BSA Board meeting, March 1-2, 2019

BSA Business Office
4475 Castleman Ave.
St. Louis, MO 63110

March 1, 2019 (Board meeting with staff)

Meeting called to order approximately 1pm (R. Spicer, taking minutes, arrived during Membership Report)

In attendance (alphabetical)


2. Finance and Administration Report - Wanda

3. Membership and Communications - Amelia
   - Discussion about FB popularity and demographics
   - We need an Instagram account (general agreement)
   - Will students go for 3-year memberships? Should we offer 3-yr student gift memberships? SSB does 3-yr memberships; a number of people around the table give their grad students memberships every year
     - Less concerned about the finances (not a sig source of revenue) and more interested in the communications and engagement element
     - Questions about what happens when students graduate and still get the discounted rate
   - Comment that the content on FB feels “random” and could be more strategic and intentional, especially with more on publications and scholarship of society (e.g., AJB cover images)
   - Suggested that we have more intentional coordination across platforms
   - Do we have a social media editor for AJB? Not really but Rich tweets
   - Discussion at “Strategy Day” included separate Twitter handle for pubs
   - Amelia will come up with a strategy and report back
   - Plant Summit had major discussion about communication (more on this later in agenda)

4. IT Update - Rob
   - Ongoing work for GDPR
   - Migration to CiviCRM (90% done); paused for membership renewal (not good time to migrate)
   - Awards interface
   - Future:
     - Updating websites (to discuss ad hoc committee later)
     - Awards administration / comments on how great this new system is
       - Includes automatic scoring and winner determination
Discussion about normalizing scoring across reviewers to “correct” for variation in reviewer scales

- Data breach: not that much known about it
- AFS proposal that they will pay for conversion to CiviCRM; sounds like a small task
  - Recommendation that we be careful about entering into informal arrangements with providing services for other societies; general consensus on this; to whatever extent we do this must be properly compensated
- Discussion re: forming an ad hoc committee for web design
  - We already have a technology committee and we could use them
  - Rob recommends ad hoc group with design focus/experience
  - Suggestion that this should tie in with education and outreach
  - Andi is willing to serve on it
  - Already have a designer in mind - the same group that did the new SSE site
  - Our current site has lots of dead ends
  - Point made about clarifying what we want: outward-facing site to draw in public (great but requires more content and updating than we are currently capable of) vs a site for our members that is organized and useful and easy to find what you want
  - Desire clean home page with no clutter; clear flow to useful information
  - Mission statement needs to be there
  - Heather, Andi, Rob will conference call to talk about how to populate this committee (already suggested: Ya Min, Cat, Jodi)

5. Wiley Report and Plan S Discussion – Gillian

AJB
- Global reach of AJB: strong in Europe, but big questions about the accuracy of these data (e.g., US numbers don’t make that much sense)
- Most institutions have access through licenses; two types: All Journals at a good rate is one type and they expect to see these numbers to increase
  - How do we get noticed within this All Journals License?
  - Why is Europe not showing up in the “online traffic”
- Increase in downloads is expected to continue (Gillian suggests that decline in Dec is expected due to general seasonal changes)
- Question about why EU is not showing up for downloads?

APPS
- Suggestion that we look at what are the most downloaded articles (subject areas) per country
- Trying to decrease Primer Notes and bump up regular articles
  - Urge submission of methods papers to APPS
  - Also urging education-related work

Marketing
- Email campaigns to readers and authors completed
- Member and author surveys
- Promoting journals at conferences & Latin American Botanical Congress
- Discussion:
  - Suggestion that the material describing Wiley marketing is ‘boilerplate’ and question re: what an authorship/readership campaign is.
Author campaign: AJB and APPS “Publish with us AGAIN” outreach for the first time this year. Q: How far should this go back?
• Readership campaign: Highlight top downloaded articles; reaches out to authors who had highly cited (downloaded?) articles and they send it out to network
  o New papers are well-advertised on Twitter; one BSA twitter account and might create separate one for AJB
  o Question about timeline for how quickly the authorship campaign can go out: should be within a few weeks. Suggestion that things are a bit slow and not nimble.
  o Last year: 2 author and 5 reader campaigns were sent out; suggestions that maybe we should flip these this year since submissions are down
  o Many questions about how to get AJB eTOCs now (Who is getting them and how? Many folks seem to no longer receive them)
    ▪ Has been a point of frustration and anxiety for staff
    ▪ Goal is that every society members should automatically receive eTOC without doing anything
    ▪ They’ll be separate (AJB, APPS) when it finally comes out from Wiley
  o Suggestions that we reach out to potential readers in less represented subject areas that we’d like to see expand
  o Question about landing page(s) for pubs and covers. We just launched the HUB in November.

Finances
• $900k subscription income
• $140k non-subscription (rights, archives sales, pay-per-view, OpenAccess)
• About $93k royalties still due
• In general our income is down but our expenses are down too
• Heather, Wanda and Lucinda can look to do a comparison before and after switch to Wiley to help think about a 5-year window
• Note that we know exactly what we are bringing in from Wiley with the exception of the royalties (this year’s budget included nothing for royalties)

Plan S
• Coalition S = 11 EU research bodies and two charitable organizations who propose (in Plan S) to require funded work to publish in 100% immediate Gold OpenAccess (i.e., not hybrid journals) and have a cap on APCs (article processing charges).
• 85% of current journals are NOT Gold OA
• Global South, Humanities and Social Sciences are largely left out
• A modified version of Plan S was put out in response to push back in which hybrid journals would be in compliance if they had a “transformational agreement” in place.
• 4.1% AJB; 1.6% APPS articles were funded by these organizations
• The Plan S coalition has since grown and this is a movement that we cannot ignore
• Our APC is very low compared to others so the proposed cap is unlikely to have an effect on us
• Q: What proportion of our pubs (AJB) are OA? About 25%.
• Q: What would it cost us to go fully OA? It costs $750 for members to publish AJB OA ($1500 for non-members). 180 articles = $270k is what you’d bring in if everyone paid $1500; less 900k in subscriptions -> $630k lost revenue
• Discussion about to what extent this shift is inevitable (opinions vary on this)
• We need to explain our position to our membership
• Q: Should going OA be a priority on fundraising? (opinions vary here too)

Wiley & Projekt Deal partnership
• announced Jan 2019
• Projekt Deal reps ~700 academic institutions in Germany
• “Read & publish [OA]” reciprocal agreement with Germany
• MIT and UC systems have entered into similar agreements in NA and we can expect more of them to come -> more evidence of the changing landscape in scientific publishing

6. Publications - Amy M/Sean
• Submissions are down in a dramatic and puzzling way (Jan & Feb) and they are anxious about it
• Pushing every article out on Twitter
• We need to increase our Impact Factor
  o Improve reach
  o Need to get a review series up and running; hope to roll out by January 2020 with starting goal of 3-4 reviews per year
  o Models for review editors -> one person organizes others to "shake the bushes" for good reviews
  o APPS strategies: special issues
• Expanding international reps on editorial boards
• Cross-publishers special issue experiment is in the works (AJB – IUPS – APPS)
• PSB: newsletter, book reviews, first special issue ever coming out on living collections
• Social media push
• Returning to idea of early career research article award competition
• Note that it will take a few years to see benefit of pushes to increase impact factor
• Reminder that OTNOTs are highly cited but do not show up in the Impact Factor denominator
• Wiley-funded strategy session was great; focused this time on getting a review system going

7. Education and Outreach – Catrina
• NSF showcase video from Digging Deeper
• Second submission was greatly improved and they knew the first submission was premature, but wanted the feedback
• Tucson meeting goal to integrate local Community College and Tribal College educators
  o Applying for funding re: diversity and inclusion (to support above efforts) at Tucson BOTANY 2019: RCN UBE (RCN Undergrad Biology Education) conference proposal “Spotlight Session” planned: Speaker lined up from Reservation
  o Speaker from Arizona State on inclusivity program assessment
  o Ann is looking for contacts at community colleges in local Four Corners area. Looking for 8-10 faculty
• New module on potato soft rot (Planting Science)
• Pub in prep on Digging Deeper; work meets standards for “What Works Clearing House”
• Plant science career website is in the works – broadly defined plant-related careers
• Recruitment for teachers is down; looking for reform-minded high school teachers, but they are given less and less autonomy and this may be affecting their ability to participate; Charter schools have more flexibility but public schools less so; interesting observation: mobility of families is requiring public schools to have more standardized curriculum
• Note that MoBot doesn’t have an IRB
8. Conference Update - Johanne / Amy L
   • Q: Are there options for quick / low budget food? Should be.
   • Request for funding students to go on field trips again -> 3k request with the expectation of more students applying (will discuss tomorrow 3/2)
   • Childcare options: They’ve been looking at one org that ESA and SSC both use in which they come in and set-up a day care room. 30 hrs for up to 12 kids with activities (0 - 12 yrs) = $7k (will discuss tomorrow 3/2)
     o Q: Do we require proof of immunization? Logistically challenging.
     o Resort lazy river is also a question (liability)
     o Alternative is to provide grants for family care, but agreed that the convenience of on-site is the key.
   • Request to discuss tomorrow Rick McCourt’s request for contribution from the Darbaker fund to support a phycology symposium
   • Organizers are overwhelmed with colloquia and we may need to limit those too. Discussion about concern about limiting something that has a big draw. But then some of the contributed paper sessions are small and poorly attended.
   • Plenary: Stephen Pyne, Arizona State (history of fire)
   • Regional Botany: Thomas Van Devender (sky islands)

9. Plant Summit Report - Ann/Lucinda/Min Ya
   • 2.5 days at Biosphere; Crispin and Stern are PIs; 40-50 attendees; 8-9 organismal/evolutionary/comparative types
   • Arabidopsis people said they were not represented, in addition to evo/devo/phylo/comparative biologists groups; general feeling that ag industry was by far the best represented and dominant voice
   • Research themes that came up at the end of day 2 left many feeling like they were not represented
     o Crop productivity on arid lands was a major theme; e.g., a focus outcome was a “moonshot” for “30 day rice” in the desert
     o Positioning to leverage for federal research dollars; very focused on national economic interests and feeding the world
   • Training and diversity discussed on day 1 but then it dropped off the face of the meeting
   • We must stay involved because it is happening one way or the other; Donoghue will be involved in the document writing stage
   • Note that the decadal vision that was produced before had little-to-no impact
   • Plant Genome Initiative was mostly driven by the maize community and they were very broad minded about it
   • Section on inclusivity; What is “success” in science? How do you define a “plant scientist”?
   • Update to be held at BOTANY 2019

Meeting adjourned 5:45pm
March 1, 2019 (Board meeting with staff)

Meeting called to order 8:05 AM

In attendance (alphabetical)
Heather Cacanindin, Erika Edwards, Ned Friedman, Sean Graham (video), Amy Litt, Chris Martine (video), Lucinda McDade, Min Ya, Chelsea Pretz, Loren Reiseberg, Ann Sakai, Rachel Spicer, Linda Watson, Andi Wolfe

1. Minutes Approval - Andi
   • Board Call 12/7/2018
   • Executive Call 1/9/2019
   • MOTION & VOTE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES -> APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)

2. Student Report - Chelsea and Min Ya
   • Student members are up
   • Question about student chapters
     o membership is 50% off if you are in a chapter ($10 vs $20); typically you need to become an official student organization at your institution
     o Next PSB will include info on this (= opportunity to forward/spread word)
   • Conference activity
     o Undergrads dominated career/job search workshop
     o Undergrad network building workshop
     o Botany career luncheon
     o Wiley sponsored student social; we need to make sure we acknowledge them for this
   • BOTANY 2019: workshop on crafting/writing statements for job searches; career luncheon again; undergrad networking again; goal of setting up a table to have CVs reviewed
   • Need to get (past) student members on website: “THEN AND NOW”
   • Social media: student reps believe that we can be using it much more to recruit new student members
     o Agreed to create Student Media Liaison position

3. Financial Update - Lucinda/Heather

FY2018 Draft Financial Statements
   • Q: re: Fern Society liability; probably money that is in our account but is technically theirs
   • MOTION & VOTE TO APPROVE DRAFT FINANCIAL STATEMENTS -> APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)

FY2018 Sectional, Award and Board Allocated Funds
   • Giant spreadsheet: We really need to reduce the number of tiny accounts because the administrative burden to manage them is substantial
   • Discussion re: inactive (long term dormancy) sections
     o MOTION & VOTE to disband Pacific and Mid-Continent Pteridological Sections due to inactivity -> APPROVED
• Thorhaug Award fund
  o Need to look at the legal terms of the gift and formulate a policy
  o Physiologists can think about whom to appoint to determine recipients of this award
• Discussion about the unrestricted funds being distributed into these smaller funds
  o Some of these are gifts given with the expectation that they will be used for purpose X but it is not clear whether they were given with the expectation that their money was to go into the endowment or to be used for that fiscal year directly
  o Some of these are just society priorities that we have created
  o Lucinda will keep working on this; We need to have a policy on establishment of new lines

FY2019 Profit and Loss
• Good response to dues option (default opt-in) to contribute to increase in grad student funding; significant progress toward goal of 30k total
• Note that meeting expenses get wrapped up in different fiscal years depending on timing of meeting (e.g., Ft Worth was early)
• There was a realized loss of 50k but otherwise the “losses” are all unrealized based on valuation after the sharp drop at the end of 2018; these have largely rebounded but moving forward there are good reasons to be cautious
• How is the transition to Wiley affecting our budgets? Premature to make big plans for what we are going to do with this income (royalties). It will take a few years to stabilize. Some discussion about the goal of investing more in our students.
• Discussion about how quickly we should repay the 400k that we used to buffer the transition versus using this money to invest in our students (not complete agreement here)
• Plan S is a big unknown
• Suggestion that we consider getting rid of Primer Notes in APPS (authors pay for everything in it but Primer Notes brings down the Impact Factor). General interest on the part of the Board:
  o Pubs Committee is tasked with discussing this and to report back at the summer meeting.
  o Straw poll (show of hands) of who supports this: Slightly over half support this idea (getting rid of Primer Notes) but almost half abstain or are undecided
  o Discussion about reducing frequency of issues so that there are not just 2-3 articles after eliminating Primer Notes

4. Sectional Funding Issues - Amy L
• Change in symposium funding model meant that they would no longer receive allotments from Society -> intent was for the sections to be self-sufficient.
• Should we fund them at a very small level that is proportional to their membership?
  o Note that this penalizes the small sections
  o We also shouldn’t penalize sections that charge more for their dues
• Erika (Council Chair) tasked with reaching out to Section Heads to plan a discussion about this at BOTANY 2019 ("this" being re: four potential funding options: proportional; zero; ad hoc requests; fixed
• Consider new models of colloquia that are more inclusive, diverse, democratic; and systems to avoid/limit “clubby” colloquia

5. Fundraising - Ned/Heather
• Endowment and Past Presidents’ Funds
• Kaplan Award - need ad hoc committee; we have a letter but need to structure the award agreement
• BAND Foundation: interested in contributing 25-30k/year for botany and field botany with an emphasis on undergrads; a conference call is upcoming [http://bandfdn.org/]

6. Audit Firm Selection – Lucinda
• Narrowed in on KEB and Brown, Smith & Wallace (BSW)
• BSW did our audit last time (8 yrs ago), did Evolution, is a known quantity and did a good job
• MOTION & VOTE that we follow Lucinda’s recommendation to go with BSW -> APPROVED

7. Investment Committee Update - Linda/Ned/Lucinda
• Vacancies: Gretchen LeBuhn filled vacancy on committee and has 5 yrs financial experience; Maya Thomas does pro-bono work with Ranch Santa Ana Bot Garden and is willing to develop a policy statement; one more vacancy to fill
• Question about student rep on this committee and whether this is appropriate
• MOTION & VOTE to NOT REQUIRE a student on this committee -> APPROVED but not unanimous. Two opposed.
  o Some Points of clarification:
    ▪ Is the idea that they COULD serve but that there is not a default assignment of a student? (This led to more discussion, below, rather than an answer)
    ▪ It’s a three-year term - We should ask the current rep if he’d like to continue
    ▪ We should be aware of power dynamics on these committees
    ▪ Nothing stops students from attending any meeting that they are interested in
    ▪ Comment that we are underestimating students
    ▪ We should be asking students if they’d like to serve on specific committees
    ▪ Any member can attend any committee meeting by the rules – but note that a meeting can go “into executive session” to exclude non-members at any time

7. Reallocation / Investment Policy revision
• Proposal that we TABLE this until we have the committee populated and we get input from new members with experience in finance and investments
• This committee is starting right now (not this summer) and will draft the policy statement

9. Code of Ethics / Sexual Harassment Consortium
• We have a CoE and it is distinct from the Code of Conduct; it’s old (1997) and should be revised
• Should we join a 53-member consortium? They have legal council in place
  o Societies Consortium on Sexual Harassment in STEMM (math & medicine)
  o Some of our sister orgs have joined
  o It would provide “guidance” and would be specifically for the BSA (distinct from the BOTANY meetings and that Code of Conduct infraction system)
  o We do already have a mechanism for the Board to remove someone from the BSA so there is a question of what problem this (joining the consortium) solves
  o If it is related to publications decisions, AJB has an ethics committee, and Wiley has structures in place for some of these issues as well
  o Some feel that we need more information; other are ready to join on a trial basis
o Would cost $500-$1000 per year; sliding scale re: your revenues
o **MOTION & VOTE that we join for a year as a trial** ->
  ▪ active discussion about the practical nature of how the BSA benefits from or is protected by this
  ▪ **7 in favor, 1 opposed, 4 abstentions – MOTION APPROVED**

10. Election Committee Report – Loren

  • Most males declined to accept nomination so we have a female-biased slate
    o Waiting to hear on Advisory Council Chair nominees
    o President: Muriel Poston & Cynthia Jones
    o We should have a ballot within two weeks
    o How can we have student rep input on which two students are selected to run?
      Suggested that we have a student rep on the Election Committee
    o Can Rob do a ranking system and have more than two on the ballot?
      ▪ Not everyone agrees that this makes sense or understands why we should have more than two
      ▪ The real issue is that students should have input on which nominees are selected to run
    o Agreement that students should be on the committee and that students should rank the nominees
  • Should we dissolve Advisory Council Chair? [NEW BUSINESS BUT RELEVANT TO ELECTION SLATE]
    o Suggestion that the position has no useful role or work and the past three who’ve held the position agree
    o The President would/could run the Council Meeting
    o Agreed that we DO need a Council Meeting
    o **MOTION & VOTE to abolish the Advisory Council Chair position** -> APPROVED (UNANIMOUS)
      ▪ This will require a bylaws change
    o Speaking of ByLaws (also new business, but came up in discussion here): Ann Sakai recommends that we look at the language in the bylaws (actually it’s the language under “governance/policies” re: the relationship between the PLANTS Program and the Human Diversity Committee. Note that it says that the PLANTS program is “under the purview of this committee” which may not always make sense.

11. International Collaboration

  **Nagoya Protocol**
  • We sent Rachel Meyer to a meeting and she proposed that we develop a website with resources for researchers on navigating these requirements and being in compliance
  • BUT: There is already a lot of movement on this in the museum community and we wanted to make sure that she was tapping into that
  • We already agreed to put the brakes on this and don’t want to reinvent the wheel
  • We could still hold a workshop at the conference on this.

  **Mexico meeting - Oct 2019 – Aguascalientes**
  • We know nothing more on this and will revisit at the July meeting
  • Need to make connections with botanical scholars in Mexico and Latin/South America

*Meeting adjourned ~12:05pm*