

**2018 INS Action Agenda
Washington, D.C.**

ACTION AGENDA ITEMS

Present:

Officers: Michael Kopelman (President), Keith Yeates, (Incoming President), Vicki Anderson (President Elect), Bruce Hermann (Treasurer), Michael McCrea (Secretary), Gordon Chelune (Executive Secretary – Ex Officio);

Members at Large, Newly Elected Members: Erik Hessen, Jennifer Vasterling, Robin Morris, John DeLuca, Marc Norman, Martine van Zandvoort, Alberto Fernandez, Yana Suchy, Jon Evans,

Committee Chairs and Guests: Raul Gonzales (CE Chair), Shawn McClintock (Program Chair), Peter Arnett (COI Chair), Steve Rao (JINS Editor), Jennifer Manley (Publications Chair), Mark McCurdy (SLC Chair), Roy Kessels (Awards Chair),

Guests: Melissa Lamar, Margaret O'Connor, Celianne Rey-Casserly, Miriam Beauchamp, Mieke Verfaellie, Chantel Marks (INS Director of Operations)

1	Time	Call to Order and Welcome – Michael Kopelman M. Kopelman called the meeting to order at 10:19 am ET
2		Call for New Business Items (Kopelman) <u>MINUTES:</u> No new business items were submitted or discussed.
3		Review, Discussion, and Vote on Assent Agenda Reports (M. Kopelman) Motion 1: Move to approve Assent Agenda Reports <u>MINUTES:</u> M. Kopelman discussed several topics relevant to the assent agenda. As appropriate, these topics are itemized below in the meeting minutes in the order in which they were discussed during the meeting. He also previewed the line-up of key lectures being delivered at the current INS meeting. Motion 1: Move to Approve the Assent Agenda Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by J. Vasterling Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.
4		Treasurer's Report – (B. Hermann) Review, Discussion, and Vote on the 2018 INS Budget (see Addendum 1 for the 2018 budget) Motion 2: Move to approve the 2018 INS Budget

		<p>Review, Discussion and Vote on the Burish Investment Strategy for INS Reserves (see Addendum 2 for background)</p> <p>Motion 3: Move to permit the INS officers to enter into discussions with UBS to move to a 50% equity position over a 12-18 month time frame and to approve and enter into the amended financial plan.</p> <p>MINUTES: B. Hermann provided an update and overview of the current INS budget and treasury. Overall, there was a net loss \$106,268 in 2017, due to a combination of decreased income and increased expenses. Final financials from the 2017 Cape Town meeting are still outstanding, but a small profit is anticipated. Treasurer's report is attached with more details. Budget will be a consideration in discussion of action items on the current meeting agenda.</p> <p>B. Hermann also provided an overview of an updated investment strategy from UBS Burish, our engaged investment firm, for INS investments. UBS Burish has recommended that INS gradually move to a 50% equity position over the next 12-18 months, which is consistent with the investment strategy of other organizations similar to INS. Our equity position is now 30%. There was discussion about how we would go about reversing the percent equity position if the market changed dramatically and the strategy was no longer recommended. There was discussion of creating a Finance Committee that would oversee this process for monitoring investment strategies and performance. Motion 3 was revised to permit the INS officers, at the advisement of the finance committee, to make decisions about any future revision to the investment strategy.</p> <p>Motion 2: Move to Approve the 2018 INS Budget Motion by B. Hermann Seconded by V. Anderson Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p>Motion 3: Move to permit the INS officers to enter into discussions with UBS to move to a 50% equity position over a 12-18 month time frame and to approve and enter into the amended financial plan. Also, to permit the INS officers, at the advisement of the finance committee, to make decisions about any future revision to the investment strategy. Motion by B. Hermann Seconded by J. DeLuca Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
5		<p>Presidential Appointment of Committee Chairs and Advisors (Kopelman & Chelune)</p> <p>In Cape Town the BOG voted "that the existing task forces shall become ad hoc committees, effective immediately" (p 19, #23 of Assent Agenda Packet). Other than Holly Miskey becoming Chair of the new Science Committee, the minutes do not reflect who the specific chairs would be, leaving the presumption that the</p>

previous Task Force Chairs would become the new Ad Hoc Committee chairs. John DeLuca is completing his term as Member-at-Large at this meeting, and was the Education Chair; the Cape Town minutes reflect that “he is not looking to continue as chair of the new [standing] ad hoc committee for education” (p19-20, #26 of Assent Agenda packet). Specific appointment of chairs of the following ad hoc committees need to be made by the President with the approval of the BOG and to be reflected in the Minutes.

1. Education Ad Hoc Committee (new)

Motion: Move to approve the appointment of [TBA] to serve as Chair of the Education Committee.

2. Operations Ad Hoc Committee (new, ED or continue Marc Norman)

Motion: Move to approve the appointment of [TBA] to serve as the Chair of the Operations Committee.

3. Membership Ad Hoc Committee (new or continue Yana Suchy)

Motion; Move to approve the appointment of [TBA] to serve as the Chair of the Membership Committee.

4. Finance Committee

Motion: Move to approve appointment of the INS Treasurer as Chair of the Finance Committee.

MINUTES: M. Kopelman reviewed current committees and chairs for each committee. J. DeLuca has expressed interest in continuing as chair of the Education Ad Hoc Committee through the Prague 2018 meeting. M. Norman has expressed interest in continuing as chair of the Operations Ad Hoc Committee. Y.J. Suchy has interest in continuing as chair of the Membership Ad Hoc Committee. B. Hermann, as INS Treasurer, will continue to chair the Finance Committee, and a succession plan will be discussed as part of a later agenda item on the transition plan for treasurer. These appointments are at the pleasure of the President and do not require formal motion or vote by the Board. The Board approved these appointments.

M. Kopelman pointed out that Jon Evans ends his term as Member-at-Large and term as ILC Chair. President nominates Jon Evans to serve a second term as ILC Chair, with Alberto Fernandez, Member-at-Large, to represent ILC Chair during the coming year.

Motion: Move to approve appointment of Jon Evans to serve a second term as Chair of the International Liaison Committee.

Motion 4: Move to approve appointment of Jon Evans to serve a second term as Chair of the International Liaison Committee.

Motion by M. Kopelman

Seconded by M. Norman

		<p>Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p>Student Liaison Committee: in Cape Town the BOG was advised that the Bylaws call for SLC co-chairs (2): one from North America and the other from outside North America. Mark McCurdy will be completing his term as North American SLC Co-chair and has proposed Jillian Tessier as his replacement. M. van Zandvoort recruited Anuk Schmitz to serve as the non-North American co-chair.</p> <p>Motion: Move to approve appointment of Jullian Tessier as the new North American Co-chair and Anuk Schmitz as non-North American Co-Chair of the Student Liaison Committee</p> <p>Motion 5: Move to approve appointment of Jullian Tessier as the new North American Co-chair and Anuk Schmitz as non-North American Co-Chair of the Student Liaison Committee Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by J. Vasterling Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p>President Kopelman appointed Dr. Fernandez, who will be entering his 3rd year as Member-at-Large, to serve as 3rd year advisor, and Dr. Vasterling who will be entering her 2nd year as 2nd year advisor to the SLC. There was discussion of an incoming Member-at-Large, [TBD], to serve as 1st year advisor. Mieke Verfaellie volunteered to serve as the 1st year advisor, replacing M. van Zandvoort. These appointments are at the pleasure of the President and do not require formal motion or vote by the Board. The Board approved these appointments.</p>
6		<p>Re-organization of INS Governance and Committee Structure (Kopelman & Chelune)</p> <p><u>Background</u> (Chelune): The voting BOG is essentially the INS governing body similar to a Board of Trustees, with the Executive Director as ex officio. The Officers reflect the CEO (Presidents), Secretary and Treasurer (CFO), whereas the ED functions as the COO. The committees exist to support the operations of the Society and to provide input to the BOG. Since the Sydney meeting, there has been ongoing discussion about re- structuring the INS governance and committee structure without clear action. The BOG has added 8 new ad hoc committees in addition to the 7-standing committees detailed in the INS Bylaws, and created an INS office Director of Office Operations. Addendum 3 provides a list of the current Standing and Ad Hoc Committees. Some of the original Standing Committees are largely administrative (Site Selection) or exist to largely support the biannual conferences (Program Committee, Local Arrangements, Awards). The proliferation of committees has made it difficult to conduct the business of the Society at the BOG meetings in an efficient manner.</p> <p><u>Questions to the BOG</u> (Kopelman): Should INS move to re-structure the committees in a more vertical manner? How might this look? Addendum 4 presents a draft Table of Organization (TO) in which the functions of the Society (and committees) are organized into 6 functional Divisions (Science, Education, Membership, Operations, Finance, and Publications and Communications)</p>

	<p>Adoption of a new TO could be implemented on an ad hoc basis without a Bylaws change and would provide a clear model to guide a major formal Bylaws change that can be presented to the membership for approval.</p> <p>Motion: Move to approve the proposed revision of the INS Table of Organization in which there will be six functional committees/divisions under which the other INS Standing and ad hoc committees will be organized.</p> <p>MINUTES: M. Kopelman and G. Chelune provided an overview of the proposed revision to the INS governance and committee structure. The size and scope of the structure has increased significantly over the past several years, which impacts organizational function and efficiency. The role and function of the Board of Governors has also evolved over the years. Documents and figures outlining the proposed revision to governance and committee structure were reviewed. The structure also has budgetary implications (e.g., financial support for committee chairs to attend INS meetings, etc.). There was discussion by the Board about specific recommendations for revision to the governance and committee structure, as well as related discussion about the function of the INS Executive Director and operation of INS central office. There was discussion about how each respective committee relates to the core missions of INS, and how that impacts any planned revision of the governance and committee structure. There was discussion about the potential for diminished incentive to committee chairs, if not invited to attend INS Board meetings. Revision to the governance and committee structure will also inform the planned revision of the INS bylaws. It will be important to solidify our plan for revised governance and committee structure before we formally revise the INS bylaws. Also, there was discussion about more diversity of committee leadership and membership with INS members from outside of North America.</p> <p>Motion 6: Move to approve, in principle, the proposed revision of the INS Table of Organization in which there will be six functional committees/ divisions (Membership, Education, Science, Operations, Finance, Publications/Communications), under which the other INS Standing and Ad Hoc Committees will be organized. The INS Board of Governors will formally review the functional status of the revised governance and committee structure again within the next two years.</p> <p>Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by K. Yeates Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
7	<p>Attendance at the BOG meetings (Kopelman & Chelune): The voting BOG and ED are expected to attend the BOG meetings to conduct the business of the Society. The Committee Chairs serve at the pleasure of the President. Which committee or Division chairs should routinely be invited to the BOG meetings? <u>Note, the Program Chair, CE Chair and Awards Chair have duties at the Conference and are expected to attend the conference, but not necessarily the BOG meetings unless requested.</u> The JINS Editor has business with Cambridge University Press and Associate Editors at the annual North American meeting, but is not required to be at the BOG unless requested.</p>

		<p><u>Discussion and input from the BOG.</u> Dr. Yeates to advise regarding the 2018 Prague meeting.</p> <p>Motion: Move that the Chairs of the six newly organized superordinate committees proposed in #6 above be automatically invited to the annual North American and annual Midyear BOG meetings, and that the chairs of other committees will be invited to the BOG meetings on an as needed basis at the discretion of the INS President.</p> <p>MINUTES: As a continuation of the prior agenda item on governance and committee structure, M. Kopelman made the formal motion about committee chair attendance at INS Board meetings.</p> <p>Motion 7: Move that the Chairs of the six newly organized superordinate committees proposed in #6 above be automatically invited to the annual North American and annual Midyear BOG meetings, and that the chairs of other committees will be invited to the BOG meetings on an as needed basis at the discretion of the INS President.</p> <p>Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by K. Yeates Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
8		<p>Executive Director Report (Chelune)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Update on office staffing Update on Executive Director Search (Kopelman, Yeates, Anderson, Hermann, McCrea and Chelune) Nominating Committee for 2019 Elections (Chelune) Reminder that Past-President chairs the committee and selects one additional person to serve on the committee. The President, Incoming President, and President-Elect each also a person to serve on the committee. Executive Director serves ex-officio. Update on contractual arrangements with Guarant International to serve as PCO for the 2019 Rio meeting and 2020 Vienna meeting (10% discount). Budget Request: approval to transfer some of the Matthews funds to provide translation services in Portuguese and Spanish to support of the educational mission at the Rio meeting (approximately \$5000). <p>Motion: Move that up to \$5000 be used from the Matthews' funds to support translations services for the 2019 Rio meeting to facilitate the educational mission of the scientific program</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Policy for INS Official Business Travel (see Addendum 5): On occasion INS is asked to participate in various meetings of interest to the mission of the Society. In these cases, an INS member is asked by the INS leadership to travel on behalf of the Society as its official representative. Such travel is different than that for attending the Board of Governors meeting, and specific travel reimbursement policies have been developed such that traveler is not responsible for

		<p>reasonable out-of-pocket expenses as described in Addendum 5. The traveler will be responsible for completing and submitting an Expense Form upon completion of the Official Business Travel.</p> <p>b. Policy for adjudicating Elections in the case of a tied vote: In rare circumstances, an INS Election could end in a tied vote. In such cases, the INS Board of Governors will be asked to vote between the two tied candidates. Should the vote of the BOG also end in a tie, the matter will be referred to the five INS Officers (President, Incoming President, President-Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary), who determine the winner by vote of the officers.</p> <p>Motion: Move that in the case of a tie between two candidates running for an INS elected office, the BOG will attempt to break the tie by vote of its members; should the vote of the BOG result in a tie, the INS Officers (President, Incoming President, President-Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary) will determine the winner by vote of the officers.</p> <p>MINUTES: G. Chelune provided an update on INS office operations. A search is underway for the new ED to replace G. Chelune. Several people have expressed interest in the ED position and may formally apply. M. Kopelman will chair the ED search committee.</p> <p>The website revision continues in process. The INS office has been working with a meeting planning agency for the Prague meeting in Summer, 2018. Simultaneous translation services are being explored for the 2019 meeting in Brazil. The service is costly, so revenue sources to cover the cost are being explored, along with the overall impact on the conference financials. The prospect of using the Matthews Fund or other revenue sources was a topic of discussion. Several members discussed their experience from prior meetings with real time translation and costs.</p> <p>There was also discussion of the scenario of potential tie in INS elections. The motion as supported and submitted.</p> <p>In addition, G. Chelune updated the Board on the revised plan for supporting travel by individuals delegated by INS to travel to meeting representing INS. There was support from the Board for this consideration.</p> <p>Motion 8: Move that up to \$10,000 in INS funds be used to support translations services for the 2019 Rio meeting to facilitate the educational mission of the scientific program. Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by K. Yeates Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p>Motion 9: Move that, operationally, in the case of a tie between two candidates running for an INS elected office, the BOG will attempt to break the tie by vote of its members; should the vote of the BOG result in a tie, the INS Officers (President, Incoming President,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>President-Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary) will determine the winner by vote of the officers. Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by Y. Suchy Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
9		<p>Transition Plan for ED and Treasurer (Kopelman, Chelune & Hermann) Both the ED and Treasurer are set to complete their respective terms at the end of the 2019 NYC meeting. It is potentially disruptive to have both positions rotate at the same time.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> how to best to develop a transition plan? Ask the Treasurer to serve a sixth year (Bylaws allow the BOG to extend the Treasurers term without vote; have the Treasurer-Elect begin the transition immediately after the election, create a Past-Treasurer position? The ED can begin transitioning with the new ED as soon as selected and/or the current ED can extend for a period of time until the new ED is up to speed. Transition budgets will be needed for both positions to allow meetings between the incoming and exiting personnel.</p> <p>MINUTES: G. Chelune provided an overview of the transition plan for the ED (2019) and treasurer (2019); there is consideration of B. Hermann extending his term as treasurer, facilitating the transition to the new treasurer. K. Yeates proposed a formal motion to extend the term</p> <p>Motion 10: Move to extend B. Hermann's term as treasurer for an additional year. Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by V. Anderson Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p>LUNCH BREAK: 12:30-1:30</p>
		<p>M. Kopelman reconvened the Board at 1:35 pm ET. Committee chairs and guests joined the afternoon session of the board meeting.</p> <p>S. McClintock provided an overview of the Washington, DC program and the board applauded his efforts in assembling an outstanding meeting.</p>
10		<p>Operations (Effectiveness) Ad Hoc committee (Norman)</p> <p><u>Discussion of the Website Re-design:</u> The office has been hampered by the slow development of the new web site. Rampart, the INS web design company, has been behind on the signed contract. They have been paid the total amount of the signed contract, but the work has not yet been completed. Rampart requested additional funds to complete the work - \$18,000. They believe they underbid the project by 50% (they think they should have doubled bid), and they acknowledge not appreciating the work complexity or scope. The INS and Rampart agree that they have caused some delays, however, Rampart has been the main issue: <u>Option 1:</u></p>

		<p>a. Have Rampart complete the contract at the pre-agreed upon rate. Comment: We do not believe this is a solution in best interest of INS.</p> <p>b. Rampart to complete the entire agreed contract, paying the additional \$18,000; however, an addendum will stipulate specific targets and dates. Payments will be made for reaching specific milestones by specific dates.</p> <p><u>Option 2:</u></p> <p>a. Rampart will partially complete the agreed upon contract, and the remainder will be completed by an <i>external</i> vendor. Specific targets will be agreed upon, focusing on INS priorities. Certain tasks are best suited to Rampart and not another person / company to complete.</p> <p>b. Hire outside firm to complete the remainder of the contract Comment: This may increase the cost because a new contractor will need to get up to speed.</p> <p>c. Rampart will partially complete the agreed upon contract, and the remainder will be completed <i>internally</i> (i.e., Davis).</p> <p>MINUTES: M. Norman provided an update on INS operations, including the remodeled INS website. The website revision has been led by an outside agency (Rampart) and INS office staff. M. Norman applauded the efforts of INS staff in this work, which streamlined workflow and reduced overall costs of the project. See M. Norman's summary statements above with respect to the website work and the Rampart engagement. Of the options outlined above, we have elected option 1(b), going forward. Costs for website maintenance are included in the approved INS budget.</p>
11		<p>Science Ad Hoc Committee</p> <p>a. Request BOG 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. Goal would be to offer awards beginning with Feb 2019 INS meeting.</p> <p>Progress Since Last Report: 1) Continued discussions about travel grants. 2) Developed tentative proposal:</p> <p>Award travel grants to (1) trainees (undergrad or grad students/interns) and (2) early career individuals (postdocs or within 5 years of terminal degree). Two awards for each category for both meetings (total 8 X \$1500 = \$12,000). Awards would include reimbursement of up to \$1500 for travel and hotel costs, waiver for meeting registration fees and attendance at one CE course (approximately \$3000). Awards will be based on required and optional criteria (see below) as well as abstract submission scores provided by the program committee. Required criteria: accepted presentation at INS meeting, trainee or early career status. Optional criteria used in decision making: preference given to individuals from underrepresented/ developing/low & middle income countries, first-</p>

		<p>time attendees, members who have accepted Oral presentations, expressed financial need. Preference could be granted to non-North American members for North American meeting, and North, Central, and South American members for the mid-year meeting.</p> <p>Plan for selection process: request INS abstract submission page include a checkbox for individuals to indicate an interest in being considered for a travel grant; review a brief application querying the required and optional criteria; review scores of the top scoring abstracts; offer award.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Motion: Move to allocate \$15,000 per year to support individual travel grants for 8 individuals (\$1500 each in addition to registration waiver and cost of 1 CE course at an approximate additional cost of \$350 each), 2 at the trainee level and 2 at the early career level for each of the 2 INS meetings.</p> <p>MINUTES: Holly Miskey is chair of the Science Committee, but is not able to attend the meeting, so K. Yeates provided a committee report. K. Yeates reported on the current state of Special Interest Groups (SIG), including two groups (epilepsy and neuro-oncology) meeting at this INS meeting, and two additional groups currently taking form.</p> <p>K. Yeates also presented a proposal for funding to support travel awards for individuals to attend the two annual INS meetings. The process to evaluate and select travel grant award winners was discussed.</p> <p>Motion 11: Move to allocate \$15,000 per year to support individual travel grants for 8 individuals (\$1500 each in addition to registration waiver and cost of 1 CE course at an approximate additional cost of \$350 each), 2 at the trainee level and 2 at the early career level for each of the 2 INS meetings for the next 3 years.</p> <p>Motion by K. Yeates</p> <p>Seconded by A. Fernandez</p> <p>Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>
12		<p>Membership Ad Hoc Committee</p> <p>MINUTES: Y. Suchy reported that there was no new business to report from the Membership Ad Hoc Committee. Future initiatives of the committee will focus on ways to make members more aware of the benefits of membership, which will serve our goals toward member retention and increasing membership. Also, the new tiered membership dues program is now in effect, which will hopefully help to increase membership from lower income countries.</p>
13		<p>Education Ad Hoc Committee (DeLuca)</p> <p><u>Strategy 2A:</u> Re-engineer the INS website as an overarching framework to distribute information and educational material regarding neuropsychological science.</p> <p>Current progress:</p>

- Dr. Cobia has been working with the INS office on how to implement educational content on the new website, particularly how it is presented and accessed by members. The new INS website launched fall 2017, but has still experienced some delay in deployment of various features. Dr. Cobia has reviewed its design and structure, and consulted with the INS office on reasonable timelines for developing new features. Currently, decisions are being made about what to include on the website outside of CEs, and whether to host directly versus via another service.
- A preliminary review of other society/association and science-based websites has been conducted. There is a wide variety of content, format and availability including blogs, CE opportunities, clinical tools, meeting slides/notes/recordings, and social media endeavors. Each of these appear designed to accomplish the various mission of each group.

Future plans and action items to accomplish by July 2018:

- Determining the type and kind of educational materials to be promoted and distributed on the website.
 - Action: The Education Task Force will have a proposal in place for review during the INS mid-year meeting regarding the educational content to be distributed via the website.
 - Feasibility of implementing the above proposal.
 - Action: Dr. Cobia will work with the INS office to assess the time and resource commitment needed to implement various types of educational content. The current development schedule is limited in its ability to focus on 2nd/3rd tier efforts.

Strategy 2E: Develop special educational programs for early career members.

Questions that need input:

- a. What metric should we use to determine success of the project? How do we obtain data regarding # times videos are viewed?
- b. Last year many interviewees were only granted temporary viewing access. Should we provide copies for each of them on a thumb drive?
- c. Should INS membership be polled re: people they would like to see in future interviews?

MINUTES: J. DeLuca provided an update on activities of the Education Committee. Two main strategies have been worked on by the committee. First, the website has been leveraged to showcase and disseminate education material on neuropsychological science. Dr. Cobia has been instrumental in this work. Second, the committee continues to work on conducting personal video interviews with key figures in the history of neuropsychology. Another 8 interviews will be conducted here at the INS meeting in Washington, DC; interviewees will be Michael Kopleman, Jason Brandt, Rus Bauer, Sandra Weintraub, Marilyn Albert, Ken Adams, Kathy Haaland, and Leslie Gonzales-Rothi. M. O'Connor, new INS president elect, has been instrumental to this work.

		<p>There was also discussion on strategies to maximize viewership and access to these video interviews. We also discussed future prospects for video interviewees and interviewers to maximize the scope and impact of the initiative. One option is for interviews to be conducted locally at the home academic institution of the individual, which could facilitate more interviews and significantly reduce costs of the video interview. The website revision work is also critical to hosting of and access to the archived videos. Various issues on internet access, business model, etc. related to the video interview initiative were discussed. There was consideration of a “hybrid” model, in which there are short clips that the public can access and full length videos for INS members.</p> <p>There was also discussion of other efforts from the Education Committee to link the INS website (bi-directionally) with other online resources related to neurosciences and neuropsychology. Overall, these efforts are all targeted at the mission to elevate the profile of neuropsychology in the scientific community and public at large. S. Rao offered to contact Frontiers for Young Minds to explore ideas.</p>
14		<p>Conflict of Interest Committee (Arnett)</p> <p>Note: Key questions for the BOG to consider are set out in italics below.</p> <p>--NAN indicates \$250 as the threshold for reportable compensation that could constitute a COI, and Division 40 indicates \$500.</p> <p>--Item for BOG consideration: We’re inclined to go with the latter to raise the threshold so that we can go with the light touch suggested by our current and incoming INS presidents. With that said, it will be important to run this by any legal consultants of INS to make sure that this is legitimate.</p> <p>--In the NAN policy, it is suggested that disclosures initially go to the Executive Director of NAN.</p> <p>--Item for BOG consideration: We’ve left things this way in the suggested INS policy, but would it make more sense for these to go directly to the chair of the Nominations Committee? Should the Nominations committee advise the Executive Director (or should that be the president)? We were unclear on what would be most appropriate and would ask for the Board’s guidance here.</p> <p>--Item for BOG consideration: In discussing this, we will need to consider making the review of COI forms a formal duty of the Nominations Committee. An alternative would be to create a COI Committee to do these reviews, so that disclosures could go through that committee, if it seemed like too much to add to the Nominations Committee responsibilities.</p> <p>--For the INS policy, we mostly took the wording directly from the NAN policy, with a few tweaks here and there. It seemed to be put together more systematically and coherently than the Division 40 policy, though the issues addressed were very similar across policies.</p>

--Item for BOG consideration: Is there any problem with lifting this wording directly from existing policies? We assume we could simply indicate this when putting forth the policy, but we're not sure of the legal issues involved here, so we might need some input from legal consultants associated with INS.

--Necessary to provide lists of INS vendors? One part of the policy states that, "To assist INS leaders with disclosure reporting, the INS office will maintain, regularly update, and periodically distribute to INS leaders a list of current INS vendors. However, an INS leader's responsibility to report relationships will not be confined or limited to vendors represented on this list."

--Item for BOG consideration: Do we really need this, or can we simply rely on the good judgment of our leaders and potential leaders to make this determination? In part this would depend on how difficult it would be to maintain, regularly update, and periodically distribute this list. If it is not that big of a deal to do, then why not provide it? Would be more transparent for all that way. But if this creates a very large burden, then perhaps the honor system would be good enough.

--Necessary to have candidates for INS offices submit COI forms? Right now, consistent with what the NAN policy had, we have included this. However, will this be too cumbersome, and is it really needed?

--Item for BOG consideration: As a committee, we were leaning toward including this, as it also may help candidates consider this before or during running for leadership positions in case they recognize too large a COI to continue running. And this would also help them think through when they would be publicly stating their approach to issues in field, their goals in their leadership positions – to minimize the degree to which their agendas might be driven by possible COI.

--Reporting of ongoing or completed investigations:

--Item for BOG consideration: Should we add something to the form to address whether the person is under any sort of ongoing investigation for ethical or other issues, or whether there is a completed investigation? If the latter, we assume that they should be required to report what the outcome of that investigation was. How should this information be treated if they endorse something? Should the membership be informed? We assume this would only be the case if the person actually decided to run for something, not if they decided to withdraw their nomination.

There may be legal issues involved here, as well. If a person has, for example, been accused of something like sexual harassment and is being investigated (and this is reported on the INS website) and then they are later exonerated, there could be harm involved to that person for simply disclosing that they were being investigated. The person could make that determination themselves and decide not to run for whatever position they were considering, but what if the person

		<p>did run and decided later that they were harmed by simply having to report being investigated and this was made public by INS?</p> <p>--Other Issues:</p> <p>--Item for BOG consideration: How should the fact that people being considered for office have completed a COI be made known? Should this be made publically available on the INS website? Should this information routinely be included in candidate statements, for example?</p> <p>--Item for BOG consideration (raised above, as well): What committee is going to review COI forms? Presumably this would be the Nominations Committee, instead of creating a whole new COI committee, but this could add to the committee's work burden considerably. It could initially be added on as a responsibility, but if it was considered to be too burdensome over time, then a new committee could be formed.</p> <p>--Item for BOG consideration: Should those <i>appointed</i> to positions (rather than elected) also have to complete a COI, before being considered? Presumably this should be the case, but this should be stated directly in the policy and on the form.</p> <p>Item for BOG consideration: Dual Relationships, i.e., holding elected or appointed positions in other membership organizations.</p> <p>MINUTES: P. Arnett provided an update on activities of the Conflict of Interest (Col) Committee. He provided context and background on the creation of the newly-formed Col Committee. Members include P. Arnett, M. van Zandvoort, Frank Hillary and Julie Suhr. The committee has been working on policies and procedures related to Col. It was discussed that a formal INS Col policy was reviewed and unanimously approved at the INS Board meeting in New Orleans in 2017. The function of the Col Committee in reviewing and rendering determination of Col disclosures by INS election nominees and others was discussed. This review of Col would be done in advance of election slates being set, and on an annual basis for current INS Board members, Committee chairs and staff. This process for new nominations will be coordinated with the work flow and timeline of the Nominations Committee. A modified version of the form developed by the Col Committee to align with the approved Col policy will be implemented prior to the 2018 INS election, and will be implemented for current INS Board members, Committee chairs and staff to complete annually.</p>
15		<p>Program Committee Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Washington DC (McClintock) b. Prague, Czech Republic (Yana Suchy) c. New York (Yeates) d. Rio de Janeiro (Chelune) <p>MINUTES: S. McClintock updated the group on the current INS meeting. The Board commented on the outstanding program and applauded S. McClintock for</p>

	<p>his efforts. Y. Suchy updated the Board on the Prague meeting. The program is shaping up nicely with invited lecturers, keynote addresses, etc. Please see the assent agenda for more details on the specific speakers and program for Prague. Y. Suchy also discussed outreach to other organization with whom INS has affiliations or alignment to promote the Prague meetings, which is a model for future mid-year meetings, as well. K. Yeates reported that he and Michael Kirkwood have been working on developing the program for the New York meeting. Several high profile scientific speakers have been invited and accepted to deliver lectures at the New York meeting. They are looking to expand the panel of international speakers for the New York Meeting. G. Chelune reported that progress is being made in planning the Rio mid-year meeting in 2019. Organizational and logistical details are being worked through. INS is discussing details with other organizations who have led highly successful neuropsychology meetings in South America in recent years. More information will follow.</p>
16	<p>CE Committee (Raul Gonzalez) – Introduction to incoming Chair, Melissa Lamar</p> <p>MINUTES: R. Gonzales informed the Board that his term as Program Committee Chair is ending and Melissa Lamar will be taking on the new role. No further updates were discussed.</p>
17	<p>Publications and Communications (Manly)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Propose process for JINS Editor review committee 2. Request for small budget for Publications to consult with us and improve interactive capabilities of newsletter via the website. I anticipate this will be less than \$2000. <p>Motion: Move that a new, one-time allocation of up to \$2000 be made to the INS Publications and Communications Committee for consultant time to enhance the interactive capacities of the <i>INS Newsletter</i> on the INS website</p> <p>MINUTES: J. Manly provided an update on activities of the Publications and Communications Committee. One topic discussed was the idea of creating a formal process for conducting a performance review of the JINS editor, which is common among other scientific journals. J. Manley gave an overview of a proposed process and criteria for the review. S. Rao, current JINS editor, proposed a motion for this topic. There was discussion of the content, criteria, scope of the review. There was also expanded discussion by the Board about the importance of formally reviewing the official INS journal, JINS, on a regular basis to ensure alignment of the journal and its direction with the overall mission and strategic priorities of INS. Separately, the motion for request of \$2,000 for the INS Newsletter was withdrawn.</p> <p>Motion 12: To create a formal process for the INS Publications and Communications Committee to conduct a review of JINS and the JINS editor every 5 years. Motion by M. Kopelman Seconded by K. Yeates Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed.</p>

18	<p>Student Liaison Committee (McCurdy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduction of new North American SLC Co-Chair b. Proposed Bylaws Amendment: SLC Co-Chair position & structure (alternating North American/Non-North American, 1 year term) <u>Presentation of Rationale and Discussion</u> c. <u>Discussion</u>: SLC Co-Chair appointment, limited international applicants <p>MINUTES: M. McCurdy provided an update from the SLC. There was discussion of possibly amending the bylaws to restructure the SLC chair role and criteria. This was deferred based on the approval this morning of new co-chairs of the SLC. There was discussion of the term of the SLC chairs being confined to their time as students/trainees. See the report for more details on work of the SLC.</p>
19	<p>INS Awards Committee (Kessels)</p> <p>MINUTES: R. Kessels provided an update on activities of the Awards Committee. Nominations for next year awards are being solicited. In the past, a limited number of nominations have been submitted for INS awards. Strategies to increase nominations for all INS awards were discussed, along the process for submitting nominations itself.</p>
20	<p>International Liaison Committee (Evans)</p> <p>MINUTES: J. Evans provided an update from the ILC, in addition to his submitted report. ILC represented INS at meetings in meetings in Calcutta and Chile. These events were well received and at relatively low cost to INS. ILC is exploring workshops on neuropsychology-related topics, in conjunction with Matthews Fund. See the report for more details on work of the ILC.</p>
21	<p>Follow-up from Cape Town on Re-branding of the annual INS Midyear Meeting to elevate its status (Kopelman).</p> <p>MINUTES: M. Kopelman provided background and context on this agenda item from prior Board meetings. M. Kopelman called for input from North American and non-North American board members for their input. There was discussion about a number of proposals for rebranding the two meetings each year. B. Hermann proposed allocating a small amount of financial resource to engage an advertisement/branding agency to help us resolve the issue.</p> <p>Motion 13: To rebrand the INS meetings based on their year and location (e.g., “the 2018 INS Meeting, Washington, DC” and “the 2018 INS Meeting, Prague”) Motion by M. van Zandvoort Seconded by J. DeLuca Motion approved; 12 in favor, 2 opposed.</p>

22		<p>Update on Interorganizational Relationships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. National Academy of Sciences workshop on US Psychological Sciences in a Globalizing World (Yeates & Vasterling) b. NAN Summit on Population Health Studies for Assessing Cognitive Impairment in Geriatric Patients c. Memo of Understanding with College of Clinical Neuropsychology (Australia) d. Australasian Society for the Study of Brain Impairment (ASSBI) ?? MOU e. Prague Program outreach for organization-sponsored symposia (FESN, ALAN, SLAN, CCN, ASSBI, ICCTF, CMPS) <p><u>MINUTES:</u> M. Kopelman updated the Board on current, pending or developing MOU's and affiliation partnerships with the organizations listed above.</p>
23		<p>Approval of New Budget Allocations (Hermann)</p> <p><u>MINUTES:</u> As per the agenda items and board actions outlined above, B. Hermann reported that \$10,000 will be budgeted for real time translation services at the Rio meeting, and \$15,000 per year for the next three years will be budgeted for INS travel awards. See item 11 above (Science ad hoc committee)</p>
24		<p>New Business (Kopelman)</p> <p><u>MINUTES:</u> No new business items were submitted.</p>

Adjourn

Meeting Adjourned at: 5:10 pm ET

Submitted by Michael McCrea, PhD, INS Secretary