

**Notes from Executive Board Meeting II:  
Sunday, 9/23/2018, 8:00-9:30AM  
Tennessee Room**

Board members in attendance: James Gold (President, FABBS representative), Patricia Deldin (Past-President), Steven Silverstein (Past-Past President), Wendy Heller (President-Elect), Elizabeth Hayden (Secretary), Kate Harkness (Treasurer); Board Members-At-Large: Emily Durbin (2017-2021), Diane Gooding (2017-2021), Leonard Simms (2015-2019), Robin Nusslock (2016-2020), Stew Shankman (2016-2020), Susan South (2018-2022), Jason Schiffman (2018-2022)

Invited Observers or Presenters in attendance: Ivy Tso (Program Chair 2018, Treasurer-Elect), Pearl Chiu (Membership Committee Chair), Alex Cohen (Smadar Levine Award Committee Chair, 2018), Aprajita Mohanty (Diversity/President's Award Committee Chair 2018), Greg Strauss (Program Chair 2019), Christine Hooker (Mentorship Program, 2019), Local Hosts 2019: Len Simms, Kristen Naragon-Gainey; Local Hosts 2018: Don Lynam, Doug Samuels, Susan South

**I. New Business**

**1) Welcome by President (James Gold)**

J. Gold requested that we approve agenda; moved for approval by E Durbin, seconded by Kate

J Gold welcomed new board members: Susan South, Jason Schiffman, and thanked outgoing members Theodore Beauchaine and Jennifer Tackett

J Gold thanked Susan South, Don Lyman, Doug Samuel (local hosts), who provided comments on aspects of the meeting:

D Lynam noted how valuable Jennifer Watson has been in negotiating w hotel. Local hosts noted the need for more space than anticipated; important to know space limitations (need at least ~150 seating capacity for bigger talks). Snacks were biggest expense and we had to order extra. Suggested moving Thursday poster session earlier to reduce need for heavier food at the session, although it was noted that food was very good. Noted that certain foods can be ordered "on consumption" but that can only be done w food that does not have to be eaten immediately. With respect to feedback on the food, some members wanted healthier options while others wanted more decadent items. It was also noted that Sunday often has had hot breakfast options but that this can really impact budget as a per-person cost It was noted that hiring an event planner would be useful; considering raising registration fees to facilitate this. J. Gold noted we could stagger registration fees moreso such that senior members pay more to cover increasing costs. G Strauss noted that non-member fees to attend are quite high, although many times these people should be applying to join as associate members thereby getting a reduced fee. D. Gooding noted that keeping fees low enhances diversity and facilitates attendance. It was also noted that higher fees can incentivize joining the society. K Harkness and L Simms noted that leaving registration costs flexible allows us to adapt to the locations. L Simms suggested setting a full-to-associate ratio and a specific goal in terms of how much profit we want to make off a meeting.

D. Samuels noted that monitoring membership growth in order to plan will be very important, and also important to consider in terms of programming (e.g., diversifying program means more attendees potentially, and vice-versa).

## 2) Updates and Reports from 2018 Committee Chairs and Representatives

A. Ivy Tso, Program Chair, provided commentary on the meeting and the board discussed:

I Tso thanked committee and acknowledged their efforts. Also provided feedback on innovations to content (e.g., enhanced/increased Sunday content). Moved poster session to Friday and had received much positive feedback on this change.

Sunday workshops had lower attendance than anticipated based on how many signed up. E. Hayden noted that if we continue to hold workshops, we need to plan in terms of costs and expectations of presenters (e.g., do they expect free registration). E Hayden also noted that mentorship lunches, which seemed to have gone well, could have representation across career stages (e.g., students, postdocs, junior faculty) at the lunch as this was noted to have been useful even though it wasn't specifically set up to happen this way. Some mentors noted that lunch ended up like a preliminary interview (i.e., students wanted to work w them) and this was awkward. D Samuels noted that more time for the mentor lunches would be good. K Harkness agreed, noting that in general more time for lunches might be good to prevent conflicts w talks, or not having key talks right after lunches to avoid people wandering in. J Gold noted that proximity of restaurants was important to consider in scheduling lunches. D Gooding noted need for microphones in some rooms. I. Tso tried to fit in more talks which meant some symposia were shorter than others and keeping track of time was essential; noted need for moderators. Had received positive feedback wrt shorter talks, although R Nusslock noted that different durations of symposia was confusing and made planning challenging for presenters. I Tso had conveyed this information to presenters but apparently the message was lost. D Samuels noted that smaller rooms were overflowing although big rooms were a good fit. L Simms thought Buffalo location could handle some flexibility and has been told that there is ample space. I. Tso suggested longer breaks between sessions and to have bathroom breaks at least every 90 minutes. Overall her impression was that the planned breaks were too short; also suggested that getting slides ready to go in advance of talks would be useful to make sure events start on time. Having AV by computers is also helpful in conserving time.

It was discussed whether electronic programs would work in the future vs hardcopy. Mixed opinions about this. D Lynam suggested printing fewer programs and only handing them out on request.

G Strauss noted that he planned to do a survey to get feedback on popularity of various new events to determine whether to integrate them at next year's meeting.

B. Jim Gold, FABBS representative, provided an update:

J Gold noted that FABBS would like president of each affiliate organization to attend meeting, noting that this will mean spending money for travel (potentially). Also, should we nominate an SRP ECA-winning person for this year's FABBS award, or consider nominating other ECA contenders. It was noted that ECA chair can provide input wrt whether the SRP ECA winner should be nominated versus a runner-up. L Simms suggested that we have a committee evaluate broader pool of winners (i.e., recent years' winners and runners-up). J Gold noted that we have a very time-sensitive deadline by which to inform FABBS this year so planned to confer w recent ECA chairs.

C. Website improvements: The board's understanding is that Shaun Eack will follow up with recommendations for changes.

## 3) Secretary's Report (Elizabeth Hayden)

E. Hayden had no new business to report.

#### **4) Treasurer's Report (Kate Harkness)**

K Harkness noted that there were fewer registrations on site than usual but thinks we will nevertheless come out ahead financially.

### **II. Old/Ongoing Business**

#### **1) Upcoming Meetings Scheduled and TBD**

2019: Buffalo (Len Simms, Kristen Naragon-Gainey)

2020: Montreal (Mark Ellenbogen, Suzanne King)

2021: Los Angeles (Bill Horan)

2022: Philadelphia (Thomas Olino)

The board was reminded of future possibilities for meeting locales (these were discussed last year): Miami, Atlanta, Sacramento, Vancouver, Boston, Quebec City, Ann Arbor/Detroit, Santa Fe, Chicago. Names associated with these locales were forward to J. Gold so that he can approach these people.

#### **2) Memorial events/recognizing members who have died during the year:**

P Deldin noted that she had intended to acknowledge members who had passed during her opening remarks but neglected to do so. The board then held a renewed discussion of how to have symposia in honor of members who have passed while being sensitive to the fact that it is not feasible to do this for all members. The consensus was the same as last year: if members would like to organize a specific symposium of this sort on their own, they are welcome to do so but the Society will not formally establish this. D. Gooding noted that we can list deceased members' names on the website as well.

### **III. New Business**

#### **1) Associate Member/student data blitz (i.e., opportunities for trainees to speak at meeting):**

J Gold wants Smadar Levin contenders to have opportunity to give blitz talks and to potentially make this part of the selection process for that award. P Deldin noted that this (associate member talks) has historically been controversial. Discussion ensued but many felt that this would be a good addition to the program and that this would enhance diversity efforts given that junior members tend to be more diverse. The suggestion was made to keep Smadar competition and opportunities to talk separate, and to have the President's award and Smadar finalists in a pool. When to have this session was discussed, as was being mindful of the fact that some students might not want to give talks. Finally, the concern that some senior members of SRP will object to junior-level presentations. Consensus was that a pool of applicants for SL and PA who are willing to give a talk will be the contenders for a data-blitz opportunity, and that this will be overseen by the program committee. This passed by majority vote.

#### **2) Ideas about soliciting submissions in certain content areas to broaden scope of program:**

Not addressed due to time limitations.

#### **3) Diversity committee activities going forward:**

A Mohanty wants to implement criteria for recognizing diversity and it was also suggested that diversity be formally integrated into ratings of presentations submitted to SRP for the meeting. J Schiffman suggested we consider a consultant for the issue of enhancing diversity. The importance of the program chair and diversity committee working together on this issue was noted.

**4) Women in Science lunch for 2019 program:**

J Gold asked whether there is still interest in organizing these. There were mixed opinions re whether a lunch was the best format for this (e.g., does it need to be lunch or just a discussion?). Would a workshop be a good alternative? Different options were discussed. W Heller suggested having the diversity committee come up with a plan for this event to ensure maximum usefulness.

**5) Planning costs and comped items for future meetings (e.g., workshop presenters, registration for Secretary, Treasurer, program chair). How to implement these so those entitled to comped items don't pay?**

It was decided that the program chair, local host(s), Secretary, and Treasurer should get free registration at future meetings.

**6) CAAPS and AMS—need new reps?**

Secretary offered to approach Jen Tackett (former rep for both) to get suggestions and to inquire whether she is willing to stay on for either role. Whether these should be board members was discussed and there did not appear to be strong opinions one way or the other.

**7) PCSAS founders' circle proposal (i.e., monetary contribution to PCSAS as a show of support)**

From Thursday, the discussion was whether SRP should commit \$5000/year for 5 years to support PCSAS as a founder. General enthusiasm for the idea, although many wanted more information on how the money would be used. Some members wondered whether we could support a shorter window of time or give less money per year. P Deldin gave an overview of what PCSAS is working toward in terms of getting recognition as a credentialing body and ongoing opposition from APA. Consensus was to match what we pay FABBS (~3000/year) for five years. Motion to do so passed by a majority vote.