Minutes of the 2024 Pacific Division Executive Committee Meeting

Hilton Portland Downtown, Portland, Oregon
Wednesday, March 20, 2024

Present: Rebecca Copenhaver, Carolyn Dicey Jennings, Clair Morrissey, Amy Kind, Margaret Gilbert, José Jorge Mendoza, and Alex Sager.

Guest: Amy Ferrer.

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting came to order at 12:00 PM.

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The American Philosophical Association acknowledges and pays respect to the Indigenous people upon whose ancestral lands this conference is being held. We recognize that the rights of Native and Indigenous people and nations have been and continue to be denied and violated, and we honor with gratitude the land itself and the people who have stewarded it throughout the generations.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: The agenda was adopted.

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES: The minutes were adopted as published on the APA website.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES: None raised.

6. REPORT OF ACTIONS BY EMAIL: The Executive Committee (XC) added names to the list of philosophers approved for service on the divisional program committee.

   The XC added names to the list of philosophers approved for service on the Nominating Committee.

   The committee added names to the list of philosophers considered for the Dewey Lecture and voted (alongside the Program Committee) for a nominee (Michael Bratman).

DIVISIONAL BUSINESS

7. SECRETARY-TREASURER’S REPORT (Copenhaver): Copenhaver thanked Alex Sager and the Program Committee for a fantastic program. Copenhaver thanked her assistant Mallory Medeiros for everything she’s done in her role over the past many years. There is a job ad out for the replacement for Medeiros’s replacement. Copenhaver thanked the National Office staff, who make these meetings possible and Amy Ferrer for her leadership. She encouraged XC members to visit the National Office staff at the registration table to thank them for their work because that little bit of recognition does make a difference. Ferrer said if XC members stop by the registration table and someone seems hesitant to register,
they can help the staff by explaining what the APA does and why registration is important. Copenhaver agreed and said that XC members are ambassadors when people have questions about the APA, how it works, why things are done a certain way, etc. because they know more about the APA than most people.

Copenhaver also thanked outgoing president Debra Satz and outgoing member-at-large Alex Sager for their years of service. Sager has served the division in several different roles. Copenhaver told Sager that the division appreciates everything he has done for the APA and it looks forward to working within him again in the future.

The Nominating Committee, which was composed of Debra Satz (chair), Mark Timmons, Nico Orlandi, and Copenhaver (ex officio) nominates the following terms beginning July 1, 2024: John Carriero for vice president, Adrienne Martin for member-at-large, and Alexander Sager for Secretary-Treasurer. Those nominations will go before the membership tomorrow at the Annual Business Meeting. In keeping with tradition, if Adrienne Martin is elected, she will assume the role of chair of the XC. Since Dom Lopes, Copenhaver’s predecessor, was Secretary-Treasurer, the tradition has been that the most recent incoming Member-At-Large is Chair of the XC.

Next year, the Nominating Committee will be composed of Gilbert as chair; Timmons, who will be doing his second year on it; Copenhaver as ex officio; and, while keeping our commitment to keeping multiple forms of diversity in mind, a new member to be selected from among the XC’s suggestions and suggestions from the membership. Taking suggestions from the membership is a new option. Orlandi is departing a two-year term on the Nominating Committee and we thank them for their service.

We ran into two significant issues for the 2024 meeting in Portland. The first is that we didn’t meet our room block by a significant margin. Our room block attrition percentage was 80%. We block out a certain number of sleeping rooms for the hotel and attrition of 80% means that we have to meet 80% of that block. This attrition percentage is actually a pretty good number: sometimes hotels start with 90% or 95%, which is much scarier. Ferrer noted that historically, we’ve been able to get more like 70%, or occasionally 65%, as an attrition percentage. She explained that while we’d obviously prefer those numbers, in recent years hotels have been less willing to drop their attrition percentages. In some cases, they start at 90% and we have talk them down to 80% or so.

Copenhaver emphasized that having an attrition percentage of 80% is pretty good. At last check, our pickup was 1,239 room nights and that’s was 63% of our room block. This time last year, our pickup was 1,890 rooms and that was 104% pickup. Something significant has happened from last year to this year, but it’s unclear what the change in pickup is about. It could be the very bad press that Portland receives at the national level. It could be leftover pandemic effects. It could be an effect of increased lack of institutional funding. Copenhaver doesn’t think it’s worth spending a lot of time speculating about the reasons right now because we know that we need to adjust the room block for our contracts in the near future. We probably need to adjust the room block for the 2025 meeting in San Francisco: it’s better to overshoot than to undershoot. We did just sign a new contract with the Hilton Portland Downtown because the space is fantastic and we’ll have to reduce that room block. Usually,
reducing the room block far in advance like this isn’t a problem and the hotel doesn’t usually balk. Copenhaver will explain shortly why this would be especially true for the Hilton Portland Downtown.

Determining what the 2025 room block should be reduced to will be tricky for two reasons. First, San Francisco has traditionally been our most popular destination, which means that we might not want to reduce our room block by too much. Second, next year is the first year of the 2+1 experiment [the three-year experiment in which two divisional meetings are in-person and one divisional meeting is virtual, with the virtual meeting rotating between the divisions each year]. The 2025 Central meeting will be online and we just don’t know whether that will affect the numbers for the Eastern and Pacific meeting. It could have no effect on the Eastern and Pacific meetings or it could increase their numbers: we don’t know what will happen, so we’re working with a bit of uncertainty.

Ferrer said another potential reason why our pickup is lower this year is that the base number of participants at this meeting is smaller than it was last year. There’s always a number of people who book rooms as attendees, but the number of participants tends to be the base number that allows us to track what kind of room block we can fill. That number being lower this year—again for reasons we don’t understand—is likely one of the factors.

Copenhaver said that when a division doesn’t meet a room block, it has to pay for every single room that doesn’t get picked up. This is the first time that the Pacific Division hasn’t met a room block. Ferrer explained that we know a division has to pay for every room in its block that doesn’t get picked up because it has happened with the other divisions. Copenhaver stressed to the XC that this is an important message for them to share as ambassadors: it really matters if people don’t stay at the conference hotel. It is a significant issue. The only reason we get the conference space is because of sleeping room block, so not meeting our room block this year could have been a financial disaster. Fortunately, we’re not going to incur any fees or costs, and we’ll be able to lower our room block for the next contract with the Hilton Portland Downtown. We dodged a very expensive bullet and this is likely because of the ongoing labor action at the hotel. As Ferrer’s explained in her message to the membership, Hilton Portland Downtown employees “are seeking a fair contract that includes (among other things) a pay raise, which they have not had in two years. As part of their organizing for a fair contract, workers have been holding protests (also known as actions) outside the hotel, raising awareness of their efforts.” [Ferrer’s statement on the labor action at the hotel is available at https://www.apaonline.org/news/667594/Information-on-Labor-Organizing-at-Portland-Hilton-Downtown.htm.] All of our contracts have a clause that require a hotel to notify us of any potential labor actions within six months of the meeting.

Ferrer provided background on the situation. We’re especially fortunate to have Sager on the team because he’s based in Portland. A week ago on Friday, Sager saw a group of workers demonstrating outside the hotel and notified Ferrer and Copenhaver. This was the first that Ferrer and Copenhaver heard of the labor action. The clause in our contracts states that a hotel is required to tell us if any union or labor contracts are going to expire, or even be renegotiated, within a few months of a meeting and if there are any actual or planned labor actions. The Hilton Portland Downtown very clearly is in breach of contract and that is why failing to meet our room block wasn’t a financial disaster. When Sager told Ferrer and
Copenhaver noted that XC members are welcome to join the staff action that will be taking place this afternoon outside the hotel. It’s important to emphasize that, as Amy’s message to the membership stated, “The union leaders have shared that they ‘have not called a boycott at this time, and the workers are not on strike. ... We are not asking anyone to cancel events or to not stay at the hotel at this time.’” She’s sure that the workers would appreciate you joining them outside should you want to do that.

Ferrer said that through Carol, we communicated to the hotel that we’re pro-labor and pro-workers’ rights, and that it’s very important to the APA as an organization and to the membership that they give their workers a fair contract. We also had Carol communicate to
the hotel that the problem isn’t that the meeting is taking place amidst labor action; the problem is that they didn’t live up to their end.

Copenhaver asked if the XC had any questions or concerns before resuming her report. Kind asked Copenhaver to repeat the pickup numbers. This year’s pickup number is 1,239 room nights and last year’s pickup number was 1,890 room nights. Kind asked if the difference has to do with fewer people being at the meeting and Copenhaver said yes. Kind asked if there were 600 fewer people at the meeting this year than last year. Ferrer recently looked at the numbers and there are about 200 fewer people at this year’s meeting than there were at last year’s meeting; there were just under 1,000 people last year and around 800 people this year. She offered to check the precise numbers while the discussion continued. Copenhaver noted that the number of people we had at the meeting last year was more than what we had anticipated.

Kind asked about logistics: does it count against us if a person cancels their hotel room at the last minute? Copenhaver answered that yes, it does. Ferrer said it affects our final number. Ferrer said that while there is always some sort of “wash,” some room cancellations just before the meeting, she thinks that we’ve had more of that this year than we usually do. Copenhaver said that on the positive side, that if people book on the hotel’s website rather than via the APA website’s link to the hotel website, the hotel does an audit afterwards and those bookings count towards our numbers.

Kind wondered if the fact that there were two conference hotels if that hurts our message about staying here somehow. Ferrer noted that the two hotels are connected. She explained that are two hotels because the Hilton Portland Downtown changed things on us part way through: they moved some of our block to their old hotel and in doing that, they basically broke the website link that they had previously given us. That website link also broke again a few other times in the lead-up to the meeting. Copenhaver noted that we were going to meet our attrition percentage. Ferrer concurred and said that we were already going to argue against our attrition percentage on the basis of the website link repeatedly breaking. Ferrer said that this was a rebooking of our 2021 contract [the 2021 Pacific meeting was supposed to be in-person at the Hilton Portland Downtown but in early Fall 2020, had to be pivoted to a virtual setting because of the pandemic]. Copenhaver said this year’s meeting wasn’t during Passover and Easter [the division traditionally books hotels for during those holidays to get lower rates]. Ferrer said that because this year’s contract is a rebooking of our 2021 contract, the Central and Pacific division meetings were scheduled closer together than we wanted them to be, which is very hard on the National Office staff, and the room rate we took is the highest room rate that the APA has ever had. We’ve never broken $200 before. We had no bargaining power in terms of the room rate: either we had to take the contract or they were going to charge us $250,000. We took the contract. As it turned out, that rate is higher than comps; basically, as soon as people saw that they couldn’t get a room here, they checked other hotels, saw the prices were way lower, and were never going to come back to the Hilton Portland Downtown. That was another factor to the room block for this year that we would have argued to the hotel, but we don’t have to in the end.

Kind asked if we would’ve been able to get more concessions if we weren’t so concerned about not meeting the attrition percentage. She asked what concessions could we have gotten
if our pickup had been 80% at the final number. Ferrer said we’ll be asking for a discount on the final bill and if we had met our attrition percentage, we’d be asking for a larger discount. One thing Ferrer learned from talking to other society leaders is what they were able to get for concessions from the Hilton Portland Downtown. If she remembers correctly, the American Folklore Society got 10-15% knocked off of their final bill. Given our pickup, we’ll probably end up getting 10% knocked off of our final bill: Ferrer would ask for more if we had met our attrition.

Kind asked if we’re losing some other way because we can’t get concessions that we could’ve gotten if we had met our attrition. Ferrer said no. She said that we could’ve asked for other concessions (e.g., the hotel covering some of the reception’s cost) but we don’t spend a lot on food & beverage. The American Folklore Society’s bill was higher than ours because they do banquets, dinners, and breakfasts that we don’t do. There are concessions that they’d ask for that we wouldn’t ask for because we have different meeting models. Kind clarified that she as asking because we’re treating the concessions as if they’re a huge relief. Ferrer said we aren’t just going to accept the sole concession of the hotel not coming after us for attrition. Copenhaver agreed.

Ferrer provided the precise numbers that Kind asked about earlier in the discussion. The numbers come from how many people received meeting reminder emails. This year, we emailed 837 people reminders and last year, we emailed 1,046 people reminders. So, it’s about a difference of 200 people. Kind recapped that the differences between this year and last year: this year, we’re down about 600 in rooms and 200 in people—though that may go down a bit. Ferrer confirmed these numbers.

Copenhaver asked if there are any further questions about this matter or the labor action. Jennings asked if there’s any chance that the labor action becomes a strike. Copenhaver responded that there isn’t and we know that because we’re in very good communication with the labor organizers. Ferrer said she bumped into the union organizer at the hotel on Sunday morning and talked to them. The union organizer said that it’d take longer than the duration of the meeting for the labor action to become a strike. When we found out about the labor action, one worry we had was whether they were on the cusp of a strike and would strike in the next week. The labor organizers assured us that wasn’t the case. Now that we’re here, they won’t go on strike before we leave. If you’d like to talk to the labor organizers, there are flyers in the lobby with their photos so you can identify them.

Copenhaver resumed delivering her report. The division’s funds are managed through the central funds at the National Office. This is good for many reasons, such as audits and providing a “big picture” sense of the budget. The budget is generally released about one month after the meeting. Copenhaver will send the XC the budget after it’s released. She’d say that overall, we’re doing fine and fiscally healthy. We do, however, need to be cautious and conservative in the short-term. In the long-term, we depend on the APA’s overall fiscal health. We’re mutually dependent: it’s a symbiotic dependence. The Board takes the larger issue of the APA’s overall long-term fiscal health extremely seriously. To that end, Copenhaver thanked Ferrer for her work during the pandemic and beyond. She said she expects Ferrer will have more to say about the budget in her own report.
Copenhaver accepted her third and final term as Secretary-Treasurer in 2023. The next year will be her last. She is very pleased that a vote on Sager as the next Secretary-Treasurer will go before the membership tomorrow. If Sager is voted in tomorrow, she’ll be pleased to work on the transition with him over the next year. Copenhaver is extremely grateful for Sager’s willingness to serve. She reminded the XC that there’s a job ad out for the next Assistant to the Pacific Division Secretary-Treasurer and encouraged them to send the ad to advanced graduate students who are interested in supplementary income. After applications are in, she may call on the XC to be on the small hiring committee that will review applications.

Ferrer pulled up the budget numbers about fiscal year 2024 to pr Our fiscal year is from July 1 to June 30. We’re currently in fiscal year 2024 and fiscal year 2025 will start on July 1. For fiscal year 2024, the Pacific Division’s budgeted operating revenue was $155,000 and the total operating expenses are almost $117,000—so a difference of about $38,000. This is great, but it’s worth noting that the total operating expenses only counts the meeting expenses and it doesn’t count staff time or Ferrer’s time. It’s very important not to think that difference is a budget surplus and we shouldn’t raise registration fees. That $38,000 surplus conceals other expenses that are only in other parts of the budget. The Pacific Division is basically breaking even. Copenhaver noted that the division aims to break even. Ferrer said that Lopes’s swan song as Chair of the Board of Officers was that membership is like being a good citizen of the profession: it’s like paying your taxes. She explained that membership is now becoming more transactional: people are members now because they’re going to participate in a meeting. So, instead of membership subsidizing meetings as it used to do, we need to be moving towards a model where meetings are subsidizing the other operations of the APA because they drive membership. It’s important to be thinking of moving in that direction given the trends that the APA and other professional societies are seeing. We need to make sure that meetings add to the budget rather than draining from it.

Copenhaver explained that the 2026 Pacific meeting will be virtual because of the 2+1 experiment. [The announcement of the 2+1 experiment is available at: https://www.apaonline.org/news/610518/APA-announces-21-experiment-and-virtual-meetings-committee.htm.] The Central Division will host the first virtual meeting in the experiment [in 2025] and the Eastern division will host the last one [in 2027]. She said that Ferrer can talk about the 2+1 experiment’s history if the XC wanted. The divisional coordinating committee and all three divisions’ executive committees voted on this in response to requests from the membership. The experiment will allow us to gather data relative to assessing the viability and desirability of online conferences; speculating about those things is useless without data.

Ferrer noted that the APA was one of the first professional societies to decide to experiment with some kind of rotating virtual meeting. After the APA decided to do the 2+1 experiment, the Association for Jewish Studies decided to rotate between in-person and virtual meetings. Their first virtual meeting is in December and Ferrer thinks that they’ll be rotating every other year. She’ll be in close contact with their executive director to learn from their experiences and vice versa. The American Psychological Association is going on a three-year rotation (1 virtual, 2 in-person) starting in 2028. Their experiment starts after ours ends, so we’ll be making a decision about future APA meetings before we know how their experiment
turned out. We’ll track changes to who participates in meetings—both virtual and in-person—as best we can. There are many different scenarios that we could see. For example, the virtual meetings could have much bigger numbers if they’re attended by people who aren’t able to travel to in-person meetings and by people who would’ve attended a meeting if it were in-person. We’ll track the meeting numbers and who is participating to help us decide how to proceed in the future—if 2+1 is permanent or we take another approach.

Gilbert asked if a virtual meeting will have registration fees. Copenhaver responded that virtual meeting fees will probably be more expensive than in-person conference fees. Ferrer said that the Central Division just adopted the registration proposal that the XC will discuss later in this meeting. The Central Division agreed without hesitation that their online meeting will have the same fee as the 2025 in-person meetings. She explained that online meetings are cheaper to attend and we intend them to be just as valuable for people as the in-person meetings. It doesn’t help us to undervalue an online meeting by having a cut-rate registration fee. From the 2021 meetings and the first 2022 meeting, we learned that it takes more staff time to run online meetings. We also learned the software platform fees, which were once inexpensive and helped us have a surplus in 2021, more than doubled by 2022. APA staff will look into platforms this spring/summer, but from what we’ve seen so far, we expect a virtual meeting to cost about the same as an in-person meeting.

Copenhaver said that this is a great opportunity for the XC to be ambassadors. If people are saying on social media that an online meeting should be free, please remind them that the National Office staff’s labor isn’t free and platforms realized during the pandemic that they can raise their prices. We also don’t want to undervalue the virtual meetings or the fact that people will save money on travel when they attend them.

Kind agrees on virtual conferences’ value and isn’t questioning it. She said one advantage of a virtual meeting is that people can theoretically drop in for a session or a day in the way that they wouldn’t be able to with an in-person meeting. She asked if it’d be possible to offer a one-day pass for people who aren’t on the program without cutting into our regular registration structure. Kind doesn’t have a plan worked out but wonders if we can do something like this or special one-session passes. She emphasized that she isn’t questioning the value of an online meeting; rather, she wants us to be able to take advantage of the benefits of having an online meeting.

Copenhaver responded she’s sorry to say that one-session or one-day passes probably aren’t the best idea for few reasons. First, they’re a risky financial proposition. Such passes would require a virtual conference platform to have more moving parts, which means more labor from the National Office staff and additional costs from the platform itself. As a result, costs would rise and because people would take advantage of such passes, revenue would fall. Second, Copenhaver thinks the 2+1 experiment asks us to have as few variables between virtual divisional meetings as possible. If all three divisions could offer passes at their virtual meetings, that would be fine. But since the Central meeting has already voted on their registration fees for next year, only the Eastern and Pacific Divisions would be able to do it. If the divisions don’t do the same thing, it’ll muddle with the experiment.
Kind said that those reasons make sense and she defers to people who think about this matter more. People are talking about this online and she is trying to think of ways that we can capitalize on a virtual meeting’s advantages so that a virtual meeting isn’t just equal to an in-person meeting; it’s better. We could say that part of the reason a virtual meeting is better than in-person meeting is that, although an in-person meeting has some benefits that it doesn’t have, it has some benefits that an in-person meeting doesn’t have. She said that if the three virtual meetings have to be the same for the sake of the experiment, perhaps her point should be that this is something we should think about post-experiment. Kind would love for her proposal not to be forgotten should we proceed with virtual meetings post-experiment.

Copenhaver said that the APA has, by far, the least expensive registration fees of any peer society. Our sibling societies have higher registration fees and often only have one meeting per year. We have three meetings every year. It’d be good to remind people of this.

Copenhaver thanked the XC for their continued service, especially since much of the world seems to feel stretched and tired post-pandemic. The APA thanks them and Copenhaver thanks them. She said she knows that XC members’ home institutions often don’t acknowledge the work they do on the XC. If it would help, she would be happy to write to their dean, chair, etc. to describe their work, its importance, and/or its extent. She told the XC members that there would be no APA without them.

Copenhaver asked if there were any other questions. Gilbert asked whether the APA has any thoughts about recording the virtual meetings during the 2+1 experiment. Ferrer said she assumes we’ll do what we did with the 2021 virtual meetings: sessions were recorded by default, but people could opt out of being recorded in advance or in the moment by asking the tech person in the virtual room. Anyone who registered for a 2021 virtual meeting had access to recordings of it for a year. People could continue to register for any of the 2021 meetings throughout that year to gain access to the recordings. Gilbert replied that being able to do that again would be a bonus. Ferrer said what we’ll be able to offer will depend on the platform we use and what they allow. If making recordings available for a year is expensive but making them available for 3 months isn’t, we might only make them available for 3 months. Copenhaver said this is because the platform has to store the recordings and that costs money. Ferrer agreed. She said we think that recordings of the virtual meetings will be handled like the 2021 meetings, but it depends on the platforms the National Office staff researches and what their fees for making recordings available will be.

Mendoza asked if we lost all recordings of the talks from the 2021 virtual meetings because Tommie Shelby’s talk was sweet. Ferrer responded that those talks aren’t available on the Zoom anymore. One reason a virtual conference requires more staff hours than an in-person one is that the recordings of the 2021 meetings all had to be trimmed. Zoom, the platform we used, records an entire meeting, so APA staff had to trim the preparation prior to a session and any conversations that took place afterwards if people stayed in the room. They did this for every session at the 2021 meetings. We had to download the talks for the staff to trim them and we still have them. We have audio recordings of most Presidential Lectures and Dewey Lectures over the years. We release them as a series on the APA blog. We took a break from doing that, but we’re going to post another round of those this year and Ferrer thinks that the virtual meeting addresses will be a part of that.
Jennings said that if we haven’t done this before, it would be interesting to see what things we could do for developing countries. Ferrer said we have a couple of things going in that regard. First, there is now a special membership rate for people who reside in a country on the UN list of least develop countries; it might actually be lower than the graduate student rate. Those folks also automatically get the student registration rate for meetings, which is the lowest meeting registration rate that we offer. We also have the Fund for Overseas Philosophers, which provides assistance for membership fees and meeting registration fees. It uses a different list from the UN’s list, but it’s a similar list because it’s a least developed countries list. People can apply for assistance from that fund if the reduced meeting fee is still too high for them. Ferrer just talked to the Central Division Chair and she’ll be bringing a proposal to the Board at its next meeting in May; the proposal is to add a few countries to the country list for the Fund for Overseas Philosophers, in particular Ukraine and Gaza. She doesn’t expect the Board to balk this and anticipates that we’ll be covering some virtual meeting participants out of that fund either fully or partially.

8. REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD (Morrissey): Morrissey asked Ferrer for help with this since we’re the only division that does this. Ferrer shared the report she gave to the divisions, so Morrissey and Ferrer co-presented parts of that report.

Morrissey said that last year, the Board issued a statement on academic freedom in Florida. It also joined three statements: an American Council of Learned Societies statement in support of academic freedom and New College of Florida; a statement organized by the American Council of Learned Societies on the effort to undermine academic freedom in Florida House Bill 999; and a statement organized by the American Historical Association opposing Florida House Bill 999. [Statements are available at https://www.apaonline.org/page/statements under “Letters and Statements from the Board of Officers.”] Ferrer and Lopes, Chair of the Board, wrote directly to several institutions to advocate against proposed cuts to their philosophy programs and worked with departments to support their own advocacy efforts on their campuses. Morrissey said this was just her first year, but it seems like this is something the board is called to do often and it’s something everyone should think about. Relatedly, the Board established a Task Force on Enrollment and Major Recruitment. Ferrer said the task force has started its work and is mostly staffed, but it’s thinking about added 1-2 more people. Morrissey provided an overview of what the Board has done in terms of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice: it performed periodic reviews of the Committee on LGBTQ People in the Profession and the Committee on Hispanics/Latinx; approved updates to the APA’s Statement on Best Practices in Journal Publishing and the Handbook on Academic Job Market Practices; approved, on the Task Force on Diversity in Graduate Curricula’s recommendation, updates to the Good Practices Guide; and approved changes to the names of the Committee on Pre-College Philosophy, and the Committee on Women and Gender.

The Board also established a Task Force on Contingent Faculty Issues. The APA Graduate Student Council (GSC) submitted for the Board’s review a call to encourage graduate programs to cover students’ APA membership fees. The Board provided the GSC with feedback. It reestablished the Development Committee and appointed Sally Scholz as chair. This is notable because it’s part of the ramp up to a major capital campaign. So, as
Copenhaver was saying, when being an ambassador, note that we have a big financial campaign in the works and encourage anyone with ideas to reach out to Scholz. Ferrer said that while 2024 is the Pacific Division’s 100th anniversary, this isn’t the division’s 100th meeting because meetings were paused at points during WWII. Because of this is the division’s anniversary, even though the campaign is mostly quiet and still being fully formulated, both Kind and Ferrer will mention the campaign during the meeting. There are QR codes around the meeting for people who would like to donate now.

9. REPORT OF THE CEO OF THE APA (Ferrer):

Grants Received and Awarded:

- In the end of December, we completed the final year of our Mellon Grant to support diversity institutes.
- We made $25,000 in small grants, $20,000 in Diversity and Inclusiveness grants, and $11,000 in microgrants from donor funds, such as the Berry Fund for Public Philosophy, the fund for diversity and inclusiveness, and the teaching fund. Small grants cap out at $5,000 each. Diversity and Inclusiveness grants are for larger projects: either one $20,000 grant or two $10,000 grants. Micro-grants cap out at $1,000 each and are decided on a rolling basis so folks who need just a little bit of money for a project can get a quicker turnaround. You can find all the funds on our website [https://www.apaonline.org/page/grants].

Finances:

- The overall APA budget for fiscal year 2024, which was approved in fiscal year of 2023, showed a net loss of about $104,000—that’s on a budget of about $1.5 million total. That’s not an insignificant deficit. We’re fortunate that the last time there was a capital campaign, an endowment was established for the APA and that has been generating a little bit of money over the years. That endowment means we have a little bit of reserves that allow us to weather periods of deficit, but obviously we can’t have a deficit of this scale on an ongoing basis. One of the Board’s and Ferrer’s main focuses is to move the APA to a more sustainable place financially. One piece of that was the launch of our departmental services program last year. That program includes services given directly to departments; complementary memberships to undergraduate students and first-year graduate students from the departments that joined; and an annual chair’s workshop. We’re in the process of planning this year’s workshop. Sandy Goldberg has agreed to head up a small planning committee for it. Hopefully we’ll have a bare bones agenda sometime next month that we can start promoting. The workshop itself will be over the summer.
- We’re in the process of renegotiating our contract with Cambridge University Press for the Journal of the APA. Ferrer is pleased with the negotiations and anticipates signing a new contract in the next month or so.

Other Actions of the Board:

- The Board appointed Naomi Scheman as the Discrimination & Harassment Ombudsperson. Her contact information is in the APA Meetings app. If anyone has any issues at the meeting, they should contact her.
• It appointed Johann Klaassen as incoming treasurer. He is a philosophy PhD who works in finance, particularly sustainable investing.

• R. Lanier Anderson became Board Chair on July 1, 2023 in his first year. Richard Bett has been Vice Chair for several years and is continuing on in that role.

• The Board approved four new prizes: the Anthony J. Lisska Prize for Faculty at Small Liberal Arts Colleges, which was funded by Denison University; the OUP Teaching with Technology Prize; the Stephen J. White Prize; and the AI2050 Prize. Although the Stephen J. White Prize and AI2050 Prize have been established, they haven’t been announced yet.

Other Items of Note from the Past Year:

• Our annual financial audit was clean. There were no changes whatsoever, which shows how smoothly our finance office is running. Ferrer is grateful to our finance consultant and staff accountant for that.

• We had one staff change: Devin Brymer joined the APA as New Program Assistant for Governance and Awards.

• We launched the Departmental Services Program in June.

• We hosted about twenty APA Live events, which are available in our APA On Demand library (https://www.apaonline.org/page/ondemand).

• Ferrer currently serves as Vice Chair of the Board of the Delaware Humanities, which is the state humanities council in Delaware where APA is headquartered. She is also a member of the Advisory Board of the Academic Philosophy Data and Analysis project. She is still actively involved in the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Humanities Alliance, and several other organizations to represent the APA’s interests.

10. PROPOSAL: RATE INCREASE:

Background: Ferrer said that the hotel and food & beverage industries have been hit hard by inflation and the interest rate increases in the United States. In keeping with the Board’s long-term approach to get the APA in a model that is long-term financially sustainable, they asked the divisions to consider a proposal to increase registration rates.

Proposal: The Board recommends that the executive committee adopt the following registration rates. Note that because the discounts for membership, early bird registration, and paperless registration are set by the executive director in consultation with the secretary-treasurers, only the rates highlighted in red are set by the executive committee. The others may be adjusted by the executive director per APA policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2024 Early Green</th>
<th>2024 Early Paper</th>
<th>2024 On-Site Green</th>
<th>2024 On-Site Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2025 Early Green</th>
<th>2025 Early Paper</th>
<th>2025 On-Site Green</th>
<th>2025 On-Site Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2026 Early Green</td>
<td>2026 Early Paper</td>
<td>2026 On-Site Green</td>
<td>2026 On-Site Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% increase</td>
<td>2027 Early Green</td>
<td>2027 Early Paper</td>
<td>2027 On-Site Green</td>
<td>2027 On-Site Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% increase</td>
<td>2028 Early Green</td>
<td>2028 Early Paper</td>
<td>2028 On-Site Green</td>
<td>2028 On-Site Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% increase</td>
<td>2029 Early Green</td>
<td>2029 Early Paper</td>
<td>2029 On-Site Green</td>
<td>2029 On-Site Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$241</td>
<td>$251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$321</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>$376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% increase</td>
<td>2030 Early Green</td>
<td>2030 Early Paper</td>
<td>2030 On-Site Green</td>
<td>2030 On-Site Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$322</td>
<td>$327</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are the meeting registration rates of organizations similar to the APA. Where registration categories differ from the AP’s, the rates most closely matching the APA’s categories are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Communication Association (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$391</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language Association (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Women’s Studies Association (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$295</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$365</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Association (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle East Studies Association (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>$319</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>$566</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law &amp; Society Association (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$186</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$477</td>
<td>$537</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Classical Studies (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College Art Association (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$499</td>
<td>$549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Anthropological Association (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Association for the Study of African American Life and History (2024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$307</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$536</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Jewish Studies (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American Studies Association (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>$439</td>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Religion (2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Ferrer got peer societies’ registration rates from their websites. Our rates are far less than theirs. She said that the Board is recommending that we match the current
minimum charged by similar organizations by 2026 and then, as a sustaining action, further increase registration rates by 3% each year through 2030.

Copenhaver said that in her nine years of experience as Secretary-Treasurer, she has found people tend not to notice or object to small rate increases. People tend to notice and object to larger increases—by which she means increases of $10 or more. We think that an annual 3% increase is a better, more fiscally responsible, steady way of handling registration rate changes, as opposed to trying to anticipate and adjust registration rates every year. The Eastern and Central Divisions have already voted in favor of the proposal. Copenhaver said she mentioned this not to sway the XC but rather to make sure they know what the other divisions are doing.

Ferrer said it tends to be better for the administrative side of things and for the member side of things if registration rates are the same across all three divisions. We’ve had different registration rates across the divisions before and it was confusing for people. She highlighted that the XC decides the student and member registration rates. Ferrer with the three secretary-treasurers and meeting staff set the other differences between member vs. non-member rates; between early bird and on-site rates; and between green and paperless rates. The difference between member and non-member rates is based on the median membership dues rate. We want to encourage people to be APA members, not undercut membership. The differential for on-site and early bird rates is based on the fact that it’s easier to plan when we know how many people will be there in advance. The difference between paper and green rates comes from the per-copy cost of producing the paper program, which goes up as fewer people use them and as all things increase in price. These differentials are held constant in the proposal, but they could change so the XC should focus on the base rates.

Copenhaver said that the XC shouldn’t decide this by acclamation. She said it should do a motion and a vote.

Kind recalled that Ferrer said earlier in the meeting that other societies [e.g., the American Folklore Society] have more social events at their meetings, such as dinners. She asked whether those dinners are included in their registration rates. Ferrer responded that for societies that have more social events, some of them include one dinner and then the other meals are $40-45 each (or whatever the hotel is charging). Kind said it seems like other societies have higher registration rates and those high rates aren’t because they include dinners for attendees and asked Ferrer to confirm. Ferrer said this is correct and that when other societies have a higher registration rate than the APA, their members are maybe getting one meal included in their registration fee. A lot of organizations are like us, but some have a tradition of a prize dinner and that may be included in the registration price. Copenhaver noted here that we have four coffee breaks. She asked Ferrer how much one urn of coffee costs. Ferrer answered that it’s between $500 and $700 for one gallon of coffee, one gallon of decaf coffee, one gallon of hot tea, and accoutrements. Copenhaver responded that these things matter. She said he Prize Reception has wine and cheese; the Presidential Reception has wine and cheese; the Dewey has snacks but not alcohol—and all of that is included in our registration price.
Kind asked whether we pay by what we take or if the APA has to pay for everything. Ferrer said no, it depends on whether the hotel has to refill a whole set. If they have to refill a whole set, there may be an additional charge. Kind asked if we prepaid and Copenhaver said yes. Copenhaver said that if we almost always take any leftovers to the staff. Ferrer said that at the bars, we pay by consumption.

Kind asked if we’re overselling how high other societies’ rates are because we’re hoping that members won’t notice the rate increase. She said that it’s more helpful to make a strong case for increased rates and then say that, by the way, our rates are much lower than those of our sibling societies. When the latter is too up front and center, it feels like we’re trying to get more money just because we can. Mendoza agreed. Copenhaver also agreed and said that we can’t be fiscally stable without an increase in registration rates. Kind said she thinks we go into the comparison too quickly, which makes it seem like an increase in registration rates would just be about doing what we can get away with. Copenhaver said that Kind made a good point. Ferrer said other executive committees she has worked with have different approaches to explaining rate increases and the proposal was written so as to take that into account.

Jennings asked why our rates are so low and about the history behind our registration rates. Ferrer answered that about a year before she joined the APA [she joined in 2012], the student registration rate increased from $15 to $30. It had been $15 for about ten years. Historically, executive committees have been reluctant to charge students anything, even though a growing number of participants are students. Since a growing number of participants are students, we need students to pay registration fees otherwise the numbers don’t work out. For a long time, the feeling was that because we have three meetings per year and other societies have one, the fee for each divisional meeting should be one-third of what other societies charge—even though each meeting costs what it costs. This feeling persisted in the first 1-2 years of Ferrer’s time at the APA. Around that time, Ferrer researched how many people actually attend multiple divisional meetings each year. She found that there are only few dozen people—about 25 to 30—who attend two meetings per year and about five people who attend all three meetings. Historically, we had membership subsidize membership fees because there was this idea that the fees for three meetings all should all add up to the same registration fee. We’re several years downstream from that, but we started at a much lower rate than we should’ve had to cover costs.

Jennings asked whether membership rates will increase alongside registration rates if the proposal is approved. Ferrer responded that no, it wouldn’t happen at this time. Other societies have a sliding regressive scale, in which the dues rate for the lowest income band is a higher percentage of their income than it is for people with higher income levels. We didn’t want to do that, so we do a flat percentage in the middle of the income band. This is an advantage of our approach to dues, but it also means that it’s hard to raise our dues because we have to change the percentages. We’re already at the low end of membership dues relative to peer societies’ lower membership dues and at the high end for higher dues, which makes it harder for us to increase dues. The idea is that people will pay more in membership dues as they make more money, but people don’t always honestly self-report increases in their income. We have a nice bell curve except for the lowest income band. Jennings said she asked because if people are just becoming members because of a meeting, it’d be hard if
both membership dues and registration rates increased. Ferrer said that membership dues only increase if a person moves into a higher income band.

Kind said that she wouldn’t remember how the registration rate she paid last year compared to this year, but she would notice if a registration rate increased to $200. She brought this up because of what the proposal lists as the 2025 on-site green price [$205]. Ferrer acknowledged this is an issue but said that we do have to cross that at some point. Copenhaver said the response to this concern is to advertise early bird prices.

Jennings brought up the ratio between the student rate and the member rate. Some societies are closer to the student rate being one-third or one-half of the member rate. The proposal has the student rate moving from 30% to 40% of the member rate. Jennings asked why that is. Ferrer said that student membership fee is significantly lower than that of others societies’ so we can make a bit of that up in terms of meeting registration rates. In general, there’s not a specific reason for that transition. It was more of an overall consideration of where we are now and where we want to be. Ferrer said that we need to recognize that more participants are students and the more of them there are, the more we need them to pay registration fees to cover costs. It’s important to keep in mind that graduate students who present refereed papers are eligible for a $400 stipend at the Pacific meeting: this means they can get most of what they pay back.

Jennings asked if we or the GSC have ever asked graduate students what kind of access that they have to institutional travel funds. She said it’d be good to know what institutional funding faculty and graduate student can get and noted that faculty will probably lose access. Copenhaver replied that there are lots of surveys we wish we could do, but surveys cost money. Mendoza said a decrease in institutional funding is happening at his school [University of Washington]. Jennings said she’d like to know how faculty and graduate students are differently affected by funding issues. Mendoza said he tells his graduate students that presenting a refereed paper at the Pacific meeting is the best deal they’ll get because they’re basically getting paid to present at it. Copenhaver mentioned that our graduate student travel stipends are higher than the other divisions’ stipends. The Eastern and Central division do $300 stipends. She said we haven’t raised graduate student travel stipends in a while. This isn’t to say that we can raise them, but if our financial situation changes, we could look into raising them. Ferrer said that one of the things we’re hoping to get donors for is an endowment to cover graduate student travel stipends. AV and graduate student travel stipends are always the largest budget line items for every meeting.

Sager made a motion to approve the Board’s registration rate increase proposal. Kind seconded the motion. The XC unanimously voted to approve the proposal.

11. MEMO ON REPLACEMENT OF OFFICERS:

**Background:** Ferrer explained the APA is trying to implement good practices now that we’ll hopefully never need. Across the divisions, there aren’t any consistent procedures—or in some cases, any procedures—for replacing or removing officers. The standard is that a body can unappoint whom they’ve appointed: however, the removal of an elected officer requires
a provision. Ferrer sent the information in the below proposal as a memorandum to the Committee on Divisional Coordination.

Proposal: The APA should have procedures in place for replacing elected officers, either temporarily or permanently, when they are unable or unwilling to complete their terms of office or take a leave of absence. Though there are some procedures in place for some divisions, it may be desirable to consider having parallel procedures across the divisions and the Board of Officers.

Provision for the Replacement of Divisional Officers: Ferrer suggests that the divisions propose for this provision to be added to their bylaws: “The executive committee shall fill vacancies to any office of the division in cases in which the officer becomes unwilling or unable to serve before the completion of the officer’s term.”

This is a slight revision of an existing bylaws provision for the Pacific Division. For the Eastern Division, it would be an entirely new bylaws provision. For the Central Division, which currently has highly detailed provisions for replacing elected officers in its bylaws, Ferrer suggests that the division proposes to replace those highly detailed provisions with the above, and adopt the below detailed procedures as executive committee policy.

Procedures for Replacing Divisional Officers: Ferrer suggests the divisions adopt the below procedures to be used in the event that any officer of the division is unable or unwilling to carry out the duties of the office. In the items below, the terms “disabled,” “disability,” and “become disabled” are intended to cover circumstances in which the officer becomes disabled such that they are unable to carry out the relevant duties of the office.

- President: If the president of the division should become unwilling or unable to serve, the vice president shall immediately assume the office of president and the immediate past president shall remain in office for an additional year, including serving on the APA board of officers and the divisional executive committee and serving another term as chair of the nominating committee.
  - Presidential Address:
    - If the president should die or become disabled after the presidential address has been composed but before it has been delivered, then the executive committee shall select someone to read the address of the deceased or disabled president.
    - If the president should die or become disabled before the presidential address has been composed or finished, then a session honoring the president shall be held in place of the presidential address. At the option of the executive committee, the proceedings of this session, or part thereof, shall be published in the Proceedings and Addresses of the Association, in lieu of the presidential address. The speaker or speakers shall be chosen by the executive committee after taking appropriate advice.
    - If the president should leave office not due to death or disability before delivering the presidential address, the executive
committee shall determine a suitable plenary session to be held in place of the presidential address.

- **Past President:** If the immediate past president should become unwilling or unable to serve, the executive committee shall appoint a former president of the division to serve in the office of past president, including serving on the APA board of officers and the divisional executive committee and serving another term as chair of the nominating committee.

- **Vice President:**
  - If the vice president should become unwilling or unable to serve, then one of the other nominees from the election in which the vice president was elected shall be determined to be elected vice president by the results of that election already held, with the ballots listing the previously elected vice president as first choice distributed between the remaining candidates in accordance with the usual transferable vote procedure.
  - If the vice president leaves office due to death or disability, at the discretion of the executive committee, a session honoring the vice-president may be held at the divisional meeting during the year in which he or she would have been president.

- **Divisional Representative:**
  - If the divisional representative should become unwilling or unable to serve before the first annual meeting of the division following their election, then one of the other nominees from the election in which the representative was elected shall be determined to be elected representative by the results of that election already held, with the ballots listing the previously elected representative as first choice distributed between the remaining candidates in accordance with the usual transferable vote procedure.
  - If the divisional representative should become unwilling or unable to serve during or after the first annual meeting of the division following their election, then the executive committee at its discretion shall either (a) appoint a member of the division as acting representative to serve out the remainder of the representative’s term or (b) appoint a member of the division as interim representative until a new representative can be elected by the membership during the next regularly scheduled divisional election.
  - In appointing an acting or interim representative, the executive committee shall first consider past holders of the office, past presidents of the division, and past members of the executive committee.

- **Secretary-Treasurer:** If the secretary-treasurer should become unwilling or unable to serve, the executive committee shall appoint a suitable and willing person to serve as interim secretary-treasurer while a search to appoint the new secretary-treasurer is carried out.

- **Executive Committee Member-At-Large:**
  - If a member-at-large of the executive committee should become unwilling or unable to serve, no replacement shall be made, and the post shall be filled by election at the next regularly scheduled election.
If two or more members-at-large of the executive committee should become unwilling or unable to serve, the executive committee shall have the discretion to make replacements as it judges best until the next regular election can be held.

- **Other Circumstances:**
  - If a divisional officer takes a temporary leave of absence during the term of office, the executive committee shall have the discretion to either leave the office vacant for the duration of the leave of absence or appoint a member of the division to serve in that office on an interim basis.
  - If some contingency occurs not covered by the policies above, the executive committee shall have the duty and authority to proceed as it thinks best.

**Provision for the Replacement of Members of the Board of Officers:** Ferrer suggests that the Committee on Divisional Coordination recommends that the following provision be added to the APA bylaws: “The board shall fill vacancies to any office of the board in cases in which the officer becomes unwilling or unable to serve before the completion of the officer’s term.”

**Procedures for Replacing Members of the Board of Officers:** Ferrer suggests that the Committee on Divisional Coordination recommend that the below procedures be adopted by the board to be used in the event that any member of the board officers is unable or unwilling to carry out the duties of the office.

- **Divisional Officers:** Divisional officers who also serve as members of the board of officers shall be replaced in accordance with the bylaws and policies of the relevant division.

- **Chair:**
  - If the chair should become unwilling or unable to serve, the vice chair shall immediately assume the office of chair.
  - If the vice chair is willing to serve the remainder of the chair’s term of office, then upon becoming chair, they shall nominate a new vice chair to be confirmed by the board, in accordance with the usual procedure.
  - If the vice chair is unwilling to serve the remainder of the chair’s term of office, the vice chair will serve as interim chair until the board appoints a new chair. Upon the new chair’s assumption of the office, the previous vice chair’s term of office shall end, and the new chair shall nominate a member of the association to serve as vice chair to be confirmed by the board, in accordance with the usual procedure. The previous vice chair shall be eligible to be reappointed to the office.
  - If the chair takes a temporary leave of absence, the vice chair shall serve as chair for the duration of the leave of absence and return to the office of vice chair at the end of the chair’s leave of absence. The office of vice chair shall remain vacant for the duration of the chair’s leave of absence.

- **Vice Chair:** If the vice chair should become unwilling or unable to serve, the chair shall nominate a new vice chair to be confirmed by the board, in accordance with the usual procedure.
- **Treasurer:** If the treasurer should become unwilling or unable to serve, the chair shall nominate a new treasurer to be confirmed by the board, in accordance with the usual procedure.

- **Executive Director:** If the executive director should become unwilling or unable to serve, the chair shall appoint a suitable and willing person to serve as interim executive director while a search to appoint the new executive director treasurer is carried out.

- **Standing Committee Chairs:** If a standing committee chair should become unwilling or unable to serve, a new chair shall be appointed in accordance with the usual procedures for filling mid-term vacancies of committee chairs.

- **Members-At-Large:**
  - If a member-at-large should become unwilling or unable to serve on or before December 31 of the first year of the term of office, then one of the other nominees from the election in which the member was elected shall be determined to be elected member-at-large by the results of that election already held, with the ballots listing the previously elected member as first choice distributed between the remaining candidates in accordance with the usual transferable vote procedure.
  - If a member-at-large should become unwilling or unable to serve during or after the first annual meeting of the division following their election, then the board at its discretion shall either (a) appoint a member of the association as acting member-at-large to serve out the remainder of the member’s term or (b) appoint a member of the association as interim member-at-large until a new member-at-large can be elected by the membership during the next regularly scheduled election.
  - In appointing an acting or interim member-at-large, the board shall first consider past holders of the office, past candidates for the office who were not elected, and past members of the board.

- **Other Circumstances:**
  - If a member of the board of officers who is neither the chair nor a divisional officer takes a temporary leave of absence during the term of office, the chair shall have the discretion to either leave the office vacant for the duration of the leave of absence or appoint a member of the division to serve in that office on an interim basis.
  - If some contingency occurs not covered by the policies above, the board shall have the duty and authority to proceed as it thinks best.

**Removal of Officers:** Neither the Board of Officers nor the divisions have provisions governing the removal of officers for cause.

- **Divisional Officers:** Ferrer suggests that the Committee on Divisional Coordination recommend that one of following be added to the bylaws of each division: “Members of the executive committee can be removed with cause by a two-thirds majority vote of the executive committee” or “Any elected member of the executive committee may be removed for cause by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members affiliated with the division.”
• **Board of Officers:** Ferrer suggests that the Committee on Divisional Coordination recommend that the following be added to APA bylaws:
  - “Members of the board of officers who are not serving ex officio as divisional officers can be removed with cause by a two-thirds majority vote of the board of officers” and
  - “Members of the board of officers who are serving ex officio as divisional officers can be removed with cause in accordance with the bylaws and policies of the relevant division. The board of officers may recommend that a division act to remove one of its officers for cause by a two-thirds majority vote of the board of officers.”

**Discussion:** Ferrer said that the simplest approach is adding the following to the bylaws [repeated from above]:
  - “The executive committee shall fill vacancies to any office of the division in cases in which the officer becomes unwilling or unable to serve before the completion of the officer’s term” and
  - “Members of the executive committee can be removed with cause by a two-thirds majority vote of the executive committee” or “Any elected member of the executive committee may be removed for cause by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members affiliated with the division.”

Ferrer said there are no procedures in place for when someone resigns. There also isn’t an option if a member of governance does something bad; if that happens, all we can do is to convince them to resign. Sometimes folks who are doing bad things aren’t interested in resigning, in which case we’d be stuck. Copenhaver said that if a member of governance did something bad, we don’t want to make up a policy just for that case. Ferrer said we want to design policy in good times so that we have in bad times. She thinks it’d be good to have documentation separate from than the bylaws to explain how different cases would be handled because different steps are needed if, for example, a divisional president resigns after their presidential address than if they resign after they served as president. We need something to go into the governance documents, a bylaws amendment that established how we would remove or replace an elected officer.

Copenhaver asked Ferrer if the Central and Eastern Divisions already voted to add to their bylaws. Ferrer said that the Central Division’s bylaws contain far more extensive language than that of the proposal. Neither the Central nor Eastern Division has voted: they’ve looked at the proposal, but they haven’t voted yet. She said that the XC doesn’t need to act today, but it can direct Copenhaver, Sager, and her to work on a more formal proposal once it decides what approach it wants to take. If the XC adopts the proposal or something similar to it; to make things simpler, the division can just add a provision to the bylaws and have the provision state that the specific procedures are in a separate document. Ferrer said that you don’t want to have all of your legislation in your constitution; you want it to contain only the parts it really needs to have.

Copenhaver asked Ferrer to describe the procedure to amend bylaws. Ferrer said the procedure to amend a division’s bylaws are pretty straightforward. The bylaws amendment would be proposed at the division’s executive committee meeting or its annual business
meeting. The amendment would then go before APA members who are affiliated with the Pacific Division for a vote: this would happen via email and the Pacific membership would be asked to vote via email.

Copenhaver asked the XC if they want to direct Ferrer, Sager, and her to do something more formal. Kind asked if the language in the procedures for replacing divisional officers could use different language that what’s in the proposal. The proposal uses the word “disabled.” Kind saw what that term is meant to cover and asked if the phrase “unable to serve” could replace all instances of the word “disabled” in the proposal. Copenhaver said that this was a good suggestion. Ferrer agreed with Kind’s suggestion and said that the proposal contained that language because it’s what’s in the Central Division’s bylaws. Copenhaver agreed the language should be replaced and thanked Kind for mentioning it.

Kind asked if the XC would be voting on the proposal today. Copenhaver responded that the XC wouldn’t be voting today, but they can direct Ferrer, Sager, and her to work on something more formal that would be voted on. Kind directed Ferrer, Copenhaver, and Sager to work on something more formal. Ferrer said that they’ll come back to the XC with a document of a legislative proposal of detailed procedures and a bylaws amendment proposal.

Kind brought up the proposal’s section on the removal of officers. The proposal suggests that each division add one of these provisions to its bylaws: “Members of the executive committee can be removed with cause by a two-thirds majority vote of the executive committee” or “Any elected member of the executive committee may be removed for cause by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members affiliated with the division.” Kind was interested in the difference between a two-thirds majority vote by the XC and an affirmative vote by a majority of the membership. Ferrer said that those are the two models as how someone is removed. In terms of the former model: if it’s the governing body voting, you want to make sure that the majority isn’t made up by a rogue faction and that’s why it’s by a two-thirds vote. She said that it would be helpful to know what model the XC prefers and would like to see in a proposal. Kind said she prefers, partially for expediency, a vote by the XC, but she wants there to be a high-threshold on what counts as a majority. Copenhaver agreed with Kind, saying that this sounds right to her.

12. DISCUSSION OF TIME BLOCK STRUCTURE: Copenhaver said the Eastern and Central Divisions recently altered their daily meeting structure in terms of time blocks. The Pacific Division divisional program is from 9 AM to 6 PM and the group program is 6 PM to 10 PM. Our divisional program has the same time blocks every day [in this order]: a 3-hour block, a 1-hour break, a 3-hour block, and a 2-hour block. Copenhaver doesn’t know exactly what time blocks the Eastern and Central Divisions switched to, but she knows that they now use almost all 2-hour blocks with only a handful of 3-hour blocks.

Ferrer said that the other divisions generally use this schedule now: 9 AM to 11 AM block; 11 AM to 1 PM block; 1-hour lunch, 2 PM to 4 PM block; 4 PM to 6 PM block; 1-hour dinner; and then the evening has one 2-hour block. The way they now do 3-hour sessions is that participants can opt for their session to go into the lunch break or one hour later into
the evening. The Eastern and Central Divisions now have far fewer 3-hour sessions than they historically had and the Pacific Division currently has.

Copenhaver summarized some advantages and disadvantages of changing the division’s time block structure to have more 2-hour sessions. One advantage is that it would allow us to have more sessions. Another advantage is that it would create more commonality between the three divisions and where we can achieve more commonality, all things being equal, we try to do so because we think that’s good for the membership. A disadvantage is that in Copenhaver’s experience, people really want to have 3-hour sessions—for book symposia. Another disadvantage is that we’d lose a feature that distinguishes the Pacific meeting and makes it particularly attractive to people. Since the Eastern and Central Divisions now mostly have two-hours sessions, having mostly 3-hour blocks makes us standout and is a point of attraction. Copenhaver has no opinion as to what we should do. She thinks the XC should discuss the matter—though it doesn’t have to make any decisions today.

Mendoza asked what percentage of Pacific 2024 sessions are 2-hour sessions and what percentage are 3-hour sessions. Ferrer, Copenhaver, and Mendoza did the math together aloud. The ratio of 3-hour sessions to 2-hour sessions is 2:1. Mendoza called that ratio significant.

Jennings said she liked the reasoning to have Pacific sessions be more like the other divisions’ sessions. At this meeting, she has noticed a lot of people getting up to stand at the end of a session because they were uncomfortable. Mendoza also noticed this. Jennings said that shorter sessions could make the Pacific meeting more inclusive because we could maybe have more book symposia and more books covered by book symposia. She’d be in favor or reducing the number of sessions unless people have other suggestions. While Jennings loves being in a 3-hour session, she thinks that making them rarer could make them more special.

Gilbert asked if book symposia are the only 3-hour sessions. Copenhaver answered that they aren’t because there are also 3-hour invited symposia. Sager said he liked the Eastern and Central Divisions’ time block model. He thinks that if you could have the option for a 3-hour session but you had to request it, you’d probably be more mindful of how you use that time. He doesn’t think anyone really said to him as Program Chair that they really wanted to have a 3-hour session at Pacific 2024.

Ferrer said that the Eastern and Central Divisions’ new structure means that when you put colloquia together, you bundle two of them instead of three. However, people tend to treat the talks in a colloquium session as 1-hour sessions that they drop in and out of anyway. Ferrer said that you increase the number of sessions at a meeting by making panels that previously took 3 hours instead take 2 hours (as opposed to changing the 3-hour sessions that are built on individual papers).

Gilbert said that 3-hour sessions are incredibly long. They have so many speakers and with all due respect, she thinks there are too many speakers in a 3-hour session before the session gets to the Q&A. She suggested a revamp, where there is less time for the first speaker and commentators to present and more time for the Q&A. Copenhaver said that we encourage
as strongly as possible for people to leave the audience with as much time as possible to have a discussion, but that encouragement hasn’t made much of a dent. Gilbert said there may be too many people in a session because sometimes a book symposium will have as presenters the book’s author and four commentators.

Copenhaver said that if the division were to make this change, it would take planning in a different direction for the Program Committee. The PC will have to be mindful not to overload their sessions because they’ll find themselves in trouble if they do. She said she heard a lot of points in favor of moving to the Eastern and Central Divisions’ model.

Kind won’t argue in favor of keeping 3-hour sessions, but she isn’t persuaded by the conformity argument and she wants that on the record. She thinks while there should be conformity in regards to bylaws, there’s no special reason for us to have the same meeting structure as the other divisions. She thinks people expect the Pacific meeting to have 3-hour blocks and that’s why they don’t ask for it. Kind doesn’t take the lack of people asking for 3-hour blocks as strong evidence that people don’t want them. She thinks that if we go to mostly 2-hour blocks, it could be useful to give the Program Committee a model of what a 2-hour session would look like, (e.g., 3 speakers and a commentator, a specific timetable) because it’d be a change for a lot of people. Sager takes it as evidence that as Program Chair, he didn’t get a lot of emails from people who were angry about being put into 2-hour blocks. Ferrer said Kind is correct about the conformity argument: it doesn’t make much of a difference to be closer to the Eastern and Central Divisions here. But a big reason the other divisions moved to this structure is that it allows for a 1-hour lunch break and a 1-hour dinner break, which people requested. That consideration is useful. Ferrer said the reason to discuss whether the Pacific Division changes meeting structure is the same as the reasons for the other divisions considering it, even if the outcome isn’t the same.

Sager said there’s an interesting discussion to be had with the online conference [Pacific 2026 will be a virtual meeting as part of the 2+1 experiment]. He doesn’t want to imagine spending 3 hours on a Zoom call for a session. Copenhaver replied that isn’t going to happen. Sager said he didn’t even know if 2 hours is the right amount of time for a virtual session. Copenhaver said she doesn’t think that should happen either. Sager said we should look into how to structure an online event.

Mendoza said that when it comes to a 3-hour colloquium session—i.e., when there are 3 speakers who each have their own commentator—he notoriously jumps around between sessions to see one speaker-commentator pair in multiple sessions. So, maybe it’d be even better to have one day with all 1-hour time blocks.

Copenhaver personally, and not as Secretary-Treasurer, likes to think of the differences between the divisions as opportunities for innovation. If we go to mostly 2-hour sessions, it might give us more flexibility to mix session blocks between the divisional and group programs. She isn’t advocating for this, but it’s something to think about. She can tell the XC that the group program absolutely fills up every room that we have for group sessions; there is never an extra room. Sometimes we have to put group sessions in the room the XC meeting is in and it’s the smallest room we have. The divisional program doesn’t take up every room. Granted, every hotel is different: in San Francisco, we take up every room no
matter what because it’s the smallest property. Copenhaver highlighted here that the group program has fewer blocks available to them than the divisional program and as a result, they take up everything we offer them. The group program is an important source of diversity and attendees: it’s definitely part of what makes us a generalist conference and it’s a really important part of the overall meeting program. Affiliated groups aren’t super happy about being relegated to having sessions between 6 PM and 10 PM. Jennings asked if mixing blocks between the divisional and group programs would make scheduling more difficult. Copenhaver said that it wouldn’t. Ferrer said that it isn’t an issue if you put a group session in an earlier time block that’s dedicated as a group time block; it can be managed pretty effectively. Copenhaver thanked the XC for the discussion and said that they can think about something like this for the future.

13. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (Copenhaver): Except for the past president, Copenhaver chooses every member of the nominating committee from a list of suggestions created and approved by the XC. Members of the nominating committee serve a two-year term. It used to be a one-year term, but that meant it was a lot of reinventing the wheel. Now, we always have one person who has been on the committee for a year already. This year, Nico Orlandi was in the second year of their term and will now be rotating off. Next year, Mark Timmons will be in the second year of his term.

Copenhaver chooses the nominating committee members in order to prioritize several dimensions of diversity: we want diversity in terms of field and institution, as well as gender, orientation, ethnicity, and race. This is one way that we differ from the Eastern and Central Divisions: for things like this and the XC, we have privileged our diversity goals in such a way that the other divisions vote whereas we select. We select because we don’t want to risk certain things being the result of a popularity contest and it allows us to more easily work towards our diversity goals.

Copenhaver never weighs in on the nominating committee’s decisions. She’s just there to help them navigate situations.

The XC approved a list of candidates for the nominating committee. XC members were encouraged to send Copenhaver/all XC members additional names via email.

ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM BUSINESS

14. REPORT OF THE PROGRAM CHAIR (Sager): Sager said he enjoyed chairing. He thanked Medeiros for all she does to make the meeting possible. It was a pleasure to work with Copenhaver, Medeiros, and the Program Committee. We had a really wonderful Program Committee this year.

Statistics: We got 517 submissions, which is about 60 more than last year. We accepted 20% of colloquium paper submissions and 8% of symposium paper submissions. Mendoza asked if 8% is a normal acceptance rate for symposia. Copenhaver said these are typical numbers. Sager said we had 190 divisional sessions with 655 participants. He was disappointed to hear about the hotel numbers and he hopes that this is what we were aiming for this year. Copenhaver assured him it was.
**Bright Spots and Challenges:** Sager is pleased about the level of representation on the program. We had more philosophy of race sessions this year and pretty good representation of Latinx philosophy. We also had sessions on Chinese and Buddhist philosophy. Mendoza organized a bilingual session on violence/violencia, which was great. Sager hopes that we continue to have bilingual sessions—perhaps we could have a French or Portuguese session one day. We also had AI and data sessions. The Program Committee Members (PCMs) put together a host of sessions about emerging issues. Sager is excited that a lot of the program reflects many of the changes that have happened in the last 20 years. Sager himself put together a session on philosophy of incarceration. We also had a lot of pedagogy and meta-philosophy sessions, which Sager thinks is very needed.

The only thing that Sager was disappointed in is that we didn’t have a lot of continental representation on the program. Copenhaver said that this is usually the case. Sager said we need another PCM who specializes in continental philosophy. He also noted that we don’t get a lot of continental philosophy submissions and we should try to get more of them. He wasn’t sure if this is because of continental philosophy has its own major conference through the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy (SPEP). Copenhaver explained that the Philosophy of Science Association and SPEP affect the submissions we get a certain amount, but that’s not always why we have lower numbers of philosophy of science and continental philosophy submissions. If we get a lot of papers in, say continental philosophy one year, then the next year we get another PCM in that area to review submissions and that PCM plans more sessions in that area. So, the way to get more continental philosophy or philosophy of science paper submissions is to emphasize colloquium submission deadlines to people who work in those areas. If, say, more people submit continental papers one year, then then we make sure to get another continental PCM the next year. That PCM then plans invited sessions on continental philosophy, which increases representation on the program. From there, more people will submit continental papers because of the invited sessions. This is another place for XC members to be an ambassador: tell people who work in underrepresented areas of philosophy about the colloquium paper submission deadlines and encourage them to submit. Sager said he thinks that philosophy of science was better represented on the program than continental philosophy. Copenhaver agreed. Sager said that we also didn’t get a lot of submissions on 17th and 18th century philosophy, so we need someone on the PC for that area.

The XC congratulated Sager on a great program and thanked him for his work.

15. **APPOINTMENTS TO THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE (XC Committee):** Copenhaver assembled names for the Program Committee. She also thanked the members of the Program Committee for their service.

16. **PROGRAM CHAIR APPOINTMENTS (XC Committee):** The XC recommended a list of names for possible future Chair of the Program Committee. Ariela Tubert was welcomed as the Program Chair for 2025.

17. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA OF THE ABM (XC Committee):** The Annual Business Meeting agenda was approved.
18. ANY OTHER BUSINESS: Gilbert said she read through the list of members who passed away in the last year in preparation for the Presidential Address. She asked if the list could be read at an event that more people attend. Copenhaver said it could be read at the Prize Reception. Ferrer said that we’ve talked about doing that. Gilbert and Ferrer agreed that while the Prize Reception is open to everyone, most people don’t attend. Copenhaver said we can do that as long as Gilbert is willing to attend the Prize Reception to read the list. Kind suggested that names be read twice: at the Presidential Address and at the Prize Reception. Gilbert said she’d love to do that, but she didn’t want this to just be decided to her. Copenhaver agreed with Gilbert and Kind. She said this is the start of a new tradition. The XC discussed when the names would be read at the Prize Reception and they determined that Gilbert will read them at the start of the Prize Reception because it’d be too noisy later in the reception. Ferrer said she thinks it’s nice to honor people in this way.

Kind encouraged the XC to make a donation the APA as part of the capital campaign. She said that they’re all on the XC because they believe in the APA, but money talks. Copenhaver thanked Kind for making this point. She said it’s symbolically important when we can say that every Board and every XC member has donated something; with a capital campaign, it gives people more confidence to donate.

Kind mentioned that donors can specify how the APA uses their donation rather than donating to the general fund. Copenhaver added that it’s possible to donate to the APA in honor of someone. Sager said sometimes people don’t like to donate unrestricted to a general fund. Ferrer gave examples of how people can direct the APA to use their donation. One example is that they can donate to the Meeting Assistance Fund [https://www.apaonline.org/page/assistancefund], which was created during the COVID-19 pandemic. It initially covered virtual registration fees for the 2021 meetings and now provides limited travel assistance. There’s also the Assistance Fund for Philosophers of Color [https://www.apaonline.org/page/travelfund], which was created when a prize winner donated their prize back to launch the fund. We completely used that fund this year and can’t make any more grants from it until we get more donations. In past years, Ferrer was able to give about 10 grants per meeting from the Meeting Assistance Fund. This year it was 3-4 per meeting because we don’t have money in that fund. The QR code displayed around the meeting takes you to the general fund page, but the first question allows you to specify if you want to donate to the general fund or a specific fund.

19. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM.
1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting came to order at 12:01 PM.

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The American Philosophical Association acknowledges and pays respect to the Indigenous people upon whose ancestral lands this conference is being held. We recognize that the rights of Native and Indigenous people and nations have been and continue to be denied and violated, and we honor with gratitude the land itself and the people who have stewarded it throughout the generations.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: The agenda was adopted.

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES: The minutes were adopted as published on the APA website.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES: No matters arising from the minutes.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS (Gilbert): The names of APA members who had passed away since the last meeting were read and a moment of silence was observed.

7. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (Copenhaver): Debra Satz (chair), Mark Timmons, Nico Orlandi, and Rebecca Copenhaver (ex officio) served as the 2023–24 nominating committee. The committee nominates the following for terms beginning July 1, 2024: John Carriero for vice president, Adrienne Martin for member-at-large, and Alexander Sager for secretary-treasurer.

   The nominating committee’s nominations were approved.

8. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER (Copenhaver): The Secretary-Treasurer summarized her remarks from the meeting of the Executive Committee. (See XC minutes.)

9. REPORT OF THE PACIFIC DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Sager): The Chair of the Executive Committee summarized the actions of the Committee. (See XC minutes.)

10. REPORT OF THE APA BOARD OF OFFICERS (Ferrer, Morrissey): Ferrer and Morrissey summarized their report to the Executive Committee. (See XC minutes.)

11. DISCUSSION OF BYLAWS AMENDMENTS (Copenhaver, Ferrer): Copenhaver and Ferrer summarized the discussion from the Executive Committee meeting about amending
the divisions’ bylaws and APA bylaws to include a provision about replacing executive officers. (See XC minutes.)

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS: There was no other business.

13. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned by 12:50 PM.