

## Summary of Final Meeting Policies and Procedures Task Force

The members of the Policies and Procedures Task Force held a conference call to discuss the feedback from the EC about our document. We summarize below the changes we made and the issues we believe are outside of our charge, but should be considered by the EC. We recommend that the EC consider each of the following issues and address them as soon as possible. We also remind the EC that we previously sent a document outlining issues that were outside our charge, but that we believed the EC should consider. At this time, we are submitting our final document for the EC to accept as is or to change based on its discussion of issues. We are, of course, happy to answer questions about the document.

1. EC members raised several issues which we believe to be outside our charge, but should be considered by the EC. These are (in no particular order):
  - a) .
  - b) The possible elimination of RRPR
  - c) Whether membership sees the EC agenda book, what is archived, and whether the agenda book is wholly electronic
  - d) Whether President Elect-Elect joins the EC as non-voting member
  - e) Whether nominations are public (although all of us thought this was a bad idea)
  - f) How to increase membership survey response rate (although our response rate is actually pretty good)
  - g) Amounts for travel funding
  - h) More specific procedures for naming awards, especially new awards
  - i) Procedures for selecting editors of print books
  - j) Whether Archives should be moved to hosting site outside anyone's university
  - k) What to do about Teaching Enhancement Workshops. Note that we left this section in the document because we worried if we removed it, the issue might get 'lost.' We appreciate that it doesn't quite fit.
  - l) Issues related to NITOP; same as above – we left it, even though it needs fleshing out.
2. Although our initial charge included updating the “procedures” section of the document, now in an Appendix, we respectfully request that a new task force be established to continue this work. Sorry, but we are too tired.
3. The EC raised questions about some procedures. We offer comments about those below.
  - a) Time and dates are needed for voting so that later ECs can easily reference those votes.
  - b) We realize that some officers, directors, and editors would prefer that selection procedures not change for roles related to their position. However, as we noted earlier, we strongly believe that STP should use consistent procedures for selection across its many roles. Of course, editors and directors should have input about who

serves in those roles and should be consulted. But, as we noted in our earlier letter:

A major guiding principle was consistency; we noted that as policies and procedures have developed over the years, different standards and practices have been applied. For example, some appointments require EC approval, others do not; some conferences are self-supporting and for others it's not clear. We believe establishing consistent policies and procedures is critically important and strongly recommend that the EC make consistency the foremost goal. We also recognize that establishing consistency may be unpopular in the short run, especially to those affected by policy changes, but consistency will ultimately serve the society well.

It is, of course, up to the EC whether to accept our recommendation or make changes and we appreciate that this will be a difficult decision. It's worth noting, however, that under current practice, the EC has less oversight about some major positions than about some with much less responsibility. Finally, with directors and editors being selected a year in advance, it does not seem to us that time should be a concern. All of us on the task force have been affected in major ways by personnel decisions, some of which could have been prevented if there had been an opportunity for more input.

- c) We recommend that listservs be moved outside university to 'general' webhost. We note the importance of creating archives of the EC's discussions and know that there were reasons this did not happen this year. Moving listservs to our web host will give the EC control over this issue.
- d) A concern was raised about not establishing a quorum. However, because electronic voting is asynchronous, we think the concept of a "quorum" is not useful. (How would you determine the physical presence of members at any given time?) To avoid this concern, we recommend setting the vote at 6 members. Considering that STP has been conducting votes both face-to-face and electronically, our task force felt it was appropriate to set the same rules for any form of voting. If a face-to-face meeting includes too few members (e.g., five or fewer), the President could opt to use electronic voting during or after the meeting to permit all EC members an opportunity to vote. If we set a quorum for face-to-face meetings (e.g., 70% or seven members), you could have an EC vote that is passed by a majority of face-to-face members (e.g., four people) but not a majority of EC members. We can avoid this concern by using the same voting rule (six votes for a "yes") regardless of the format. We also note that if fewer than six people are attending EC meetings, the issue for concern is attendance, not whether there is a majority per se.

- 4. We made several editorial changes based on EC members' feedback. These are:
  - a) Clarified the Organizational Chart
  - b) Noted that President-elect should update P&P Manual in future (see p. 5)
  - c) Add statement about EC function (see p. 6)

- d) Add statement that President announcements meetings through appropriate forums (p. 6)
- e) Noted that President doesn't prepare report (see p. 6)
- f) Add President-Elect-Elect to TOPEC listserv (p. 8)
- g) Made changes about Associate Chair of Fellows committee (pp. 8, 14, & 15)
- h) Clarify that votes are brought to EC by President (see p. 9)
- i) Clarified that the appointee completes term if replacing resigning officer (p. 10)
- j) Clarification composition of Elections and Appointments Committee (p. 14)
- k) Add that teaching award winners should be informed that they will be committee members (p. 15)
- l) Referenced GSTA procedures (p. 26)
- m) Minor clarifications in wording are not detailed.

Note that the Fund for Excellence section was not changed. That section was written by Wayne Weiten and we followed his judgment; if questions remain about that part of the document, we ask the EC to check with Wayne.