattling off an answer?

What about vocalized pauses? Those of us who had a parochial school education probably have an advantage here: the nuns would correct us if we said “um” or “er” and it got trained out of us. These verbal crutches are often fads. The latest is starting every idea with “So…” Now is the time to fix those pauses – they do not add to your professional appearance and distract from the message you are trying to convey. You will sound like you don’t really know what you are talking about. Listen to people giving interviews on television and note how they carry themselves and how they speak. Beware of trite phrases to fill time, such as “That’s a really good question.” It’s okay to take a moment before you start speaking, and there’s nothing wrong with asking clarifying questions to ensure that you understand the actual question being asked.

When answering questions, practice conveying the appropriate amount of information. A very short answer might be seen as abrupt and too long an answer will confuse your listeners. Practice finding the right words to explain a concept. Consider recording yourself and listening to it for pace and diction. Speaking too quickly is a sign of an inexperienced speaker. Slow the pace down a bit. At first it might seem to be too plodding, but listen to your recording and confirm the right pace. Remember, at times you might be
The AIP Youth Scholarship Committee is once again providing young adults interested in parliamentary procedure with the opportunity to earn a scholarship to attend an AIP parliamentary event this year. The link to the brief scholarship application can be found here and any high school or post-secondary student interested in advancing their parliamentary knowledge or skill is welcome to apply for this opportunity and attend the events. Please be sure to share this opportunity with anyone that would be a good candidate for this opportunity and email Joe Ramstad with any questions (ramst083@umn.edu)!

In addition, the AIP Youth Committee will be conducting Social Media Campaigns for Parliamentary Procedure Month in April under the guidance of committee vice chair Kendra Weakland (flood.kendra5373@gmail.com) and supporting the National Intercollegiate Parliamentary Association (NIPA) by encouraging collegiate students to join.

Daniel D. Foster, PhD, CP-T, PRP
Youth Committee Chair
A Study Plan for CP Test
Justin Schmid, CP, RP

The road to achieving my credential was not an easy one and featured hours of study. I should note that I recently achieved a credential with another Parliamentary organization, so my studies for this credential were building upon more than two years of previous studies and practice. I had already read both Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised (12th edition) and the American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, cover to cover twice, so this would be my third time giving them a full review.

The approach that I took to my studies was to use the many excellent study guides available from the American Institute of Parliamentarians, avail myself of any practice opportunities, and to set ambitious goals for each week of three months of study.

The main book of study that I used was AIP’s Fundamentals of Parliamentary Law and Procedure. I tasked myself with completing three lessons out of that book each week. Generally, this meant at least an hour or two, three nights each week.

For each lesson, I first tackled the reading assignments in the relevant authorities (starting with RONR, then AIPSC and finally Demeter’s). I would make notes of anything that stood out to me as unfamiliar information, then reviewed the lesson material for the chapter and finally completed the quizzes. I would note any questions I got wrong for further review at the end of the studies.

From previous studies, I had a copy of the National Association of Parliamentarian’s Study Guide. I would attempt a dozen or more of the multiple-choice questions over the course of the week in any spare time. In addition, I used AIP’s Study Manual as an end of week test for practice. I worked my way through them faster than scheduled, so went through it a second time. Again, I noted any questions I got wrong and read up on those topics further.

Meanwhile, I was fortunate to have the assistance of the esteemed President of AIP, Al Gage, CPP-T, PRP, PAP, who would give me a scripting exercise and then evaluate it. His feedback that was invaluable in understanding what is expected of candidates in the script writing portion of the test. I truly appreciated this practice and thank him for this support.

Attending the AIP Presiding Practicum in December 2022 and AIP’s West Coast Practicum in January 2023 were invaluable opportunities for practice in presiding, learning through the workshops and putting my memorization into action. In addition to my personal studies, I attended the Betty S. Green Study Chapter as my schedule permitted.

Finally, once I was a couple weeks from the test, I read through AIP’s Differences Between AIPSC and RONR, reviewed my study notes and focused in on all the questions that I still was having trouble with, rereading the relevant sections of the relevant authority. This was also time to work on reviewing all the topics that required memorization of lists or specific information.

I recognize this is not supposed to be an easy test, but even with all of this preparation, it was still extremely challenging, and I was glad for every minute of study I had dedicated to achieving this credential. I can only recommend a strong commitment to studies and comprehensive work to both practice and test yourself repeatedly to those seeking this credential. Thank you again to all who assisted. I look forward to helping those who come after me and continuing my own studies.

Justin Schmid, CP, RP
WELCOME NEW MEMBERS OF AIP

Carole Albright
Greensboro, NC
Lakisha Barclay
Akron, OH
Jesse Battle
Saint Louis, MO
Tiana Belton
Conshohocken, PA
Tobi Bray
Dallas, TX
Michelle Brown
Oakland, CA
Christina Buehler
Tigard, OR
Pamela Carpinello
Zionsville, IN
Daniel Carroll
Bulverde, TX
Christopher J. (CJ) Clugston
Gunnison, CO
Tom Coscia
St. Peters, MO

Patrick Courtney
Mason City, IA
Cole Daneman
Ashland, OR
Alexandra Fitzgerald
Jefferson, MD
Jonathan Fortney
Palmyra, PA
Peter Gerngross
Pearland, TX
Jeremy Hoffman
Weston, WI
Ronald Johnson
Alexandria, Virginia
Kurt Jones
Hereford, TX
Tripti Kataria
Chicago, IL
Natasha Kennedy
Florence, AZ
Margie Kunze
Jefferson City, MO
Lyndsay Kuzmak
Finksburg, MD

Michael Law
Las Cruces, NM
Zachary LeMaire
Morgantown, WV
Robert Loesch
Big Rapids, MI
Mary McDaniel
Babson Park, FL
Stephen McDonnell, DDS
Mendota Heights, MN
Robert McKelvain
San Marcos, TX
Jennifer Nickel
Riverside, CA
Kelly O’Malley
Fredericksburg, VA
Todd Pickard
Houston, TX
David Rosman
Stoneham, MA
Kevin Ryan
Lisle, IL
Michael Scocos
Copely, OH

Phyllis Shackelford
Chicago, IL
Audra Smith
Fort Worth, TX
Ryan Sorensen
North Hollywood, CA
Kimberly Spivey
Park Forest, IL
David Staehlin
Cottage Grove, MN
Jennifer Thompson
Farmington, NM
Brandon Umess
Goodyear, AZ
Dr. Christian Vigil
San Jose, CA
Kent Watson
Monticello, FL
Christopher Whipple
Clarksville, TN
Jonathan Zirkle
Loma Linda, CA