League of Women Voters of the United States 1730 M Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036 Tel. (202) 296-1770

memorandum

JAN 3 0 1978

January 1978
This is going on DPM.

TO: Local and State League and ILO Presidents

FROM: Gina Rieke, Chair, Endangered Species Committee

As this is the time that your boards are considering LWVUS Bylaw proposals, the Endangered Species Committee feels that you should know what recommendations we will be making.

BYLAWS PROPOSALS DEALING WITH PROGRAM LIMITATION

We have spent a great deal of time discussing methods of limiting program and have come up with the following alternative proposals. We will not be recommending the the adoption of any of them, but will propose them for inclusion in Convention consideration because so many responses to the ESC questionnaire were favorable to imposing this type of restriction.

All proposals require a change in percentage for the adoption of recommended and/or not recommended program subjects from a simple majority, as stated in current national bylaws, to a 3/5ths, 2/3rds or 3/4ths majority. An additional option is included for delaying implementation until 1980 as the committee felt Leagues should be warned well in advance of any such basic changes in the program selection process.

Variations on the core proposal would fall within the following framework: "Adoption of a recommended [and/or not recommended] program subject requires a [3/5ths, 2/3rds, 3/4ths] vote. [This proposal will not take effect until Convention 1980]."

Some of the E.S. Committee members felt strongly that these kinds of proposals would allow the minority of delegates to rule the organization; hence, we had no consensus on any of them. The alternatives will be submitted to the National Bylaws Committee and be reviewed by the national board like all those sent in by local and state Leagues. They will not be proposed on the floor through any formal action of the E.S. Committee, but will be available for delegate use.

PROGRAM LIMITATION: Sunset Laws

While the Sunset philosophy also received a large measure of support on the questionnaire returned by the Leagues, the E.S. Committee was unable to come to an agreement on defining the phrase "concerted study and action" (See Article XIII, Sec. 1). In addition, we agreed that the League already uses the Sunset philosophy when we readopt program items at every Biennial Convention.

We want to stress to you our conviction that the best way to implement an effective Sunset philosophy is through self-disciplined action by delegates at national convention. If limiting program is our goal, delegates must refrain from adopting new program and must make thoughtful decisions in regard to retaining or dropping current program.

In short, the E.S. Committee will not be proposing language for Bylaws concerning the Sunset philosophy.

Another area receiving strong support from the Leagues was the concept of requiring local Leagues to participate in at least one program item for each level of the League or one item which covers all levels. After much discussion, we decided that this would best be covered by amending "Standards for Local Leagues" (In League, p. 7) rather than through Bylaw proposals. We will recommend to the national board that the following language be included as a second item under Program: "Schedules activities on local, regional, state and national program."

The Endangered Species Committee's findings will be present to the January national board meeting and we will be making our formal report, as instructed, to the 1978 Convention. Some of our suggestions have already been implemented by the LWVUS such as the much shortened, easier to handle Annual Report Forms. Other suggestions will include new management tools, suggested activities for state Leagues, etc.

We are grateful for the magnificent cooperation we have had from you, our busy League leaders and from the national board and staff.

LWV of Texas
March 18, 1977
State Board

TO: State Board
FROM: Betty Anderson
RE: Compilation of Alternatives (Endangered Species)

I thought you would be interested in the results of the state board polling on the Endangered Species questionnaire.

Question No.		
	I. ON THE PURPOSE OF LWV	
1	The 17 responding unanimously agreed on continuing with our dual purpose of CI/VS and action on issues.	
	We unanimously disagreed that:	
2	. we should be a VS organization only	
3	. we do only study and action	
4	. on having all decisions made by a national governing board, such as Common Cause	
5	. that we should drop specific programs issues and act only on Principles (although one thought it very tempting)	
6	. that we should disband	
	II. ON SELECTION OF PROGRAM AND LIMITING PROGRAM	
7	14 agreed, 1 disagreed, 2 no opinions	on continuing biennial program selection at Nat. Convention
10	13 agreed, 4 disagreed	on requiring 3/4 vote of delegates at Convention to adopt a non-recommended program item
9	11 agreed, 6 disagreed	on requiring 2/3 vote of delegates at Convention to adopt a recommended program item
11	9 agreed, 7 disagreed, 1 no opinion	on dropping a program item automatically after 6 yrs. if . . .
8	8 agreed, 7 disagreed, 2 no opinion	on limiting study to one new program study item per biennium
13	7 agreed, 6 disagreed, 4 no opinion	on dropping at least part of an item from the nat. program at the next nat. Conv.
12	3 agreed, 9 disagreed, 3 no opinion	on dropping at least one complete item from the national program at next nat. Conv.
	III. ON MEMBER AGREEMENT	
20	16 agreed, 1 no opinion	on allowing concurrence with other Leagues consensus
23	15 agreed, 2 disagreed	on requiring a LL to participate in at least one program item. .
14	14 agreed, 2 disagreed	on continuing present study/discussion-based consensus
16	14 agreed 2 no opinion	on continuing present use of concurrence procedures
17	14 agreed, 2 disagreed	on allowing consensus by resource committee with member concurrence
	17 disagreed	on allowing consensus by resource committee without member con-

Question No. III. ON MEMBER AGREEMENT (CONT'D.)

19	11 agreed, 2 disagreed, 1 no opinion	on allowing regional consensus with LL concurrence
	1 agreed, 14 disagreed	on allowing regional consensus without LL concurrence
18	8 agreed, 8 disagreed	on allowing consensus by boards with member concurrence
	1 agreed, 15 disagreed	on allowing consensus by boards without member concurrence
21	5 agreed, 10 disagreed, 1 no opinion	on choosing a statistcially valid cross section of Leagues to study and reach concsensus on an item for other Leagues' concurrence
22	3 agreed, 13 disagreed, 1 no opin.	on requiring a minimum of one yr. active participation by each new League member
15	1 agreed, 15 disagreed, 1 no opin.	on allowing <u>only</u> study/discussion-based consensus

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

"Every member materials such as F&I's should be greatly condensed (e.g., one sheet, both sides, similar to the national series on Energy). Leaders Guides can contain much more of the study material. This would decrease costs and encourage reading among members. Most of our in-depth studies are wasted on members who never read them.

Statements #4 & 6 were probably the most important statements, and yet their wording prohibited real discussion. Who dares say we disband. But the "work horse" member is no longer available, we must face this and perhaps explore whether we disband or have decisions made by a national and/or state governing boards.

#11 is probably a good idea in principle, but should not be automatic. It really depends on the subject under discussion. If we want to -et back to being ahead of the rest of the studies, six years is too soon to judge. However, membership turnover would require updated information via VOTER articles, etc., not restudy though.

#12 Reasons as above, but we should be realistic,perhaps present"options for dropping" then vote on weighted scale.

#13 Some sections are less important than others, but here again, not all Leagues act on the same segments (Vertical program).
National should give members positive options for selecting out one or more items for their League.

#12 & 13 Both questions too categorical, but I think each convention should be open-minded to either or both possibilities as events seem to warrant. We probably need to drop program items but should not be required to do so against all common sense.

#21 There is no such thing as a "statistically valid cross section" of Leagues, dogs, people, or anything else. Validity cannot be sufficiently and adequately defined, either generally or specifically.

#22 Agree only if there are two categories of membership--participating and supporting (with dues high enough to be supporting) and if the opportunities for active participation by new members are carefully structured and monitored to ensure that the experience is satisfying and rewarding for each individual.

(ENDANGERED SPECIES, ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUAL ST. BD. MEMBERS CONT'D.)

#14-21 The nature and subject of the study underway should determine how member agreement should be reached to some extent. If program material were in smaller chunks, members might not feel so much at sea in group discussion; unit meetings might not be as lengthy as they are now. Discussion-based consensus might be reserved for specifics; and concurrence used for agreement of statements of general position, formulated after a representative number of members (or Leagues) had reached consensus.

In my opinion very often when Leagues are in trouble, they are not making use of tools available, and not taking advantage of the built-in flexibility already in the basic structure of League, and are not properly trained and/or motivated.

I found this questionnaire to be pedestrian, unimaginative, and misleading. While I very much applauded the intent of the Endangered Species committee, it seems to me that this questionnaire reflected the old League habits of examining trees instead of forests. Think fresh! "

League of Women Voters of the United States 1730 M Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036 Tel. (202) 296-1770

memorandum

This is going on DPM.

August 24, 1977

TO: Local and State League Presidents (copy to ILOs)

FROM: Gina Rieke, Endangered Species Committee Chairman

RE: Questionnaire Results

Attached is a summary of replies to the questionnaire sent out by the Endangered Species Committee. 1054 local and state Leagues answered, out of a possible 1398 and we were impressed not only by the volume of response, but its thoughtfulness. As you will see from the tabulations, we basically like the League the way it is and for what it tries to accomplish. There are, however, areas where we would like to consider changes and it is to these our committee will address itself between now and national convention.

While the consensus is that League structure and procedures are sound overall, need for better management methods surfaced in comments such as "too much paper", "our leaders are weary and overworked", "we need professional staff to help take some of the pressure off the volunteers". The process for adoption and retention of national program issues was seen as another possible area for change, with an almost even division of opinion on questions 8 and 10, and question 9 showing a majority favoring a 2/3 vote of delegates to adopt a recommended issue. An additional issue demanding committee attention is the "sunset" philosophy. Here opinion was equally divided between Leagues favoring the adoption of such a concept and those feeling it is already practised through the reevaluation of each study emphasis by our delegate body at national convention. Comments related to program were revealing in their frequent mention of the need to decrease the workload and stop stretching our resources so thin. It is also interesting to note the degree of support given to the concept of concurrence (questions 16, 19, 20).

Committee deliberations have already begun by mail. Where a national bylaws change would be required to implement recommendations, we will work out suggestions for proposed changes for consideration at Convention '78 and in all cases will do our best to come up with positive recommendations. Any suggestions you may have for us are most welcome. Please send them to my home, 2998 Kohala Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah 84117.

Many thanks for a job well done. I trust that after reading the survey results you will agree that though sometimes beleaguered, our organization is far from endangered.

11. ... drop a program item automatically after 6 years if no study has been done during that time (Sunset law).
agree 707 disagree 263 no opinion 46

12. ... drop at least one complete item from the national program at next national convention.
agree 217 disagree 571 no opinion 233

13. ... drop at least part of an item from the national program at the next national convention.
agree 199 disagree 531 no opinion 231

14. ... continue present study/discussion-based consensus.
agree 991 disagree 19 no opinion 12

15. ... allow only study/discussion-based consensus.
agree 174 disagree 765 no opinion 74

16. ... continue present use of concurrence procedures.
agree 823 disagree 117 no opinion 89

17. ... allow consensus by resource committee -
- with member concurrence.
agree 542 disagree 422 no opinion 55

- without member concurrence.
agree 11 disagree 965 no opinion 22

18. ... allow consensus by boards -
- with member concurrence.
agree 384 disagree 659 no opinion 62

- without member concurrence -
agree 22 disagree 942 no opinion 16

19. ... allow regional consensus -
- with local League concurrence.
agree 682 disagree 241 no opinion 90

- without local League concurrence.
agree 13 disagree 892 no opinion 55

20. ... allow concurrence with other Leagues' consensus.
agree 718 disagree 228 no opinion 70

21. ... choose a statistically valid cross-section of Leagues to study and reach consensus on an item for other Leagues' concurrence.
agree 261 disagree 651 no opinion 99

22. ... require a minimum of one year active participation by each new League member.
agree 81 disagree 908 no opinion 53

23. ... A local League should be required to participate in at least one program item for each level of League or one program item which covers all three levels.
agree 693 disagree 252 no opinion 72

Endangered Species Committee
Final Tabulation

This is going on DPM.

ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMITTEE

Final Tabulation of Questionnaires and Activities

Summary of Responses of 1054 Leagues
(numbers are based on Leagues rather than individual members)

The League of Women Voters should . . .

1. ... continue with the dual purposes of citizen information (voters service) and action on issues.
   agree 1044 disagree 7 no opinion* 3

2. ... be a voters service organization providing citizen information only.
   agree 15 disagree 1026 no opinion 6

3. ... do only study and action.
   agree 14 disagree 1026 no opinion 5

4. ... have all decisions made by a national governing board, such as Common Cause.
   agree 9 disagree 1034 no opinion 15

5. ... drop specific program issues and act only on the Principles (In League, P.13).
   agree 15 disagree 1007 no opinion 34

6. ... disband.
   agree 5 disagree 1034 no opinion 6

7. ... continue biennial program selection at national convention.
   agree 947 disagree 36 no opinion 37

8. ... limit study to one new program study item per biennium.
   agree 434 disagree 488 no opinion 97

9. ... require 2/3 vote of delegates at convention to adopt a recommended program item (simple majority is current requirement).
   agree 560 disagree 361 no opinion 104

10. ... require 3/4 vote of delegates at convention to adopt a not recommended program item (simple majority is current requirement).
    agree 437 disagree 480 no opinion 105

* *No consensus was recorded in the "no opinion" category.*

SEP 19 1977

League of Women Voters of the United States 1730 M Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036 Tel. (202) 296-1770

memorandum

This is going on DPM.
August 24, 1977

TO: Local and State League Presidents (copy to ILOs)

FROM: Gina Rieke, Endangered Species Committee Chairman

RE: Questionnaire Results

Attached is a summary of replies to the questionnaire sent out by the Endangered Species Committee. 1054 local and state Leagues answered, out of a possible 1398 and we were impressed not only by the volume of response, but its thoughtfulness. As you will see from the tabulations, we basically like the League the way it is and for what it tries to accomplish. There are, however, areas where we would like to consider changes and it is to these our committee will address itself between now and national convention.

While the consensus is that League structure and procedures are sound overall, need for better management methods surfaced in comments such as "too much paper", "our leaders are weary and overworked", "we need professional staff to help take some of the pressure off the volunteers". The process for adoption and retention of national program issues was seen as another possible area for change, with an almost even division of opinion on questions 8 and 10, and question 9 showing a majority favoring a 2/3 vote of delegates to adopt a recommended issue. An additional issue demanding committee attention is the "sunset" philosophy. Here opinion was equally divided between Leagues favoring the adoption of such a concept and those feeling it is already practised through the reevaluation of each study emphasis by our delegate body at national convention. Comments related to program were revealing in their frequent mention of the need to decrease the workload and stop stretching our resources so thin. It is also interesting to note the degree of support given to the concept of concurrence (questions 16, 19, 20).

Committee deliberations have already begun by mail. Where a national bylaws change would be required to implement recommendations, we will work out suggestions for proposed changes for consideration at Convention '78 and in all cases will do our best to come up with positive recommendations. Any suggestions you may have for us are most welcome. Please send them to my home, 2998 Kohala Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah 84117.

Many thanks for a job well done. I trust that after reading the survey results you will agree that though sometimes beleaguered, our organization is far from endangered.

Endangered Species Committee
Final Tabulation

This is going on DPM.

ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMITTEE

Final Tabulation of Questionnaires and Activities

Summary of Responses of 1054 Leagues
(numbers are based on Leagues rather than individual members)

The League of Women Voters should . . .

1. ... continue with the dual purposes of citizen information (voters service) and action on issues.
   agree *1044* disagree *7* no opinion* *3*

2. ... be a voters service organization providing citizen information only.
   agree *15* disagree *1026* no opinion *6*

3. ... do only study and action.
   agree *14* disagree *1026* no opinion *5*

4. ... have all decisions made by a national governing board, such as Common Cause.
   agree *9* disagree *1034* no opinion *15*

5. ... drop specific program issues and act only on the Principles (In League, P.13).
   agree *15* disagree *1007* no opinion *34*

6. ... disband.
   agree *5* disagree *1034* no opinion *6*

7. ... continue biennial program selection at national convention.
   agree *947* disagree *36* no opinion *37*

8. ... limit study to one new program study item per biennium.
   agree *434* disagree *488* no opinion *97*

9. ... require 2/3 vote of delegates at convention to adopt a recommended program item (simple majority is current requirement).
   agree *560* disagree *361* no opinion *104*

10. ... require 3/4 vote of delegates at convention to adopt a not recommended program item (simple majority is current requirement).
    agree *437* disagree *480* no opinion *105*

* *No consensus was recorded in the "no opinion" category.*

11. ... drop a program item automatically after 6 years if no study has been done during that time (Sunset law).
agree 707 disagree 263 no opinion 46

12. ... drop at least one complete item from the national program at next national convention.
agree 217 disagree 571 no opinion 233

13. ... drop at least part of an item from the national program at the next national convention.
agree 199 disagree 531 no opinion 231

14. ... continue present study/discussion-based consensus.
agree 991 disagree 19 no opinion 12

15. ... allow only study/discussion-based consensus.
agree 174 disagree 765 no opinion 74

16. ... continue present use of concurrence procedures.
agree 823 disagree 117 no opinion 89

17. ... allow consensus by resource committee -
- with member concurrence.
agree 542 disagree 422 no opinion 55

- without member concurrence.
agree 11 disagree 965 no opinion 22

18. ... allow consensus by boards -
- with member concurrence.
agree 384 disagree 659 no opinion 62

- without member concurrence -
agree 22 disagree 942 no opinion 16

19. ... allow regional consensus -
- with local League concurrence.
agree 682 disagree 241 no opinion 90

- without local League concurrence.
agree 13 disagree 892 no opinion 55

20. ... allow concurrence with other Leagues' consensus.
agree 718 disagree 228 no opinion 70

21. ... choose a statistically valid cross-section of Leagues to study and reach consensus on an item for other Leagues' concurrence.
agree 261 disagree 651 no opinion 99

22. ... require a minimum of one year active participation by each new League member.
agree 81 disagree 908 no opinion 53

23. ... A local League should be required to participate in at least one program item for each level of League or one program item which covers all three levels.
agree 693 disagree 252 no opinion 72