



SSO:USA BOARD MEETING MINUTES 09.12.18

Board Members Present: Sheama Krishnagiri (SK); Esther Huecker (EH); John White (JW); Tina McNulty (TM); Moses Ikiugu (MI), Beth DeGrace (BD), Elizabeth Francis-Connolly (BF); Doris Pierce (DP), Kate Barrett (KB); Lynne Anderson (LA)

Meeting started: 8:00 AM pst

Issue	Discussion	Action
-------	------------	--------

1. Approval of Minutes (BD)	Beth asked for approval of the minutes. SK asked BW to look up item on page 3 of the minutes that was followed by “?”. Minutes approved pending change on remarks related to ?? on page 3.	Beth to look up item on page 3 of the minutes that was followed by “?”.
2. Treasurer Report (EH)	Treasurer (EH) sent out updated monthly financial documents for both Oct and Nov on the Nov 30 th meeting, hence no new monthly reports at this time. The Board was sent 2 financial working documents. These working documents will not go into the minutes. Board members are asked to look at line items for input into the budget..	Board is asked to respond on anything that they would like to include on next years budget by January 8 th via email to Esther.
3. Legal (LA)	<p>Legal: Lynne Anderson representative for MI presented legal committee’s monthly report</p> <p>No feedback was provided from the board on the legal committees monthly report.</p> <p>SK asked if the representative would have the right to vote, given they are selected to fulfill the responsibilities of the chair. EH: Representative can share information with Board , have been through this before, but not permitted to vote.</p>	Lynne will take this back to the committee for discussion.
4. Institute Action Item (SK)	<p>SK: One of the research subcommittees has been working on the institute, a summary of the process and budget has been forwarded to the board. Sheama has asked for questions and feedback.</p> <p>DP: In the past the Research Committee has worked closely with the Institute subcommittee. DP had to step back this year because her team has</p>	

	<p>submitted to present at the institute. DP mentioned that of the 4 applications for the institute all were accepted. The Institute Subcommittee added a paid facilitator/convener, which was not expected by Doris. This shortens the presentation time and adds to the overall cost of the institute. At this point, DP asked the Board to give the subcommittee feedback specifically regarding amount of honorarium and the number of presentations chosen. Should they have 3, as originally charged, or 4.</p> <p>BF: Liked all the different presentations. Looked really interesting and gave a broad perspective of multi-site studies. Most of her questions have to do with the budget. Don't know what the 41 dollar expense for each speaker.</p> <p>EH : It is a draft budget that she assisted with. They needed numbers for a budget. Any cost will be shared with the Canadians. They had a conference call regarding what is the bottom line cost., it would be approximately \$41 per person for facility and lunch. Included in the budget are speaker expenses for lunch, multiplied by 5.</p> <p>BF: What would be an appropriate honorarium? Do they have their conference paid for as well?</p> <p>EH: People can come for the institute without registering for conference. In the past we had not paid conference fee. It was not budgeted in this preliminary budget. Only budgeted to cover the institute fee.</p> <p>SK: We have had 4 different institutes. Do we need to get a convener and add the cost of paying for that person as well.</p> <p>EH: I appreciate that they put in the document that this person has experience as a convener. Whether they should receive the same honorarium as everyone else is still unclear.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>BF: Looks like there are multiple people presenting, how are the 5 honorariums divided?</p> <p>EH: Needs to be 1 honorarium per group.</p> <p>KB: Is the \$41 per speaker?</p> <p>SK: Watching the budget because of the high overhead this time. Assuming that the 4 groups have enough experience</p> <p>EH: These are the number from, option B, the cautious budget. The registration cost would be \$80, this past year it was \$75. Whoever is a part of this gets lunch, rather than just snack and amenities are available throughout the afternoon. As somebody coming to the conference, for \$5 getting a lunch seems reasonable. I used the \$350 because that was the feedback I was getting from the group as a suggested price. If people feel we want to go with a different honorarium, we would have to go with a different budget</p> <p>John: One of the ways we could think about that, is to turn this back to the research committee. The amount budgeted was based upon 3 presenters. The honorarium remains the same, but is now divided by 4 groups. This keeps the budget under control. Same for the convener, since they were not considered it will also come from that original allotted amount. What I know about Ellen's work, will probably have additional insight and enrichment that we might not be able to pull from the membership from the research committee alone.</p> <p>EH: Not that we budgeted for a certain amount, not like we had a budget. The recommendation was that they were to select 3 people.</p> <p>BF: How much does the Ruth Z. lecture get?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>WH: Travel, lodging, registration, \$1000 and a kaleidoscope</p> <p>KB: The 54 expected registrations sounds low. There is an attraction here that so many people would likely attend.</p> <p>BF: The room only allows for 60 members.</p> <p>TM: Comment about number of presenting teams. One of the things that I like others is to have depth, and with 4 teams the depth may be diluted. As a researcher I would be more in favor having 3 teams presenting and preserve the depth from the institute.</p> <p>DP: Last year the honorarium for Dr. Creswell was \$1500. Dr. Creswell also had flight, 2 night lodging and food covered. The thing about the budget, the honorarium is important in enabling teams to present, specifically international presenters.</p> <p>EH: I think we also need to think about the huge honorarium for Dr. Creswell. How much income to offset this. Dr. Creswell did a whole 4 hours. This would be portion of what he did.</p> <p>DP: Dr. Creswell cost \$3000. Divide this by 3 teams and this is different than the \$350 proposed.</p> <p>EH: I was asked to look at 4 teams and a convener.</p> <p>SK: Can we go with the total that was spent on Dr. Creswell. We can go with John's suggestion and tell the research committee you have this money. Mention to the committee that we are interested in more depth vs. breadth.</p> <p>EH: We had \$4000 in expenses for last year which is similar to this year.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>BF: Last year was the first year we had an honorarium.</p> <p>EH: Gave honorarium to 4 or 5 people at \$200.</p> <p>DP: Little higher cost to have Dr. Creswell, but it worked out well. What is the model for the institute that works remains unclear, but the philosophy of the committee is that we need to be responsive to the research needs of the society.</p> <p>SK: Can we suggest to the committee: 3 presenters to get the depth, plus a convener to get a little less money, give them the total budget of \$2000 for honorarium and speaker expenses. We would like to keep to the same cost as last year. Suggest that they decide how to divide.</p> <p>DP: Do they need board approval for one of the speakers.</p> <p>JW: Question for the research committee, seems we are going to have a larger pool to draw from. What we are expecting in terms of numbers, we could have more interest than the capacity of the room which may have budget implications. The conference committee may need to consider shifting the venue to make it available to a larger number of people.</p> <p>EH: It has to do with a contract with the facility and costs related to changing a contract. We are going to have to put a limit on registration.</p> <p>TM: I do have the same concern, similar concern, think the institute is highly valued by members and some members may consider not attending if they cannot get into the institute.</p> <p>DP: Can we give some feedback to the research committee and the joint committee. I think that would be fine having the joint committee decide</p>	<p>SK will communicate the decision with the research subcommittee. BF will discuss with conference committee.</p>
--	---	--

<p>5. Motion (DP)</p>	<p>venue. If venue changes, costs change.</p> <p>DP: Motion for discussion for research/theoretical papers: Motion is in document on Page 3 of the research committee report(see attached), number IIB.</p> <p>Motion: Discussion time following each research and theoretical paper presented at the 2010 CSOS/SSO meeting will be no less than 15 minutes in length, not including time to transition between sessions.</p> <p>John: I support the general intent of this motion. My concern is that there are some papers where there could be a 6 hour discussion; others papers can end in 15 minutes. Need to build in a structure to ensure the presenter gets the chance to stimulate the discussion that helps him/her to move forward. For example, in the presentation does the presenter need to have 2 provocative questions for the audience for review?</p> <p>SK: Previously had a question that needed this addressed on the abstracts but is now lost. I do not mind putting something like this back in and come in already for questions ready for discussion.</p> <p>KB: I like the idea of having that in the proposal. My concern is that presenters will go on into the discussion time. Be real intentional that there is a limited time to present and a designated time for questions.</p> <p>BF: Would like to remind everyone that the call for abstracts has already been sent out, and some have been received. This is a joint conference and we can send friendly ideas, but cannot dictate at a joint conference.</p> <p>DP: One of the struggles the board has had, is the relationship between the</p>	
-----------------------	--	--

board and the conference committee. Independence or separate. Last year the conference committee suggested that papers be reduced to 10 minutes, the board did not support and it happened anyway. So if the board is concerned and suggestions did not work in the past to the conference committee, which is why we are at a motion this year. We need to get control over the discussion time/ questions.

EH: If we support this motion, it would have to be enacted after 2010. Trust the conference committee this year.

EH: I would like to amend that the motion will take place in 2011. That it will be a strong recommendation for the 2010 conference.

John seconded.

SK: This information has been sent out in the past with confirmation of presentation.

KB: This would have to be discussed with Canadians

BF: Almost like 12 minutes presentation, 12 minutes discussion, with 5 minutes between rooms. I think the Canadians are easy to work with and open to suggestions and I think that conference committee is committed.

KB: I can only think of 1 presentation where the presenter went over without communicating. Moderator for the room keeps time and has moderation skills, keeps a list of questions.

DP: Will speak against the amendment to postpone the amendment to change the wording from WILL BE to SHOULD BE no less.

BF: Can put this in the conference committee's things to consider, but to get

	<p>into the minutia is not appropriate.</p> <p>EH: Withdrew her amendment. John withdrew his second.</p> <p>DP: Proposed changes to the amendment: Discussion time following each research and theoretical paper presented at the 2010 CSOS/SSO meeting SHOULD be no less than 15 minutes in length, not including time to transition between sessions.</p> <p>John seconded.</p> <p>Discussion: JW: It becomes uncomfortable to both room monitor and speaker when the speaker does not stop speaking. Is there some way to give feedback to the speaker, that this was problematic in your presentation.</p> <p>It is relevant for the board to provide those guidelines.</p> <p>DP: What might simplify this is that the research committee only meant the scheduled time. We are talking about the program. Leave it to the conference committee to work out the fine points about what to do when speakers do not comply.</p> <p>SK: The variability at each of the recent conferences has caused some of this issue, to have this expectation remain steady over time will help the expectations to become known / expected..</p> <p>BF: I appreciate this.</p> <p>EH: The motion should say this is an expectation for our society.</p> <p>DP: Point of order. Are we about to vote on the word change from will to should. Discussion is out of order.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>6. Conference Committee (BF)</p>	<p>EH: Call for the question on the amendment:</p> <p>Betsy abstains from the vote. Everyone else in favor.</p> <p>BF abstained because she does not feel it changes the motion that much. Feels like it is still dictating to joint committee.</p> <p>All in favor of the motion: EH, JW, DP, BW, KB, TW Against the motion: BF</p> <p>Motion passed.</p> <p>BF: Kim sent recommendations from the conference committee from last year. She had a list of suggestions. So I will be taking any questions that people have.</p> <p>SK: Kim had sent in the suggestions from the conference committee, Simultaneously a minority report was sent in. There was also an abstract review subcommittee report that was sent in.</p> <p>DP: I spent some time thinking about this, simplest way is to put this on the list of bylaw changes that we are cumulating, that we strike the word 'that the conference committee selects or reviews'. Then we would not have to get into a new standing committee. Let the ad hoc committee function. Responsive to the idea that Dr. Kennedy separates the makeup of the program from the abstract review process, trying to keep it more sequestered. Allow us to operate with the separate Ad Hoc review committee.</p> <p>Kennedy indicates in her report that, line 333 in the bylaws, shall judge the</p>	
-------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>selection of papers.</p> <p>DP: I agree with the recommendations and the bylaw change.</p> <p>SK: The ad hoc committee that was formed on the abstract review process last year worked on the criteria for selection, composition of committee and SOP's. In it, the board selected a coordinator for the selection and review, that person ran through the procedures, the conference committee worked with them but the question at hand from Kim's suggestions is should the abstract review be separate or one.</p> <p>BF: As well, as who selects the person. Does that come from conference committee or from the Board?</p> <p>SK: The board had approved this person.</p> <p>DP: Here is a motion to the Board. The Board puts to the membership for a bylaw change that removes the responsibility of paper review from the conference committee. Striking of the language of line 333 in the Bylaws.</p> <p>SK: Seconds.</p> <p>DP: Provide rationale for the motion: we worked very hard to ensure fidelity and confidentiality of the abstract review process to address complaints about the process. Board Appointment of a person with a good knowledge base to chair that committee and he/she operates with a SOP.</p> <p>Conference committee stated after several months that we put something in place that violated the bylaws. The Board amended its wording. That is how it was handled last year due to the conflict with the bylaws. We can harvest all of the work we did to improve how we manage the conference review process by taking out the responsibility for the review of the abstracts</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>considering all of the other responsibilities with conference logistics. The Conference Committee is asking that it goes back to paper selection and make up the program.</p> <p>BF: Paper selection process was separate and worked in collaboration with the conference program chair.</p> <p>JW: Trying to create as much consistency from year to year with the process. Build a cadre or reviewers with experience with the process, it has relative consistency. Has consistency been an issue? Seems that we may need a separate group to review the abstracts but yet has close communication with the conference committee.</p> <p>BF: As being the abstract review chair and a conference chair in another year: The abstract review chair has been a person quite well respected within the profession and society, impressive and work very hard. I do not know if that speaks to what you were commenting on John.</p> <p>JW: I was speaking to the process to provide the consistency, a rotating flow of reviewers so that we do not burn out our best reviewers. Not necessarily about the quality.</p> <p>SK: Reminded everyone about Bonnie's comment in her report about growing the society and increasing rigor of scientific review. Separating the process makes it more transparent as well.</p> <p>DP: There is a lot of hesitancy to list the problems that resulted in the creation of the SOP. I feel the hesitancy, so I am not going to respond to what the problems were. They were very serious problems. Board should be responsive without hearing the dirty laundry. Protecting ourselves with conflict of interest that may occur and maintaining fidelity.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>These are growing pains that we are going through and to say go back to the way we used to do it, is not acceptable nor is it representative of growth.</p> <p>MI: I don't know the background, but I have a copy of the Bylaws and am curious of the history. Is the issue that the conference committee is incapable of objectiveness?</p> <p>SK: This is one of the reasons this came up three years ago.</p> <p>BF: The abstract review committee has always independently reviewed the abstracts, blind review.</p> <p>DP: What is the pro for keeping it in the conference committee</p> <p>BF: The abstract review coordinator has to work closely with the conference committee in terms of the timeline, the call for abstracts out, coordinating how many spots we have in terms of the conference program.</p> <p>KB: Seems like what this change would do, to more clearly explain what is currently happening but to make it more transparent. This person will always remain in close contact with the conference committee.</p> <p>BF: This must be explicit.</p> <p>DP: If this passes at the board level, the makeup of the program should not be a responsibility of the reviewer but that of the conference committee. I would like to see the reviewer rank the papers and that is where their responsibilities end.</p> <p>SK: Make-up of program would be removed from abstract review to the conference committee if motion passes.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>MI: Issue a structure and what are the guidelines and transparency. What is needed is more detailed guidelines, but who should develop those.</p> <p>SK: The Ad Hoc committee did develop these guidelines. If you look at the SOP that was developed for this review committee there are many developed procedures.</p> <p>DP: As the person who put this motion on the floor, can we put the question to vote:</p> <p>Vote: Put onto the bylaw changes for the year: removal of the phrase “judging the selection of papers” in line 336 of the Bylaws . BF, MI, JW abstains DP, SK, KB, BW, TM approve</p> <p>Motion passed</p> <p>SK: Last year Polly agreed to the abstract review coordinator who has been appointed at this point for the upcoming joint conference.</p> <p>Will discuss the rest of the issues from the conference committee and the SOP;s at the next meeting. Tina will need to consider someone for the next committee.</p> <p>DP: Request that the conference committee respond to motion just approved and indicate changes of responsibility for paper review in the SOP’s.</p> <p>BF: Has a joint conference committee, so this would not be appropriate to be addressed. Yet, could work with SSO people to put this forward. SK is willing to review.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>SK: If you have not turned in the spring availability form, please send in to Sheama asap.</p>	
--	---	--

Secondly, you owe suggestions to Bonnie Kennedy for membership survey. We just have to address the rest of the agenda at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 10 am pst