

International Neuropsychological Society

Board of Directors Meeting

October 26/27, 2021

Present:

Officers: Skye McDonald (President), Ida Sue Baron (Incoming President), Jonathan Evans (President-Elect), Ozioma Okonkwo (Treasurer), Alberto Luis Fernandez (Secretary), Marc Norman (Executive Director – Ex Officio)

Members at Large: Juan Carlos Arango Lasprilla, Desiree Byrd, Robin Green, Fiona Kumfor, Sallie Baxendale, Sanne Schagen

Visitors: Margaret O'Connor

Absent: Glenn Smith

1. Apologies

Marc Norman asked if the BOD has a position about doing a tribute to Muriel Lezak in the Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society. Kathy Haaland made the proposal and Stephen Rao asked if the BOD had a position since this did not happen before. Desiree Byrd said she supported the idea of leaving this as an editorial decision. Everybody on the BOD agreed with the idea.

2. Welcome

Skye McDonald welcomed all Board members.

3. Issues to be approved

Change to presidential slate

Skye McDonald addressed the Board with a summary of the issues leading up to the current consideration of changing the Presidential slate. She stated that the last president from a non-English speaking country was Alexander Castro-Caldas, more than 20 years ago. She emphasized that since INS is an international society this should be remedied. Although there have been candidates from non-English speaking countries over the years, members tend to vote for candidates from English speaking countries when these are running against candidates from non-English speaking countries. In addition, a generation of presidents has not been able to increase the participation of members from non-English speaking countries.

Skye McDonald also reminded the Board of the current principles that guide presidential nominee selection. First, the INS does not have any minimum criteria for the election of candidates and she suggested this should remain the case. Second, she reminded the Board that the nomination committee is independent from the BOD. This committee has discretion to select candidates.

The new proposed procedures to increase inclusivity would be: First, explicitly ask the memberships and international societies to propose candidates to assist the nomination committee in the selection process. Second, to increase the nominations from two to three candidates. Third is the consideration of the notion of region. The BOD can make strategic decisions about the definition of a region. Skye suggested that it would be USA first year, non-USA second year, and on the third year it could be from outside the anglosphere.

Skye emphasized that the current vote on this topic is about doing something tangible to become more diverse, to better represent international members of INS and to reduce the current bias.

Juan Carlos Arango asked if the discussion included in the emails could be included in the minutes. Skye McDonald agreed that they could be included (see Appendix to the minutes). He agreed in being more inclusive but insisted that this procedure will not be helpful in this regard.

Ida Sue Baron said that she had 3 concerns: 1) membership is not a requirement, and because long standing INS members have not been nominated, she would like that the long-term members are given the first chance, 2) since INS is a non-for-profit corporation the BOD cannot change the bylaws, and the issues in this proposal are changing them, this should be voted by the members. Ida Sue Baron stated that the issues that are in conflict with the current bylaws are: 1) changing the election cycle to three years, 2) changing the next cycle which is currently for North America; 3) increasing the numbers of candidates from two to three.

Skye McDonald responded that these issues are not in the by-laws so there is no need for a by-law change. According to her these are simple procedures. Marc Norman affirmed that these issues are not included in the bylaws.

Ozioma Okonkwo agreed in increasing the diversity, however he raised a concern that the candidates need to be prepared to take on this role, that is why he thinks the candidates should be INS members. He proposed that they start by being members-at-large before being nominated for president.

Sarah MacPherson agreed on increasing diversity. She asked what would happen if INS wanted to nominate candidates from a region and there were no candidates available.

Skye McDonald made clear that the proposal includes members from non-anglosphere regions. She said that there are many candidates that are prepared, including previous INS member who were nominated but were not elected.

Sanne Schagen said that she is in favor of the proposal. She said that being a part of the BOD was never a requirement to be nominated for president.

Shawn McClintock said that he was not sure about what means the opposition between non-USA vs USA. He said that the non-North American label might overlap with the non-anglosphere label in the same candidate.

Juan Carlos Arango asked how India should be considered since English is one of the official languages. He asked for more clarification about the procedures.

Desiree Byrd said that the new procedure is not about appointing a president but changing the nomination procedure.

Margaret O'Connor asked about the candidates from countries in which there are few INS members. She proposed that the third-year election is labeled "countries with less representation" instead of English-speaking vs non-English speaking countries. Skye McDonald agreed with this proposal.

- A. Presidential slate selection

MOTION: Skye McDonald. To vote to change the presidential election procedure to be more inclusive with members from countries with less representation.

SECOND: Jonathan Evans

Results: 11 votes in favor and 1 vote against.

Ida Sue Baron asked that Marc Norman review the bylaws with a lawyer.

- B. COVID protocol for New Orleans

MOTION: Skye McDonald. To approve the COVID protocol for New Orleans

Robin Green asked if this is mandated or if this is a recommendation. Skye said that it would be encouraged but not mandated. Robin asked if this could be mandatory. It was agreed that it would be a recommendation and that members should be informed about the policies of the hotel, the city and the state.

SECOND: Shawn McClintock

Results: all in favor

- C. Special projects procedure

MOTION: Skye McDonald. To approve the INS Special Projects Funding Procedure

SECOND: Desiree Byrd

Results: all in favor

- D. New Mathews fund initiative

MOTION: Skye McDonald. To approve the new Charles Mathews fund initiative.

Juan Carlos Arango asked if candidates from high income countries can apply. Jonathan Evans answered that in the past these funds were targeted at countries in which neuropsychology is less well developed with the priority for low-middle income countries.

SECOND: Shawn McClintock

Results: all in favor

- E. New Education Chair

Move: To appoint Sarah McPherson as the new chair of the Education committee.

Sara MacPherson was moved to the waiting room for this voting. Ida Sue Baron wanted to thank Derin Cobia for his work and cooperation during his term and she supports the nomination of Sarah McPherson. Ida Sue Baron also made clear that Sarah's term would be starting in next February when Derin Cobia's term is finishing.

Second: Sallie Baxendale

Results: all in favor

4. NOLA program chairs to raise donations for hurricane relief.

Skye McDonald noted that INS should help raise donations anywhere the conferences are organized. Desiree Byrd agreed with this idea. Ida Sue Baron said that this should be announced to the members. Skye McDonald said this should be announced at the conference. Sallie Baxendale asked how the decision would be made on what cause should be supported in the case that there is more than one possible cause to support. Marc Norman said that there are many options to organize these procedures and they should be further discussed.

MOTION: Skye McDonald. The BOD supports the request to collect donations for New Orleans hurricane victims and also would like to carry forward to all future meetings and to help coordinate the money collection.

SECOND: Robin Green

All in favor.

5. Collaboration between the International Cancer and Cognition Task Force and INS 2023 meeting in San Diego with view to future MOU.

This item was deferred.

6. Executive Director's report

The contracts for the San Diego meeting are already signed. The Barcelona contract is on the process to be signed. Ozioma Okonkwo has done a very good job working with the bookkeeper. As a result of this work, it is expected that the accounting system is more accurate from now on.

7. SIGs awards

Marc Norman reminded about this point and asked the BOD members to think in advance. Skye McDonald asked if this is something the BOD should decide before February.

8. Naming of Life-time achievement award (in the category of service, education or research).

This item was deferred.

9. MOUs: Strategic role of Board in choosing MOUs

This item was deferred.

Appendix

(THE FOLLOWING TEXT IN RED FONT IS THE COPY OF THE EMAIL EXCHANGE ABOUT THE CHANGE TO PRESIDENTIAL SLATE WHICH JUAN CARLOS ARANGO REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED)

Dear all

I thank Juan for coming forward with his reasons for not voting for this proposal. Ida Sue has also stated that she is unsure how she will vote. In the hope that we can resolve issues in a way that increases Board unison, I have allocated a small amount of time in the very packed meeting next week to address any major obstacles to this proposal.

Because the meeting is packed, could Board members really think about whether the concept of having every third year devoted to finding Presidential nominees from non-English speaking regions is something they agree with, or not. The details of the plan that we have collaboratively and thoughtfully constructed can be finessed later to ensure they are fit for purpose.

What I will say about details, some of which are questioned by Juan below, is that we need to be very careful that we do not design a different, more difficult standard for Presidents from non ESB regions than we currently apply to those from North America and (predominantly) Anglo Saxon countries. For example, there are no minimum criteria for accepting nominations from the USA/UK etc. and this includes INS membership.

Best wishes

Skye

Skye McDonald
Professor Clinical Neuropsychology
UNSW Psychology
Room 1011, Level 11, Mathews Building
UNSW SYDNEY 2052
E: s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au
W: <http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/Users/Smcdonald/>
President

From: Juan Arango <jcalasprilla@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 18 October 2021 6:11 PM

To: Ida Sue Baron <idasuebaron@email.gwu.edu>; Skye McDonald <s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au>; bod@the-ins.org; Margaret O'Connor <moconnor42@bwh.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: Presidential elections

Dear Board Members,

Skye, thank you for the additional details provided in response to the points raised. Right now, I'm leaning towards voting against the proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposal is very important for the organization and it is, in the current form, not sufficiently detailed or clear.
- 2) The approach to "regional" representation is flawed, primarily because the definition of region, and its corresponding representatives, is too vague.
- 3) The current proposal has the potential to be discriminatory because there are no clear minimum criteria for being nominated and no clear criteria for meeting Board acceptability for candidacy.
- 4) Potential conflicts of interest are not adequately addressed in the current proposal.
- 5) If this current proposal was designed to increase cultural diversity in INS, I am not convinced that such an outcome will result from its implementation in the way the proposal is currently specified. In fact, it runs the risk of alienating current members who have made, and continue to make, important contributions to the organization and its goals. Yet, these members may be overlooked for the presidency in favor of someone who is not even a member of INS.

Fortunately the next Board Meeting is scheduled at a more convenient time for me in Spain and I would be happy to discuss these points further. Regardless of the outcome of this vote, this proposal cannot be the only solution to increasing cultural diversity within INS. We need to have specific actions to increase and retain international membership, and allow members' voices to be heard within the INS.

Juan

El vie, 15 oct 2021 a las 13:17, Ida Sue Baron (<idasuebaron@email.gwu.edu>) escribió:

Dear Skye and INS BOD members,

As I already wrote, this conversation is best held in person at our Board meeting. Thus, a short response.

First, thank you Skye for your response. And, thank you Juan for responding to Skye's request. You make important points about the proposed process, which should be discussed and resolved before a vote. I appreciate your time, care, and, thoughtfulness about the implications of this proposal for INS membership and future governance.

Second, I brought up the point about the diversity of membership to illustrate the issue that we need focus on why our Society has so few members in other countries. Finding INS Presidents from those countries was not the objective. Encouraging new members and regaining lost ones should be.

The objective of this proposal is laudatory; I fully support a better process. I look forward the discussion at the BOD meeting.

Respectfully,

Ida Sue

On Oct 15, 2021, at 12:12 AM, Skye McDonald <s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Juan

Thanks so much for this email. It is especially important given you were the one Board member unable to attend any of the meetings. Some of the issues you raise were discussed and others not so it's great to be able to think about them. My thoughts are as follows

Criteria for selection:

Criterion such as clinical vs research, English speaking, PhD, are not defined in our current processes. I prefer to keep it flexible. This also applies to defining "region". This is not intended as a hard and fast definition but simply an impetus for INS to focus on a particular area to try and expand presidential candidates. The INS Board will decide which 'region' and I believe it is their responsibility to do so. I agree there are many issues of diversity within INS that we can improve, but this proposal is specifically trying to increase cultural diversity.

Transparency of nomination committee:

The nomination committee (composed of representatives nominated by the Presidents) has always had the responsibility to select the final slate based on their judgement. This will not change under this proposal.

This proposal does, however, assist the nomination committee by asking regional societies, SIGs and the general membership to help identify potential candidates. This will increase the pool and reduces the risk of bias based on only selecting candidates known to the committee. As always the president will be elected based on member votes. Voting has traditionally been low and is certainly something that could be worked on.

Nomination directly from the membership

This has always been possible and shall continue to be so. In addition the By-laws state that if a member has 40 nominations they will be added to the slate (i.e. the nomination committee has no discretion). Sallie has reminded me of the important issue discussed that 40 votes is a prohibitively high bar. I agree and we should look at changing this but that will require a change to the by-laws so will need to be a separate issue.

Presidential nominee not required to be an INS member:

This was explicitly included due to feedback from both Margaret O'Connor (who chaired the last nomination committee) and Ida Sue (who provided oversight of where INS members come from). The fact is our membership in countries other than USA, UK, Australia, Canada is tiny. There are also esteemed people who once were members but no more. So selecting someone who is currently not a member (but would have to join obviously) is probably necessary to try to increase INS representation in other regions. The successful nominee would be on the Board for at least a year beforehand in order to learn the ropes.

As before, could anyone who is going to vote against this proposal please let us know ASAP and also the reasons

Best wishes

Skye

Skye McDonald
Professor Clinical Neuropsychology
UNSW Psychology

Room 1011, Level 11, Mathews Building
UNSW SYDNEY 2052
E: s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au
W: <http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/Users/Smcdonald/>
T: 02 9385 3029
President

From: Juan Arango <jcalasprilla@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, 14 October 2021 6:36 PM
To: Skye McDonald <s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au>
Cc: bod@the-ins.org; O'Connor, Margaret, Ph.D. <moconnor42@bwh.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: Presidential elections

Hi all,

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback on this. Apologies for the delay in reply. October is a busy month for me.

It would be helpful to clarify some potential issues that could arise from these new procedures. The more specific we can be a priori about the procedures, the better. For instance, here are some questions that come to mind. Once I see the responses, it will be easier to make up my mind on my vote:

1. Definition of "region". It seems complex to determine who is an appropriate representative of a region. Does this person need to have residency in the region? Does it need to be permanent residency? Does this person need to be a national of the country? I am thinking about a number of grey situations in which individuals living in one country might be very active in leading initiatives in another country. What region would they "belong to"? Another example might be someone who moves temporarily to a country and becomes an influencer in neuropsychology in that region. What region would they "belong to"?

2. Strategy for selecting Yr 3 president. It sounds like this strategy will change every three years and be decided by the board. The consequence of this is that the board members at the time may have undue influence over the process. Could the demographic profiling thresholds be more specific? What other mechanisms could be put into place to ensure avoidance of conflicts of interest?

3. Potential candidates - what are the minimum requirements for candidates? It is not clear what the minimum requirements are for candidates. There are many leaders in many regions who would make excellent INS presidents, but struggle with English communication. Do candidates need to have working knowledge of English, or can they participate with an interpreter? Do they need to have a PhD/PsyD? In many countries, being a neuropsychologist requires only bachelor's or master's degree. This should be clearly documented.

4. Potential candidates - INS membership not required. I was surprised to see that INS membership was not a requirement to be nominated. Given that the president leads and embodies the organization, it seems that INS membership should be required. Some organizations even require the president to have been a board member before assuming the presidency. Being a member shows some level of dedication to and knowledge of the organization, however some professionals in developing regions cannot afford membership, even if they are voted as president. What are the pros and cons of the minimum requirement to be an INS member?

5. Nomination selection. The criteria that will be used to determine the three potential candidates for presidency (if there are more than three candidates proposed) is not clear. If the selection of candidates is made by the nomination committee, the criteria on which the proposed candidates will be judged should be available to all interested candidates, in addition to the minimum requirements. Please specify.

6. Value of clinical vs. research experience. It is not clear the weight that will be placed on clinical vs. research experience in the selection of the candidates. Can you please clarify?

7. Diversity and equity. While I understand that these procedures were designed to target geographical diversity/equity, how will diversity and equity be ensured for women, individuals with disabilities, sexual orientation, etc.?

8. Clarification of the membership voting process. I assume that the three candidates are then voted on by the INS members and the individual with the most votes (not necessarily the majority of the votes) is declared the president. Is this correct?

These procedures may be an interesting proposal to address the lack of active international participation in INS. However, we should also be considering alternate procedures in which any member of the organization, regardless of region and background, has the possibility to be selected by the membership directly. We should think about the low percentage of member participation in voting procedures and the extent to which these procedures might help or hinder a member's decision to vote.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this conversation and I'm looking forward to hearing additional thoughts on these points.

Sincerely,

Juan

El jue, 14 oct 2021 a las 8:01, Skye McDonald (<s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au>) escribió:

Dear everyone,

I have not received any further comments, feedback etc., about this proposal which I sent last week. So I am presuming no one wanted any further changes. We will be voting to approve this procedure when we meet in a couple of weeks. If anyone is going to vote against this, could they please let us all know as soon as possible and let us know why.

Presidential election slate: proposal that

The election cycle is thus: Yr 1: USA, Yr 2: Other countries with majority INS membership more or less (Canada, UK, Australia, Mexico, some European countries); Yr 3: Other regions that INS wishes to target

The next election (2022) = Yr 3

The board decides on a strategy for selecting the President in Yr 3 with a focus on a particular region that meets INS' strategic goals.

Strategic goals may be guided, for example, by where the midyear meetings are coming up, or by examining membership profiles of INS committees and SIGS, as well as growth of membership in particular regions. The office could be asked to assist with this demographic profiling.

Strategic focus for Yr3 should be determined by the nomination committee and/or Executive committee with two options decided early in Yr 2 and presented to the board to vote beforehand.

Every nomination committee is tasked with finding three potential candidates that are 'matched' in terms of ESB or other relevant attributes to minimise voter bias, noting that INS membership is not a requirement

Each year there is a call for nominations that is general, but that, as a priority, societies in the relevant region/s are notified of the call

That we enlist the SIGS to nominate people from the relevant countries.

That as our first strategic priority we focus on Asia (India eastwards) to fit with our first meeting in Asia (Taiwan)

That the membership is notified of the change in alternation cycle with a focus on regions where we have less membership every third year via newsletter or other means

Best wishes

Skye

Skye McDonald
Professor Clinical Neuropsychology
UNSW Psychology
Room 1011, Level 11, Mathews Building
UNSW SYDNEY 2052
E: s.mcdonald@unsw.edu.au
W: <http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/Users/Smcdonald/>
T: 02 9385 3029
President