

**Board of Governors Meeting  
31 January 2017  
New Orleans, USA**

## ACTION AGENDA ITEMS

Present:

Officers: Kathleen Haaland (President), Keith Yeates, (President-Elect), Bruce Hermann (Treasurer), Michael McCrea (Secretary), Gordon Chelune (Executive Secretary – Ex Officio), Vicki Anderson (Guest), Eric Hessen (Guest)

Members at Large: Guy Vingerhoets, Jon Evans, Emilia Łojek, Peter Arnett, Martine van Zandvoort, Alberto Fernandez, Yana Suchy, John DeLuca and Marc Norman.

Committee Chairs: Jennifer Manley (Publications Chair), Jon Evans (Chair ILC), Roy Kessels (Awards Chair), Raul Gonzales (Program Chair), Mark McCurdy (Student Liaison Chair), Steve Rao (JINS Editor)

Regrets: Michael Kopelman (Incoming President); Special Note: K. Haaland commented on M. Kopelman's recent health problems, which impact his ability to attend the INS meetings in New Orleans. He loyally offered to participate by phone, but it was felt best that he stay focused on his recovery. The BOG sends their best wishes for a speedy recovery to Dr. Kopelman.

1	Time	Call to Order and Welcome – Kathleen Haaland, INS President
2	10	<p><b>Assent Agenda</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and Discussion of the Assent Agenda Materials – Haaland &amp; Chelune  <b>Motion 1:</b> Move to Approve the Assent Agenda</li> <li>Call for Additional Agenda Items – Haaland</li> </ol> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> K. Haaland introduced the agenda item and G. Chelune provided a summary of the assent agenda, as well as the requirement of the assent agenda. There was brief discussion regarding contents of assent agenda, primarily with respect to treasury and membership.</p> <p><i>Additions to the agenda:</i> K. Haaland proposed adding to the agenda, time for discussion by the board regarding the recent US Presidential Executive Order on immigration and foreign travel. B. Hermann proposed adding to the agenda discussion on use of a travel agency for INS travel.</p> <p><b>Motion 1:</b> Motion by K. Yeates, second by B. Hermann; Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
3	15	<p><b>Treasurer Report</b> -- Hermann  Review and Discussion of the 2017 INS Standing Budget – Hermann &amp; Haaland  <b>Motion 2:</b> Move to Approve the 2017 INS Standing Budget</p> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> B. Hermann provided an overview of the treasury, including the following high level details:</p> <p><u>2016 Bottom line</u>— \$92,171 (prior yr= -67,390)</p>

		<p><u><b>Income</b></u>—total= \$1,372,430; 91% of our total income came from dues (34%) and meetings (57%); Only 9% of income came from other sources (5.5% JINS), other line items &lt;2%. Our income is extraordinarily dependent on those two revenue streams</p> <p><u><b>Boston and London meetings</b></u> - Boston was a huge scientific and fiscal success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boston total income= \$445,960 –a total of 2,019 attendees—a record</li> <li>• Boston expenses=\$305,001—down from Denver (323,522)</li> <li>• Boston net gain=\$140,959</li> <li>• London (-32,887, 20K due to unsold hotel room block)</li> <li>• London otherwise comparable to Sydney (-11,409) and Jerusalem (-12,565)</li> </ul> <p><u><b>INS investment strategy</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process began in 2014 in Jerusalem</li> <li>• Culminated in 2016 where we rolled the last of our maturing CDs to UBS</li> <li>• Moderately conservative plan (35% equities, 65% fixed income)</li> <li>• From 12/16/15-1/26/17 we have a return +2.71%</li> </ul> <p>Please see attached treasurer's report for more details. Overall, the past year was highly favorable financially, particularly compared to prior fiscal year. Conference and membership are the main sources of income. The Boston conference was a major scientific and financial success, with favorable margin and lower expenses than prior year. B. Hermann also summarized recent adjustments to the INS investment portfolio under advisement of our financial advisors. There was discussion regarding the current finances and treasure of INS.</p> <p>With respect to the action agenda related to treasury, the 2017 budget has been assembled and is presented for review (see attached). Core elements of the budgeted income and expenses were summarized by B. Hermann. There was discussion of the costs associated with online subscriptions for JINS, in accordance with the publisher contract. The terms of the contact may be reviewed for possible renegotiation in the future. S. Rao, JINS Editor, provided brief commentary on the contractual arrangement with the publisher. The board will review further and seek advisement on this issue.</p> <p><b>Motion 2:</b> Motion by M. McCrea, second by K. Yeates; Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
4	25	<p><b>Executive Director -- Chelune</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of the status of Website Rebuild Project – Chelune &amp; Norman</li> <li>2. Status of the INS Office Reorganization and new Director of Office Operations (DOO)</li> <li>3. Discussion of the relationship of the BOG to ED and INS Office (DOO) in terms of office operations/business management. Does the BOG function as “Board of Trustees” or as the “Office Management Team” of INS as a business entity?</li> </ol>

4. Review of *London Motions* 7-12 presented in London regarding Membership and Dues (see Assent Agenda, pgs. 10-11):
- a. *London Motion* 7 regarding the loss of “active” membership in INS after failing to pay annual dues by the stated dues deadline – upon review this is in violation of our current Bylaws and cannot be enacted without a Bylaws change. It is recommended that this change in criteria for membership be rescinded or deferred until there is a Bylaws change. Suspension of “benefits” does automatically occur when dues are not current, and does not require a Board action.

**Motion 3:** Move to rescind *London Motion* 7.

- b. Regarding *London Motions* 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 concerning tiered changes in dues based on Income status by country of residence -- Because of the delay in completing the website rebuild and the complexity involved in providing a tiered dues structure for members residing in Upper Middle Income, Lower Middle Income and Low Income countries, these changes are not likely to be implemented in 2017 for the Call for 2018 Dues. This impacts the decision on whether to increase the 2018 dues for regular members in High Income countries from \$120 to \$150.

Discuss whether to increase dues unilaterally or wait until the website is able to increase dues in a tiered fashion?

**Motion 4:** Move to revise London Motions 9-12 to read that tiered changes in dues structure will be implemented as soon as the changes can be programmed in the website.

- c. The Executive Director would also recommend that the discounts be amended. Rather than assigning a dollar amount that may increase in future years, make the discounts on a percentage basis of the dues for High Income countries: 60% for regular members from Upper Middle Income countries and 40% for regular members from Lower Middle and Low Income countries. Should dues increase in the future, the same percentages can be applied to the new dues structure.

**Motion 5:** Move that when tiered dues changes are implemented, regular members from Upper Middle Income countries will pay 60% of the High Income countries members' rate and that regular members from Lower Middle Income and Low Income countries will pay 40% of the rate for members from High Income countries.

- d. *London Motion* 10 calls for a reduction in Associate (student) dues from \$60 to \$45 for members residing in Upper Income countries. This is a de-valuation of INS Membership, and from a marketing perspective is very unwise. The Executive Director recommends that rather than a decrease, the dues be maintained at the current level of \$60. This will be a much more potent marketing point than a devaluation.

**Motion 6:** Move to revise *London Motion* 10 be read that when the next dues change occurs, Associate Members' dues remain unchanged and stay at their current level for Associate Members from

		<p>Upper Income countries.</p> <p>e. <i>London Motion 12</i>: The tiered dues structure for students in Upper Middle, Lower Middle and Low income countries, are also contingent on the website being operational and able to differentiate nuanced categories. To be consistent with the proposed changes discussed in #3 above, the discounts should be on a percentage basis of what Associate members pay in Upper Income countries (e.g., 60% for Upper Middle Income countries and 40% for Associates from Middle Income and Low Income countries).</p> <p><b>Motion 7:</b> Move that <i>London Motion 12</i> be revised to read that when tiered dues changes are implemented, Associate Members from Upper Middle Income countries will pay 60% of the High Income members rate and that Associate Members from Upper Middle, Lower Middle and Low Income countries will pay 40% of the rate for Associate members from Upper Income countries</p> <p>5. Revision of Honoraria for Program Invited Symposia. Currently, organizers of Invited Symposia have been given \$5,000 to be split among the participants. This has become a budgetary issue, especially at mid-year meetings. For Cape Town, it was decided that Invited Symposia would be given \$2,500 honoraria to be split among participants, and symposia organized by organizations (e.g., FESN, SACNA, etc.) would not be compensated by the Program. Individually organized symposia will continue to receive no compensation. It is proposed that this change in compensation be applied to all future INS annual and mid-year meetings.</p> <p><b>Motion 8:</b> It is moved that the honoraria provided for Invited Symposia be changed from \$5,000 USD to \$2,500 to be split among symposium participants in a manner determined by the organizer of the symposium.</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b></p> <p>G. Chelune presented the Executive Director's report and a number of others provided additional input, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The INS website revision is underway, but not yet complete. It has created challenges to the INS office operations, including the conference registration, logistics, etc.</li> <li>• M. Norman provided an overview of the interface between the INS office operational efficiencies and the website functionality. The Effectiveness Task Force led by Darin Cobia conducted an internal assessment of INS operations, staffing, allocation of responsibilities, etc. The Task Force recommended creation of a new position of Director of Office Operations in the INS office. The position was posted and applicants were reviewed. Chantal Marcks has been identified as the top candidate for the position and has been offered the position. The formal hiring process is underway.</li> <li>• G. Chelune and M. Norman summarized a number of factors that affected the progress toward the launch of the new website.</li> <li>• G. Chelune briefed the BOG on Motion 3 with respect to London Motions</li> </ul>
--	--	--

7 and 8-12 (see above). There was discussion that the action of London Motion 7 would first require a bylaws revision. There was discussion about the parameters in defining delinquent membership deadline and penalties, as well as procedures for reminding members to renew their membership and policies for re-instating delinquent members. See Motion 3 below.

- G. Chelune summarized issues related to London Motions 8-12 and how the ability to administer those policies is dependent on the new website being fully operational. He proposed that we either a) pursue the approved dues increase across the membership, but that the adjustment to dues in a tiered framework be deferred until the new website is fully operational; or b) that we wait on both actions until the website is fully function and do it all at once. There was discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.
- There was discussion about the plan for tiered dues based on economic status of a member's home country, as well as restructuring of dues for associate members and students. Overall, the tiered system will be based on a percentage of full membership, high income equivalent.
- See Motions 8-12 below for more details.
- G. Chelune discussed the timeline for onboarding the DOO, meeting other staffing priorities, and work by the website firm.
- G. Chelune led a discussion on stipends for Annual and Midyear meetings, in order to standardize stipends and travel support across meetings and individuals. There was discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of reducing the allotment from \$5,000 to \$2,500, as well as a number of options to reduce the costs associated with the program. The board deliberated a number of options related to programming, symposia, stipends, etc.

#### **MOTIONS and ACTIONS:**

**Motion 3:** Move to rescind *London Motion 7*.

Motion by P. Arnett, second by K. Yeates; Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.

**Motion 4:** Move to revise London Motions 8-12 to read that tiered changes in dues structure and increase in membership dues will be implemented as soon as the changes can be programmed in the website.

Motion by G. Chelune, second by K. Yeates; Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.

**Motion 5:** Move that when tiered dues changes are implemented, regular members from Upper Middle Income countries will pay 60% of the High Income countries members' rate and that regular members from Lower Middle Income and Low Income countries will pay 40% of the rate for members from High Income countries. Motion by G. Chelune, second by M. Norman; Motion

		<p>approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p><b>Amendment Motion 5 to read:</b> Move that when tiered dues changes are implemented, regular members from Upper Middle Income countries will pay 50% of the High Income countries members' rate and that regular members from Lower Middle Income and Low Income countries will pay 20% of the rate for members from High Income countries, all rounded to the nearest US dollar. Motion by K. Haaland, second by K. Yeates; Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p><b>Motion 6:</b> Move to revise <i>London Motion 10</i> be read that when the next dues change occurs, Associate Members' dues remain unchanged and stay at their current level for Associate Members from Upper Income countries. Motion was withdrawn.</p> <p><b>Motion 7:</b> Move that <i>London Motion 12</i> be revised to read that when tiered dues changes are implemented, Associate Members from Upper Middle Income countries will pay 67% of the High Income members rate and that Associate Members from Lower Middle and Low Income countries will pay 33% of the rate for Associate members from High Income countries, all rounded to the nearest US dollar. Motion by K. Yeates, second by Y. Suchy; Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p><b>Motion 8:</b> It is moved that the honoraria provided for Invited Symposia be changed from \$5,000 USD to \$2,500 to be split among symposium participants in a manner determined by the organizer of the symposium.  Motion tabled for discussion later in the meeting.</p>
5	10	<p><b>Executive Summary of Accomplishments regarding the Action Plan</b> – Haaland Discussion of budgetary issues moving forward with implementation of the Action Plan initiatives. Planning for future transitions among Committee and the ED</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> K. Haaland provided an overview of the INS strategic planning process and the Action Plan, particularly for new board members. There was discussion of the 4 main priorities of the INS strategic plan, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Science</li> <li>• Operational Effectiveness</li> </ul>

		<p>Progress on several key tactical strategies that support each priority is impacted by the delay in completion of the new website. K. Haaland provided a summary of high-level updates on each of the strategic priority areas. In addition, task force leaders provided more detailed updates on the work and progress relevant to each of the strategic priorities (see below). Detailed reports from each of the priority areas is also included in the Assent Agenda packet. There was discussion about the resources, financial and otherwise, required for implementation of the strategic priorities.</p>
6	10	<p><b>1. Task Force Reports: Education -- DeLuca</b>  Discussion of Oral History Videos  Criteria for candidates to interview  Business plan to monetize the videos  Other Items</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> K. Haaland provided an update on work and progress related to the Education priority. J. Deluca discussed work of the Task Force. Please see the Assent packet for a more detailed report on work and progress by the Education Task Force. There was discussion on the forum, availability, dissemination, marketing, cost, etc. associated with the video interview initiative and other INS-sponsored resources (for CE and otherwise). This work is ongoing and predicted to result in work product in the next several months. It will be important to prioritize the opportunities, and to understand the economic impact of these project to INS.</p>
7	15	<p><b>2. Task Force Reports: Membership -- Suchy</b>  Discussion of changes in Membership Categories (requires ByLaws Changes) – see attached <b>Appendix 1</b> for suggested changes.</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> K. Haaland provided an update on work and progress related to the Membership priority. Y. Suchy discussed work of the Task Force. Please see the Assent packet for a more detailed report on work and progress by the Membership Task Force. Y. Suchy presented a proposal for an “early career” category of INS membership, comprised of people who are up to 3 years out from completion of their terminal degree; dues for this group would be stratified at a level in between student and full members. Also proposed by Y. Suchy was the expansion of a membership category to include trainees and staff “in training”, other than students per se. Also, there is a group of members under the “ILC institutional affiliate” designation; there is a proposal to eliminate this membership category and include those members in another existing membership category. Further, there was discussion around the criteria that designate a person as a neuropsychologist for purposes of determining eligibility for membership in INS. The added benefit and downside to each of these proposals was discussed, with particular recognition to the overall impact these changes could have on our global membership and on INS. The timing of any changes to policies was also discussed. Y. Suchy also discussed the topic of determining when a member is considered emeritus status or “inactive.” Many of these changes are also dependent on the new website to operationalize and/or enforce any changes to membership categorize. Various methods for recording and tracking member status and category were discussed. Implications related to member dues, census, etc. were discussed. V. Anderson suggested that we</p>

look to existing websites for other membership organizations to track member status, etc., so to avoid re-inventing the wheel here.

**MOTION 9:** It is moved to revise the categories for INS membership and membership dues to be as follows:

Membership type	Eligibility	Dues
Regular (voting)	Any independent clinical practitioner, academic, or researcher who completed his or her professional degree (Doctoral degree, Master's degree, or equivalent) that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.) more than 3 years ago.	150.-
Early Career (voting) (new category)	Any individuals within the first 3 years after completion of their professional degree (Doctoral degree, or equivalent) that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.). This will include both postdoctoral fellows and individuals who have entered the work force but are within 3 years of completing their degree.	90.-
In training	Any individual who meets <b>EITHER one of the 2 criteria below:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is currently actively pursuing a degree (Doctoral degree, Bachelor's degree, or equivalent) that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.) and has status as a matriculating student at an accredited institution of higher learning</li> <li>b) Is in-between having completed one "stepping stone" degree and is planning to</li> </ul>	45.-



		<p>become a matriculating student in pursuit of a second degree that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.). <b>There is a 3 year limit on option (b).</b></p>	
		<p><b>MOTION 9:</b> Moved 9 by Y. Suchy; second by K. Yeates. Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>	
8	15	<p><b>3. Task Force Reports: Science – Yeates</b>  Actionable Items:  a. BOG endorsement to proceed with creation of INS Special Interest Groups and the attached Implementation Plan (See Appendix 2).  <b>? Motion:</b>  b. Discussion of Travel Grants (See Appendix 2)  <b>? Motion:</b></p> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> K. Haaland provided an update on work and progress related to the Science priority. K. Yeates discussed work of the Task Force. Please see the Assent packet for a more detailed report on work and progress by the Science Task Force.</p> <p>K. Yeates provided an overview on the creation of special interest groups (SIGs) across various concentrations with neuropsychology, as well as the recent survey of INS members on the topic. Over 700 members responded to the survey, with responses showing overwhelming enthusiasm and interest in the SIG model. Respondent data indicated level of interest and endorsement in various areas (e.g., cognitive disorders, dementia, TBI, etc.). Proposed structure, function, etc. for SIGs is outlined in greater detail in the submitted proposal (see Assent packet). There was discussion about the ideal number of SIGs to create, from the stand point of members and the organization. The number and growth of SIGs will be dictated largely by an “organic” movement within and across specialty concentrations. Impact on the INS office function and ability to accommodate SIGs at INS conferences was discussed. There was discussion of the benefits (tangible or other) that INS will provide the SIGs. No motion or vote of the BOG was considered required for this initiative; no financial resources were requested in support of the SIGs at this time.</p> <p>K. Yeates led discussion on the topic of creating travel grants funded by INS to support travel by trainees and early career individuals to attend INS conferences. Please see Appendix 2 for more details. Current BOG members provided commentary on how support like this impacted them personally while trainees. A survey of students indicates high interest in information and opportunities related to awards of this nature. The structure, eligibility, administration, benefits, cost and overall impact of this proposal on INS was discussed by BOG. Similar programs affiliated with other membership organizations were discussed. It was agreed that this opportunity will be developed further, with the plan for K. Yeates to bring back to the BOG at a future meeting for additional discussion.</p>	

9	10	<p><b>4. Task Force Reports: Operations – Norman</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Website Re-build</li> <li>b. Office Re-organization and selection of Director of Office Operations</li> <li>c. How fast can the INS office move forward with implementing Strategic Action Plan Initiatives?</li> </ul> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> K. Haaland provided an update on work and progress related to the Science priority. M. Norman discussed work of the Task Force. Please see the Assent packet for a more detailed report on work and progress by the Operational Effectiveness Task Force.</p> <p>M. Norman updated on the evaluation of candidates for the DOO position and the offer made to an internal candidate, with acceptance pending. He also provided an update on the upgrade to the website, which is critical to so many other priorities in the INS strategic plan. Option to be built into the website to support the priorities of education, membership, science and operational effectiveness are considered critical and being closely evaluated in the building of the site. Data capture and warehousing is also a critical consideration to maximize the effectiveness of the INS office.</p>
10	15	<p><b>Draft Conflict of Interest Policies and Procedures – Yeates and Haaland</b> Discussion of Policy and its Implementation (see Assent Agenda Addenda pgs 85-87 and Appendix 3). <b>? Motion</b></p> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> K. Yeates presented an overview of a proposed COI policy for INS. There was discussion regarding the purpose, scope, administration and enforcement of a COI policy. A COI committee and chair will need to be appointed, with anticipated timeline in 2017. G. Chelune commented that the adoption and timing of a COI policy could impact the nominations process for the upcoming INS election in 2017. The COI form used for INS conference speakers could be used as a template for a form to be used in conjunction with administration of the COI policy.</p> <p><b>MOTION 10:</b> It is moved to approve the Conflict of Interest Policy as worded (see Appendix 3). Moved by B. Hermann, second by K. Yeates. Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
<b>LUNCH BREAK: 11:00 – 1:00</b>		
11	10	<p><b>Committee Reports: Awards Committee – R. Kessels</b> Discussion of current policies &amp; Needs</p> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> R. Kessels updated the BOG on activities of the Awards Committee. Nominations for the various INS awards for the Cape Town meeting have been limited. R. Kessels requested ideas to increase award nominations. There was discussion of the Committee being more proactive in seeking nominations, rather than relying on nominations from the membership. Other strategies for</p>

		<p>increasing nominations were discussed, including outreach to specific individuals and groups (e.g., ILC) requesting nominations for awards tied to specific meetings and venues. The requirement of nominees and recipients being INS members was discussed. There was agreement to pursue a change to the Awards Committee policy indicating that INS members and non-members be eligible for nomination for INS awards. R. Kessels will return to the board with a revised policy for discussion and approval. Please see the attached committee report for more information on work from this committee.</p>
12	10	<p><b>Committee Reports: NOLA Program – B. Hampstead</b></p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> Ben Hampstead provided an update on the status of the NOLA program. Abstract submission was near the highest level ever for an INS meeting. Attendance is approaching 2,000, which is near the highest ever for INS meetings. There was discussion of how the SIGs are best situated in alignment with the meeting program, schedule, logistics, etc. B. Hampstead also commented on the positive impact of the invited symposia on the overall INS program and meeting attendance. There ensued a substantive discussion on the benefits and level of honorarium associated with the invited symposia at INS meetings. Ideas for how to distribute resources in support of the invited symposia were discussed. The importance of consistency and some degree of standardization of stipends, travel support, etc. was discussed by the BOG, recognizing also the benefit of program chairs having some autonomy in support of the respective program content, speakers, geographic variables, etc. There was extensive discussion about whether the same model should apply to both the annual and midyear meetings, or whether different circumstances of the two meetings create the need for different arrangements for the two meetings. The topic will be tabled for discussion on the next INS Officers teleconference in March. Please see the attached committee report for more information on work from this committee.</p>
13	15	<p><b>Committee Reports: Continuing Education – R. Gonzalez</b></p> <p>Discussion of CE Chair Transition. The 2018 annual meeting in DC will be Dr. Gonzalez' final meeting as CE Director. He proposes that the new CE Director begin the position no later than November 2017 so that they may overlap with him at the DC meeting to facilitate training and work toward a smooth transition.</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> R. Gonzalez informed the board that his term as CE Chair concludes with the 2018 INS meeting in Washington, DC. He advises identifying candidates for a new CE Chair as soon as possible. There was a request of the BOG members to provide names of interested and qualified candidates. The plan is to identify candidates and possibly have a vote of the BOG prior to the summer meeting in Cape Town. Please see the attached committee report for more information on work from this committee.</p> <p>K. Haaland notified the BOG that G. Chelune's term as INS Executive Director concludes in February 2019, with the option to continue beyond that date. There was also discussion of B. Hermann completing his term of INS Treasurer, which concludes in February 2019. Planning around success transitions for the ED and treasurer will be guided by M. Kopelman and the BOG going forward.</p>

14	10	<p><b>Committee Reports: Publications and Communications – Manly</b>  Discussion of current status of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JINS</li> <li>INS Newsletter</li> <li>SLC Facebook</li> <li>SLC Listserv</li> </ol> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> J. Manly presented an overview on JINS. R. Kessels raised the topic of open access of JINS publications, which is a movement among scientific journals. This issue will be discussed with S. Rao, JINS Editor, and possibly with Cambridge, JINS publisher. R. Kessels also recommended creating an ISI category for “neuropsychology.” This issue will also be discussed with S. Rao.</p> <p>J. Manly reported highly favorable news on the INS Newsletter, including a relatively high rate of INS members opening the newsletter link. J. Manly indicated that she does not have a student member of the Publications Committee, but is recruiting a student from the SLC to join. Please see the attached committee report for more information on work from this committee.</p>
15	15	<p><b>Committee Reports: International Liaison Committee -- Evans</b>  Future Plans/Initiatives  Plans for Transition to new ILC Chair  Matthews Fund –  Plans to appoint new ILC chair in 2018</p> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> J. Evans provided an update on work related to the ILC. A full report is available in the assent agenda packet. A key focus has been on reinvigorating the use of Charles Matthews Fund, which is to be used to support the development of neuropsychology around the world, with a particular focus on low and middle income countries and places where neuropsychology is not well developed. J. Evans noted that a seven day workshop on the topic of neuropsychological rehabilitation, sponsored by the Charles Matthews Fund, will take place in Kolkata, India on the 19-25th February. The international faculty for the workshop includes Prof Barbara Wilson, Professor Robyn Tate, Dr Michael Perdices and Professor Jon Evans. Other topics of interest relevant to the work of the ILC will be communicated and highlighted in the INS Newsletter. J. Evans indicated that his term as committee chair concludes in February 2018, which prompts the need to identify a new chair. The role can be filled by current or newly elected board members. This will be discussed further at the BOG meeting in Cape Town.</p>
16	10	<p><b>Committee Reports: Student Liaison Committee – McCurdy</b>  Discussion of Student Representative collaboration with Program Committees  Status of APA International Grant  Future plans/needs</p> <p><b>MINUTES:</b> M. McCurdy provided an update on activities of the SLC. The APA grant is in process. There was a request that local student reps (~20 per meeting) be granted free access to conference workshops (without CE credit).</p>

		<p>This topic/request is to be discussed on a future INS Officers teleconference. M. McCurdy also updated the BOG on the international training database, which is in process. There was discussion about whether that information would be made available on the INS website (or accessible via web link), with proper disclaimer language. It was agreed to move ahead in posting the information to the INS website in the near future. E. Lojek briefed the BOG on a recent forum of an international group that was a collaboration between the SLC and E. Lojek's local university in Europe, which turned out to be productive.</p>
17	5	<p><b>FESN Symposia:</b> Re-occurring Budget Allocation – van Zandvoort &amp; Haaland Discussion of plan for 2017 INS Symposium <b>Motion</b> if there are budgetary implications</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> K. Haaland provided an update on past funding resources from INS in support of the FESN Symposia, primarily in the form of an INS-affiliated symposia at the FESN meeting and providing financial resource for the presenters in the symposia. M. van Zandvoort is organizing the INS-affiliated symposia at FESN for 2017. Financial resources and budget implications were discussed. The benefits of this effort to INS were discussed, with particular relevance to our strategic priorities (e.g., membership, education, science). BOG members affiliated with FESN provided context and commentary from the standpoint of FESN.</p> <p><b>MOTION 11:</b> It is moved that \$5,000 be allocated to support an INS symposia at the 2017 FESN meeting.</p> <p>Moved by M. van Zandvoort; second by E. Lojek. Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
<b>AFTERNOON BREAK: 20 MINUTES</b>		
18	30	<p><b>Re-organization of INS Governance Structure</b> – Haaland Discussion of whether to change the governance structure to mirror the Strategic Plan. Changes in the governance structure will require changing the Bylaws. See attached draft of Organizational Chart</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> This topic was tabled for future discussion, given the need for substantive discussion and time to achieve.</p>
19	20	<p><b>Approval of Budgetary Amendments</b> to the 2017 Standing Budget – Hermann <b>Motions:</b></p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> B. Hermann summarized budget amendments from today's actions. It was recommended that \$5,000 be allocated for attorney fees, which the BOG approved, without need for formal motion and vote.</p>
20	10	<p><b>Report of the Ad hoc Bylaws Committee</b> – McCrea &amp; Haaland</p> <p><b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> M. McCrea and K. Haaland provided an update on the activities of</p>

		the Bylaws Committee, including consultation with an attorney who is an expert in non-profit law and membership organizations. Further action on revision of the bylaws is deferred, pending other actions of the organization on membership, etc. It was suggested that we review minutes of meetings from the past 3 years to capture any actions that might impact the bylaws revision.
21	10	<b>Farewell to outgoing BOG Members</b> – Haaland  <b><u>MINUTES:</u></b> K. Haaland recognized those BOG members rotating off the board and thanked them for their dedicated service. Their efforts will be celebrated over dinner this evening.
22	5	<b>BOG Dinner Information</b> – Haaland & Chelune Muriel's on Jackson Square – 801 Chartres Street 7:00 Drinks in the Séance Room & 7:30 Dinner in the Small Planation Rm.
23		Adjourn – K. Haaland adjourned the meeting at 5:33 pm CT

Submitted by Michael McCrea, PhD, INS Secretary

## Appendix 1: Membership Task Force suggested changes in membership categories

Motion	Membership type	Eligibility	Dues
1	Regular (voting)	Any independent clinical practitioner, academic, or researcher who completed his or her professional degree (PhD, MD, Master's degree, or equivalent) that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.) more than 3 years ago.	150.-
2	Early Career (voting) (new category)	Any individuals within the first 3 years after completion of their professional degree (PhD, MD, Master's degree, or equivalent) that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.). This will include both postdoctoral fellows and individuals who have entered the work force but are within 3 years of completing their degree.	90.-
3	In training	Any individual who is meets <b>EITHER one of the 2 criteria below:</b> c) Is currently actively pursuing a degree (PhD, MD, Master's degree, Bachelor's degree, or equivalent) that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.) and has status as a matriculating student at an accredited institution of higher learning d) Is in between having completed one "stepping stone" degree and is planning to become a matriculating student in pursuit of a second degree that pertains to the practice of neuropsychology (e.g., psychology, neuropsychology, rehabilitation psychology, neuroscience, medicine, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.). <b>There is a 3 year limit on option (b).</b>	45.-
4	Emeritus (voting) (10 year requirement is new)	Any formal regular member who is currently retired and over the age of 65 years, and who meets <b>EITHER one of the 3 criteria below:</b> a) Has been a regular dues-paying member consecutively for 10 years b) Has been a regular dues-paying member consecutively since first joining INS c) Has been a regular dues-paying member consecutively since this rule went into effect.	75.-
5	ILC Institutional Affiliate	We move to eliminate this category.	

## **Appendix 2: Science Task Force Action Report**

1) Need BOG endorsement to proceed with creation of SIGs and implementation of plan (see attached).

### **Science Task Force Short-Term Goal:**

Develop and implement member Special Interest Groups (SIGs).

### **Progress Since Last report:**

- 1) Conducted membership survey, with excellent response rate and very positive endorsement of SIGs (n = 700). See attached results.
- 2) Elicited BOG feedback on proposed plan for implementing SIGs.
- 3) Discussed logistics of SIG breakouts at INS meetings with Executive Director.
- 4) Finalized plan for implementing SIGs (see attached).

### **Recommended Actions for SIG Implementation:**

- 1) BOG approval (see Action Item).
- 2) Appoint SIG liaison on Science Task Force.
- 3) Implement plan, to include announcement to members, addition of web page with SIG information, and solicitation for SIG proposals.

### **Anticipated Needs/Expenses Associated with SIGs:**

Expected costs in the short-term are minimal, as are immediate demands on the INS office, given that Science Task Force members will conduct the membership survey and process results. However, the implementation of the plan may be associated with both increased demands on the INS office and potential ongoing expenses.

Expenses are likely to stem from several sources: (1) the need for space for SIGs to meet during INS meetings; (2) potential infrastructure needs of the SIGs (e.g., list serves); and (3) the integration and ongoing updating of information about SIGs, including application forms, on the INS website. Determining the costs associated with space will require consideration of space availability at INS meetings, and whether SIG meetings can be accommodated in the usual meeting space or will require additional space. If additional space is necessary, this may lead to ongoing expenses, but I cannot estimate the actual expenses at this time.

Most of the responsibilities for tracking SIG activities and applications will fall to the Science Task Force, its SIG liaison, and the designated SIG coordinator (chosen from among SIG Chairs). Nevertheless, the INS main office is likely to field e-mail from members about SIGs, and may be asked to provide assistance with some SIG activities (e.g., list serves).

### **Desired Outcomes and Metrics:**

The creation of SIGs should provide a forum for INS members to associate with other members who share similar interests. SIGs should thereby help members feel more engaged in INS, and encourage them to maintain their membership and perhaps encourage others they know to join INS. Appropriate metrics to assess these outcomes would include: (1) number of SIGs; (2) number of members joining SIGs; (3) total INS membership; (4) meeting attendance (total, as well as proportion of SIG members vs. non-members).



## 2) Need BOB consideration of proposal for travel grants.

### **Science Task Force Mid-Term Goal:**

Develop travel grants for targeted groups/offer awards for multi-national/multi-institutional research in neuropsychology.

### **Progress Since Last Report:**

- 1) Began discussions about travel grants.
- 2) Developed tentative proposal:

Award travel grants to (1) trainees (undergrad or grad students/interns) and (2) early career individuals (postdocs or within 5 years of terminal degree). Preference for individual from underrepresented/ developing/low & middle income countries. Encourage first-time attendees, but not require. Could ask about financial need and availability of other resources. Require those awarded to be presenting. Two awards for each category for both meetings (total 8 X \$1500 = \$12,000). Also cover registration plus one CE course. Encourage participation in North American meeting by non-North Americans and participation in mid-year meeting by North, Central, and South Americans. Would likely require integrating eligibility for award into submission of abstracts. Could consider additional registration waivers for those who do not win full award.

### **Proposal for INS Special Interest Groups**

INS is considering the formation of special interest groups (SIGs). SIGs would provide a forum for neuropsychologists with common interests to come together during INS meetings, for the purpose of sharing recent research, discussing professional issues, and interacting informally. SIGs might also engage in various activities between meetings (e.g., list serves, newsletters).

SIGs will be formed through a formal proposal process. SIG proposals would include a description of the SIG's proposed name, mission, goals, and proposed activities, which should be consistent with INS's stated mission. A proposal will require signatures by 20 INS members (regular, associate, or student) to be eligible for approval by the Science Task Force (subject to limits on the total number of SIGs; see below).

All SIGs will have a Chair and Co-Chair, who will share responsibility for overseeing SIG activities and membership. The Chair and Co-Chair will initially be key proposers of the SIG, but will be elected by the SIG membership thereafter. Chair terms will be fixed to some predetermined length (2 years). A Chair can serve for a maximum of two terms.

The Chairs of all SIGs would constitute a SIG coordinating group. They would elect a SIG Coordinator. The SIG coordinator would report to the Science Task Force and be available to attend meetings of the Board of Governors as needed. A member of the Science Task Force would also serve as a designated SIG liaison. The Science Task Force would review and approve proposals for new SIGs, as well as applications for renewal of existing SIGs.

SIGs will be established for some initial fixed term (2 years). They will be renewable subject to specific metrics (e.g., number of members; number of meeting attendees; number of ongoing activities outside meetings). The Science Task Force, on the recommendation of its SIG liaison, may vote to disband a SIG based on metrics suggesting declining membership interest.

The SIG leadership and members would determine SIG meeting formats and content. At a minimum, however, all SIGs would be expected to meet at both INS meetings each year. SIGs could also choose to encourage SIG activity between meetings (e.g., list serves, newsletters). The SIG liaison, together with the SIG Coordinator, would provide suggestions/ideas for SIGs about potential activities, and provide assistance with obtaining infrastructure and support from the INS main office as available.

SIG members must be INS members, of any level (regular, student, or emeritus). Any INS member can attend any SIG meeting, but can only vote for SIG Chair/Co-Chair if they are members of that SIG. INS members can join a SIG by submitting an application to the designated SIG Chair. To encourage student and trainee participation, each SIG will be encouraged to identify a student liaison, and students and trainee members of a SIG will hold voting privileges. SIGs would be expected to count attendees at their meetings as one metric relevant to renewal.

SIGs will not receive monetary support from INS. They might choose to collect modest dues for their activities. They would not be permitted to pay speakers. The total number of SIGs will be capped, with the number determined as a function of space availability at INS meetings.

### **Appendix 3: Draft Conflict of Interest Policies and Procedures of the International Neuropsychological Society (INS)**

The following policies and procedures are designed to protect the INS, its leadership, and its members, from perceived, potential, or actual conflicts of interest involving the INS leadership. The policies and procedures are intended to identify and address non-trivial conflicts of interest, as determined by an INS Conflict of Interest committee. The policy is based primarily upon the willingness of the INS leadership to voluntarily disclose potential and actual conflicts of interest.

#### **Conflict of Interest Committee**

A Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee will be established to implement the conflict of interest policies and procedures. The President, with approval of the Board of Governors, will appoint COI Committee members. No member of the COI Committee shall serve concurrently in another INS leadership position. Initially, the Chair of the COI Committee shall serve for 2 years, and two additional members, appointed by the President, shall serve for 1 and 3 years, respectively. Thereafter, the President, with the approval of the Board of Governors, will fill any vacancies on the three-member Committee, with the terms of all subsequent members to last 3 years.

#### **Disclosure of Relationships**

Each person in a leadership position within INS (defined as Board of Governor members, all Committee chairs, the Executive Director and INS staff, and the editor and associate editors of JINS journals) will be required to disclose relevant relationships and to identify and explain any potential or actual conflicts of interest. A Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form has been developed for this purpose.

## **Relationships Representing Potential Conflicts of Interest**

INS leaders having monetary relationships (i.e., salary, transactions, gifts, honorarium, hospitalities, or other remuneration) exceeding \$2,000 in any given year (not including reimbursement of expenses) with companies, vendors, test and book publishers, individuals, and other entities involved with INS, will be considered to have a non-trivial relationship that represents a potential conflict of interest for INS. Such relationships must be disclosed, although the specific monetary amount involved need not be disclosed. INS leaders may choose to report relationships less than \$2,000 if they feel it is appropriate. The COI Committee may request additional information regarding an INS leader's disclosure, including specific monetary information, when the Committee has a concern about a potential or actual conflict of interest.

Not all potential or actual conflicts of interest affecting INS will involve monetary relationships. Non-trivial potential or actual conflicts of interest, especially those involving multiple relationships (e.g., commitments to other professional organizations), also should be reported, even when they involve no monetary relationship or benefit.

## **Types of Disclosure**

At least three types of disclosure are required of INS leaders:

**Annual Disclosure:** Disclosure forms will be submitted annually by all INS leaders to the Chair of the COI Committee on or before December 15 of each year.

**Updated Disclosure:** Disclosure of new relationships that pose potential conflict of interests is an ongoing responsibility. If a new relationship arises during the year that involves or could engender an actual or potential conflict of interest, an INS leader should notify the Chair of the COI Committee in writing in a timely fashion and submit an updated disclosure form to the Executive Director within 30 days.

**Disclosure Related to Candidacy:** Candidates for elected or appointed INS leadership positions must submit a disclosure form to the Chair of the COI Committee in a timely fashion, to allow review and approval by the COI committee at least 7 days prior to presentation to the Board for confirmation of the nomination or appointment. Election statements presented by the INS should note that all candidates completed COI Disclosure forms and were judged acceptable by the COI Committee, and that the COI information is available to INS members on request.

## **INS Member and Public Access to Conflict of Interest Disclosures**

Conflict of interest disclosure forms and related information provided by INS leaders will be public information and available to INS members and the public upon request to the Executive Director. INS leaders can request that specific disclosures be kept private if the information is deemed sufficiently proprietary, its disclosure is legally prohibited, or the disclosure involves personal relationships and could unduly harm the leader or other party involved. The COI Committee makes the ultimate determination of whether to treat any disclosure as public.

Information provided by an INS leader to the COI committee as part of an inquiry or complaint process will be kept confidential and will not be available to INS members or the public. The COI Committee can choose to deny access to COI disclosure forms if it determines that a particular request is frivolous or malicious in nature. The Board of Governors shall review any such determination.

## **Review of Disclosure Forms and Management of Conflict of Interest**

Annual conflict of interest disclosure forms will be forwarded by January 15 by the Chair of the COI Committee to the COI committee for review. Updated and candidacy related disclosure

forms will be forwarded by the Chair of the COI Committee to the COI committee in a timely manner.

When an apparent or actual conflict of interest is identified, the COI committee will contact the INS leader to obtain further information as needed, and, if necessary, to ask the INS leader to manage, reduce, or eliminate the conflict of interest. If a satisfactory resolution is not reached according to the COI committee, the matter will be referred to the Board of Governors for final disposition, which could involve several options (e.g., no action; suspension from a committee; removal from office), depending on the seriousness of the conflict of interest and its actual or potential harm to the INS.

### **Retention of Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms and Information**

The INS and COI Committee will retain conflict of interest disclosure forms that are submitted by any INS leader during the leader's years of service in that position plus one (1) additional year. Disclosure forms submitted by candidates who are not elected or appointed will be destroyed immediately following the election or failed appointment.

### **Conflict of Interest and Voting and Quorum Procedures**

If a conflict of interest exists for an INS leader, the leader should recuse himself or herself from discussing or voting on any matter involving that conflict. Any recording of the vote should reflect the disclosure and recusal. The INS leader shall not be counted as part of the quorum necessary to vote on any matter involving the conflict of interest.

### **Inquiries Regarding Conflict of Interest**

INS members with inquiries concerning conflict of interest, or about the INS Conflict of Interest policy, are encouraged to contact the Chair of the COI Committee. All such communications will be kept confidential as provided below.

### **Complaints of Conflict of Interest**

Any INS member may lodge a complaint of conflict of interest regarding an INS leader with the COI Committee. Complaints should be sent directly to the Chair of the COI Committee and will be handled in strict confidence. If a member contacts the Executive Director or another INS leader, the communication will be kept in strict confidence and re-directed to the Chair of the COI Committee.

When a complaint is received, the COI Committee will review the matter using the information that is immediately available. If the COI Committee decides that a conflict does not exist, no further action will be taken. If the COI Committee determines that a Conflict of Interest may exist, the Committee will contact the INS leader in question and seek further information, which will be treated confidentially. After obtaining additional information, the COI Committee will decide whether the conflict merits further action. If the COI Committee believes a conflict of interest necessitates resolution, the Committee will inform the INS leader and request that the leader resolve the conflict. If the INS leader in question does not provide the additional information requested or indicates an intention to persist in a conflict of interest situation, the Committee will then notify the Board of Governors. Only at this point will confidential complaint information be disseminated outside of the COI Committee, and this information will be limited to Board of Governors. The Board of Governors will review the matter, consider the recommendations of both the COI Committee and the INS leader in question, and make a final

determination. If a prior vote by the officers or Board of Governors may have been affected by an undisclosed conflict of interest that is subsequently revealed, the vote shall be reconsidered.

# BOG

## Membership

Recruitment  
Retention

SLC

ILC

SIGs

## Education

Continuing  
Education

Video  
Archives

Webinars

## Science

Program

Awards

## Operations

## Finance

## Publications & Communications

JINS

Newsletter

INSNET

Social Media