

NCB Preliminary Executive Committee Meeting

Marriott Inn Downtown – Des Moines, IA

Sunday March 9, 2014

3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. – Cedar Rapids Room

Executive Committee: Sue Blodgett (Presiding); Paula Davis (President-elect), Billy Fuller (Immediate Past President), Mark Boetel (Secretary-Treasurer), John Obrycki (ESA Governing Board Rep.), Erin Hodgson (At-large Member), Linda Mason (At-large Member), Bob Wright (At-large Member), and Kacie Athey (At-large Student Member). **Absent:** Billy Fuller, Linda Mason, and Kacie Athey.

Committee Chairs, Co-Chairs, Designees: Erin Hodgson (Local Arrangements), Matt O’Neal (Program), Ian MacRae (Nominating), Von Kaster (Audit), Gary Hein (Photo Salon), Debbie Finke (Student Awards), Kelly Tindall (Honorary Awards), Kelley Tilmon (Professional Awards), Phil Sloderbeck (BCE Educational Project Awards), Alice Harris (Student Affairs), Dan Young (Linnaean Games).

Absent: Phil Sloderbeck, Kelley Tilmon, Kelly Tindall, and Dan Young.

Invited Guests: Frank Zalom (ESA President), David Gammel (ESA Executive Director), and Jeff Bradshaw (Secretary-Treasurer-elect).

I. **Welcome / call to order – Sue Blodgett**

President Blodgett called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m., and thanked the group for attending.

II. **Introductions**

Attendees introduced themselves, and described their respective Branch/meeting roles.

III. **Approval of 2013 Final Executive Committee Minutes (Rapid City, SD) – Mark Boetel**

A. President Blodgett noted that Mark posted all four sets of minutes (i.e., Preliminary and Final Executive, and Preliminary and Final Business meeting) on the ESA website for review by the membership. She asked if there were any corrections or other comments.

B. Von Kaster mentioned that he believed he was listed as present in the Final Executive Committee meeting; however, he had not attended (*this was reviewed afterward, and the minutes had accurately reflected that Dr. Kaster was absent*).

C. Mark noted that he had made an error in a statement about onsite registration revenue within his Treasurer’s report in the Preliminary Executive Committee Meeting minutes. The sentence incorrectly stated “The estimated total registration revenue is \$4,330”. Mark will correct the statement by striking the word “total” and replacing it with “onsite”. The revised document will be posted online to replace the original. MOTION (Obrycki), SECONDED (Wright) to accept all four minutes documents as corrected. No further discussion occurred, and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. **Approval of minutes from Executive Committee/planning meeting minutes held at ESA annual meeting in Austin, TX – Sue Blodgett**

Sue distributed a hard copy of the minutes, requested the committee to review them for a few minutes, and asked if there were any suggested corrections. None were made. MOTION (Obrycki), SECONDED (Hodgson) to accept the minutes as presented. No discussion, and the motion passed by unanimous consent.

V. **Reports from ESA**

A. ESA President Frank Zalom

1. Science Policy Initiative

- a. The Governing Board (GB) approved the formation of a Science Policy Capability Committee at the ESA annual meeting in Austin.
- b. Each ESA section has nominated a representative to serve on the committee, and Rob Wiedenmann will serve as its GB representative.
- c. ESA retained Louis Burke Associates, a consulting firm that represents other societies interested in influencing public policy, to assist us with the process.
- d. Key objectives are to develop science policy statements for posting on the ESA website and to actively engage with policymakers at various levels of government on issues of importance to our membership.
- e. Policy statements developed by *ad hoc* committees will be proposed to the Science Policy Capability Committee, which will review them and then forward to the GB for official approval/adoption.
- f. Statements will also have some type of timeline, and be periodically reviewed.
- g. ESA is now publishing a periodical “Science Policy Newsletter” that provides timely updates to our membership.
- h. The Science Policy Fellows program was formally adopted by the GB.
 - i. Five fellows will be selected on a rotating basis for two- year terms.
 - ii. Fellows will receive training on policy advocacy and will attend policy hearings on Capitol Hill.
 - iii. The ultimate goal is to train young scientists on how to impactfully interact with policymakers.

2. 2014 ESA Annual Meeting (Portland, OR)

- a. The theme, “Grand Challenges Beyond our Horizons”, relates to key entomological challenges facing humans on our planet, and what we as entomologists can do to address them.
- b. This corresponds with our Science Policy agenda as well.
- c. An *ad hoc* committee has been formed to begin working on this.
- d. A website has been developed as a place where members can offer suggestions of major issues on which we can focus.
- e. The 2016 ICE meeting will be an excellent venue at which this initiative can be discussed and promoted.
- f. A symposium on this topic will also be offered at the Portland ESA meeting.

- g. Submissions are strong for the Portland meeting. Over 130 symposia have been accepted.
 - h. Over 3,000 attendees are expected for the meeting.
 - i. Portland will be an excellent venue for our meeting. The city is easy to navigate, and its Light Rail system includes a run from the airport to the hotel/convention center area.
 - j. Meeting registrants will be provided with Light Rail passes.
- B. ESA Executive Director David Gammel
- 1. ESA Central and the Governing Board are exploring the possibility of establishing a publishing partnership with one of the larger scientific journal publishing companies.
 - a. A candidate publisher has been identified, and ESA is in final contract negotiations with them.
 - b. The GB will need to approve a contract before the partnership can begin.
 - c. Benefits:
 - i. It will likely increase our publishing revenue, which has been steadily declining for several years.
 - ii. It will also dramatically expand the reach of our journals.
 - 2. 2016 International Congress of Entomology (ICE) meeting
 - a. Planning is well underway.
 - b. A website for the Congress was launched around March 1.
 - c. The goal was to start early to allow international travelers plenty of time for obtaining passports and visas, and making their travel plans early.
 - 3. Science Policy Initiative
 - a. Congress and the President recently approved the creation of the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research, which includes about \$200 M in research funding. Funds for proposed research must be matched (i.e., 50:50) by money from other sources.
 - b. A board is being formed to oversee that foundation, so it would be important for ESA to have representation on the board. Our consultant is helping us pursue it.
 - 4. ESA finances
 - a. The Society ended 2013 with about \$5.4 M in reserves, which was an increase of about \$500,000 from that in 2012.
 - b. Last year's record-setting attendance made the 2013 Annual Meeting very successful, and the meeting budget surplus helped increase our reserves.
 - c. Membership is at a 13-year high, so that is also helping generate revenue.
 - d. Our stock market portfolio also performed very well this past year.
 - 5. The Federal budget
 - a. The President's budget proposal was released in February.
 - b. ESA will be submitting commentary, supporting programs such as AFRI, NSF, and associated agencies.
 - c. Committees may invite people from ESA to provide testimony.

- d. On March 23rd, there will be a briefing on invasive species on Capitol Hill. Mike Roth (University of MD), Bob Nowierski (USDA-NIFA), and Floyd Shockley (Smithsonian) will be providing testimony.
- 6. Awards
 - a. The Entomological Foundation has recently been refocusing their core mission to mostly involve K-12 educational programming.
 - b. ESA and the Foundation have been in discussion about potentially moving some of the Foundation's more professionally oriented awards to ESA. To date, no agreement has been made.
 - c. ESA awards: we used a new website through Confex for managing award submissions this year. There were some problems, but we are working to address any issues on ESA Central's end of the process.
- C. Governing Board Representative John Obrycki
 - 1. The idea of going to a publishing partnership is probably an excellent opportunity.
 - 2. Philosophical questions: What is the role of our journals? Do we, as a society, wish to support our journals, or do we want the journals to support our society? We will be discussing this during GB meetings.
 - 3. This may be an excellent time to discuss page charges, open access fees, etc.
 COMMENT (Zalom): ESA has hired a consultant to assist with procuring and evaluating offers from potential publishing partners.
 QUESTION (Wright): Would we have the opportunity to add journals if the opportunity arose?
 (Gammel) That is an option. It may be valuable as we move forward, especially if entomologically oriented articles in some new cutting-edge area begin to flow to other journals in the future.
 QUESTION (O'Neal): Where is ESA with regard to Open Access fees?
 (Gammel) we are much lower than most other similar publishers, although our version is simply a PDF file posted on our website, which isn't truly the same as Open Access in the formal sense.

VI. **Budget Update – Mark Boetel**

- A. The audit committee did an outstanding job of thoroughly reviewing the audit report files.
- B. Two years ago, the Executive Committee approved a proposal by the Audit Committee to shift the audit reporting process to a calendar-year basis, rather than basing reports on the Branch meeting cycle. This is a very good fit, and it makes things much cleaner for maintaining records.
- C. Handout (Statement of Financial Position, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 2013):
 - 1. We had a very good year in 2013, as the Rapid City meeting final budget ended up at a little over \$35 in the black.
 - 2. The Branch savings account is mostly a maintenance account that is not used much, so it is maintained at a modest balance.

3. Our brokerage portfolio is comprised of 6 mutual funds that typically perform very well, even in lean years such as 2008. We lost \$762.48 in 2013; however, the funds appear to be doing very well in Q1 of 2014.
 4. One misleading item in the Statement is that it appears that our reserves went down by an additional \$2,500. That is not really the case. One of the 2012 Linnaean teams failed to cash their travel stipend check before the end of 2012. Thus, although it was not a component of the 2013 budget, it has to appear in the 2013 books.
 5. Total NCB assets are at \$83,060.67. Thus, our gradual "spend down" initiative may be going a little more gradually than preferred.
 6. The bottom line is that our Branch is in excellent financial standing.
- D. Handout (Working Budget for 2014 NCB meeting):
1. Registration has already reached our projected final number of meeting registrants (337), which is excellent news for the revenue side of our budget.
 2. Sponsorship revenue for this meeting (\$11,000) was slightly lower this year than that of the past couple of years.
 3. Program Enhancement Funds from ESA Central are about \$600 lower than in 2013, which mainly is a product of reduced attendance at the Rapid City meeting. An additional contributing factor was that other branches had higher attendance last year. Thus, they got a slightly larger percentage of the total amount from ESA.
 4. The budget projection, after all bills associated with the 2014 meeting have been paid, is for us to run a modest deficit of about \$775, which is very reasonable and in line with our spend-down goals.
 5. President Blodgett, Erin Hodgson, and Matt O'Neal, and their respective committee members did a good job of carefully adhering to a modest budget philosophy while planning what appears to be an excellent meeting.
 6. Large financial reserves are no longer necessary because we are covered for a meeting failure and for unanticipated liabilities by the ESA insurance policy.
 7. The Branch is not in the business of making money. Rather, it is to hold enriching scientific meetings that support the professional needs of our membership.
 8. The spend-down initiatives are all worthy of continuing, as they are all student-member oriented and, as such, are a good investment in the future of our Society.
 9. Total assets after bills have been paid are projected to be nearly \$84,000. That figure is slightly lower than it was about three years ago, so we are achieving some net reduction of our reserves; however, the rate at which it is going is quite slow.
- QUESTION (Bradshaw): Do you know what the cost of some of the awards, such as the student travel scholarships are, and do you have suggestions for how we can manage those expenses once we reach our targeted spend-down floor?
- (Boetel) The student travel scholarships run us about \$5,000 each year. It will be difficult to pull some of these opportunities back in the future, as the students have gotten accustomed to them and really appreciate them.
- COMMENT (Davis): The students do really appreciate the travel scholarships. We had over 40 applicants representing about 17 schools this year. We also had at least five undergraduates that applied for them this year.

COMMENT (Blodgett): We may want to consider making undergraduates a separate category for this. Another option would be to take the host institution out of the equation. No Iowa State students were awarded travel dollars for this meeting.

COMMENT (Davis): We also have repeat applicants among years, so another option could be to limit students to something like one travel scholarship per degree.

COMMENT (Boetel): In 2011, the Executive Committee approved increasing Linnaean team stipends from \$1,500 and \$1,000 for first and second place teams, respectively, to fully supporting both teams at \$2,500 each to attend the annual meeting. We also voted in 2011 to increase the Comstock and Graduate Student Scholarship prizes from \$500 to \$1,000 each in 2011). Student competition prizes were also increased in recent years, and they now cost us around \$7,500 to 8,000/yr.

COMMENT (Wright): Given that we have well over \$80,000 in reserves, the increased spending is certainly not out of line.

VII. **Committee Reports**

A. Audit – Von Kaster

1. The committee received the 2013 audit files last week, and all of our finances appear to be in good order.
2. The gradual spend-down of reserves that has been discussed during recent meetings is a good goal to have. However, we should probably discuss what the “floor” should be in this process.
3. The committee was unanimously of the opinion that Mark did a good job of organizing the audit files in a very succinct, easy-to-review, form.

COMMENT (Boetel): It would be prudent to establish a target floor for spending down, as was recommended by the Audit Committee. After a recent meeting, it became necessary to draw \$9500 out of our reserves to pay final hotel/convention center bills. Thus, the floor value should not be too low.

MOTION: (Boetel), SECOND (Obrycki) to establish a spend-down floor of \$40,000.

DISCUSSION:

(Obrycki) That amount appears to be a very reasonable figure.

(O’Neal) Should we establish a targeted rate per year for spending reserves down?

PEFs were not enough to have as many speakers as originally proposed this year.

(Boetel) That is disappointing, because the allocation of PEFs does not necessarily limit how much we spend on speakers. PEFs are used to support the overall meeting budget. In the future, it would be advisable for the Program Chair to be in close communication with the Secretary-Treasurer in case additional PEF support is needed for outside speakers.

No further discussion occurred, and the motion passed by unanimous consent.

B. Student Awards – Debbie Finke

1. The student competition will be run all day on Monday, rather than compressing it into the first half of the day, which has been the case for several years.
2. There were 27 poster submissions and 62 oral paper presentations entered. Totals of 30 judges and 6 alternates volunteered to assist with evaluating presentations.

3. It needs to be made clear on the Confex submission system that students are only allowed to enter one competition, either paper or poster, but not both.
COMMENT (Hodgson): In reviewing our governing documents and committee guidelines, no such rule was found.
COMMENT (Blodgett): Maybe Jeff B. and I can review the old submission instructions. If no such rule is located, we can make a motion and vote on it via email before the 2015 meeting.
4. There were three applicants for the NCB Graduate Student Scholarship Award. Lauren Diepenbrock will receive the award. There were also three applications for the Comstock Award, and Michael McCarville is the winner of that one.
5. Based on feedback from people that served on this committee in recent years, we put a link to the evaluation criteria on the NCB Awards webpage.
 - a. Some students are still failing to provide the information requested, which makes it difficult to evaluate the packets.
 - b. The committee would like to refine the list of evaluation criteria and potentially also revise what is required for a packet to be considered complete.
 - c. The committee would like to increase emphasis on CVs, and place less emphasis on recommendation/nomination letters in the future.
 - d. COMMENT (Blodgett): Your committee could come up with recommendations for revision, and the Executive Committee could review and vote on them.

C. Program – Matt O’Neal

1. There were 11 proposed symposia, and 10 were accepted. Five symposium organizers requested PEF support for external speakers. Two of them said that the amount allocated to them was insufficient to bring in some of the speakers they wanted to include.
2. Totals of 162 submitted papers and 54 poster presentations were submitted for this year’s meeting, and that included symposium presentations as well as student competition papers and posters.
3. As in past years, several students contacted the Program Chair and other Branch leaders, pleading to change their submitted presentation from regular to the student competition.
 - a. Some changes were allowed; however, some requests were made too late for the presentation to be reassigned.
 - b. This is frustrating, because the Confex system provides each submitter with a confirmation email stating how their presentation is classified. Co-authors also get this confirmation.
COMMENT (MacRae): This is a frequent problem that has persisted for several years. Maybe the confirmation emails from Confex could include something like “Confirmed –Student Competition submission” in the subject line.
COMMENT (Boetel): Confex could add a confirmation pop-up at the end of the submission process that the submitter would have to click on to confirm the classification of their presentation.

4. As mentioned by Debbie Finke, the student competition sessions will be run throughout the day on Monday, thus avoiding several concurrent sessions for it.
 - a. This should make it easier for attendees to view more of the student presentations they wish to see, and it will provide students with larger audiences.
 - b. It will also save the Branch some money this year, as we were able to have fewer, larger competition sessions.
5. It would be good if we could work more on inviting more of the smaller, local, non-land grant institutions to participate in and send students to the meeting.

COMMENTS (Blodgett and Obrycki): This was done this year, and many of the recent NCB presidents have made such invitations.

COMMENT (Boetel): In reviewing the registration database for this year's meeting, our Branch has actually gained some ESA memberships through these efforts, as we now have members from places like Augustana College, Luther College, and Nebraska-Kearney. Thus, these efforts are making a difference.

D. Nominating – Ian MacRae

1. Two candidates (Gary Brewer and Billy Fuller) are vying for Governing Board Representative.
2. Jeff Bradshaw was willing to run for Secretary-Treasurer, and is doing so unopposed.
3. There are two individuals (Frank Peairs and Jen White) running for At-large member of the Executive committee.
4. Despite contacting several people, the committee had problems getting a sufficient number of nominations for President-elect. Despite the efforts of our committee members and a few others in trying to convince people to run, we only have one candidate (Luis Cañas).

E. Honorary and Professional Awards Committees – Kelley Tilmon and Kelly Tindall

1. No reports were made.

DISCUSSION:

(Blodgett) We discussed the possibility of restructuring or combining these two committees during the 2013 Final Executive Committee Meeting. It would be helpful if we could discuss this further.

(Wright) Combining the committees could be quite burdensome to the individuals that lead such a combined committee in the future, as there are typically several applications for some of them.

(Blodgett) Maybe more of the process could be vetted through ESA Central. It would be helpful if we could at least form an *ad hoc* committee to maybe look at the whole process and structure to see if improvements could be made.

(Boetel) This may be something that the Immediate Past President and the President-elect could help with.

(Davis) The President-elect will be quite busy with repopulating committees for the subsequent meeting cycle.

(Blodgett) I will contact some of the past chairs of these committees to see if some of them could serve on an *ad hoc* committee to review the entire process and structure of these committees.

(Gammel) It may be helpful for you to identify a representative of the Executive Committee to serve as the single communication liaison between NCB and ESA Central.

(Boetel) This may be a good activity to task At-large members of the Executive Committee, as we have had discussions in the past about how they can better serve the needs of the Branch.

2. Sue will review all of this discussion and maybe contact some of the other branches, to come up with something for the Executive Committee to consider. It may be helpful to have an Executive Committee member serve as an awards “czar”, through which all awards communications between ESA and our Branch would be carried out.

F. Local Arrangements – Erin Hodgson

1. There already has been a lot of favorable feedback regarding the meeting.
2. A suggested timeline for carrying out Local Arrangements Committee (LAC) duties throughout the meeting planning cycle has been forwarded to 2015 LAC Chair, David Margolies.
3. The LAC guidelines have been updated to be more contemporary with regard to current technology (e.g., email, rather than postcard correspondence).
4. The Hexapod Scurry 6k run event is something new this year. It will take place on Wednesday morning. Thelma Heidel-Baker’s husband printed signage for the event and hosted the registration website. He will also go ahead of runners to make sure no one gets off track. Proceeds will be donated to the Entomological Foundation.

G. Student Affairs – Kacie Athey

No report.

H. Linnaean Games – Dan Young

No report.

I. Photo Salon – Tom Myers

VIII. **New Business:**

A. Sponsorship Levels – Mark Boetel

1. It would be helpful and, perhaps more fair to our donors, if we were to establish sponsorship levels for future NCB meeting fundraising.
2. Clearly stated sponsorship levels would also provide benchmarks for Local Arrangements and Program committees to appropriately acknowledge levels of sponsorship for various meeting events/functions.
3. Sponsorship categories could also foster some friendly competition between companies, potentially leading to increased sponsorship revenue.

MOTION (Boetel), SECOND (Wright) to establish the following sponsorship level structure, effective for fundraising efforts to support the 2015 NCB-ESA meeting:

Platinum	\$5,000+
Gold	\$2,500 – \$4,999
Silver	\$1,000 – \$2,499
Bronze	\$500 – \$999
Friend	up to \$499

DISCUSSION:

(Gammel): ESA uses a similar framework for sponsorship of the ESA Annual meeting. Levels help establish who we list as sponsoring key events during the conference. Some companies have approached ESA staff, asking why they were not listed sponsoring a particular event, and the answer was that they had not provided sponsorship at a level to be listed for it.

(Davis): Companies receive numerous sponsorship requests each year, and it could be difficult for some to support at the upper levels.

(Boetel): It is probably still worth establishing these levels, even if some companies choose to continue supporting the meeting at the same levels.

(Gammel): There has been some discussion at ESA Central regarding the establishment of a national sponsorship program. Then there could be a single sponsorship transaction at the national level to support programming for all branch meetings.

QUESTION (O’Neal): Are these levels similar to those used by other branches?

(Boetel): These are the levels used during the 2007 NCB-ESA meeting in Winnipeg, MB. There was no further discussion, and the motion passed by unanimous consent.

B. Time and place for future NCB meetings – Sue Blodgett

1. States that have not hosted the meeting in recent years include Colorado, Indiana, and Illinois.
2. To date, we do not have a commitment to host the 2016 meeting.
3. Frank Peairs (Colorado State) has been contacted, and will consider having Colorado host. COMMENT (Davis): There is some interest from Indiana and Illinois as well.

C. NCB-ESA Student Travel Scholarships – Sue Blodgett

1. There were 45 applications for Student Travel Scholarships in 2014.
2. Should we develop some rules, such as excluding students from consideration if they resided in the host city of the meeting?

COMMENT (Obrycki): This seems very reasonable. The three presidents (Immediate Past, current, and -elect) can determine the criteria.

COMMENT (Wright): One consideration could be to limit the number of travel scholarships an individual can receive to one per year.

COMMENT (Blodgett): That would probably require additional recordkeeping.

COMMENT (Davis): We have all applications, and degree information is included in each.

3. Sue will work with Paula and Luis on developing some criteria and ground rules for applications.

D. Multi-year rotation of committee chairs – Sue Blodgett

1. There would probably be a lot of value in having chairs of some of the key meeting planning (i.e., Program, Local Arrangements) committees to serve on them for more than simply the year they chair them.
2. This would improve continuity transfer of institutional memory from one meeting to the next.
3. This has been done on an informal basis in recent years.

COMMENT (Wright): Committee chairs are already responsible for transferring this information to subsequent chairs by submitting their committee reports in a timely manner.

MOTION (Davis), SECOND (Obrycki) to formally revise the NCB -ESA Committee Guidelines document to reflect that Program and Local Arrangements Chairs will remain on their respective committees to serve in an advisory role to assist their successors.

DISCUSSION:

(Wright) The key things in this process would be for past chairs to pass on any documentation and advice they can to their successors, and to participate in phone calls on an as-needed basis.

(Boetel) It would be advantageous to handle this in a manner similar to that used by ESA, where they serve three-year, graduated terms.

(MacRae) The first year would be training and observation, the second would be serving as chair, and the third would be advisory.

(Wright) The introductory role would probably not be a full-year term, as the individual would likely not be identified right away.

No further discussion occurred. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

IX. **Call for other New Business**

COMMENT (Gammel): Please note that ESA 2017 will be held in Denver, CO. The timing and location of that meeting may impact whether you want to hold your Branch meeting Colorado within months of the Annual meeting.

X. **Adjournment**

MOTION: (Bradshaw), SECOND (Wright) to adjourn. There was no further discussion, and the Motion passed by unanimous consent. The meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Boetel
NCB-ESA Secretary-Treasurer