

American Fisheries Society

March Management Committee Meeting

Monday, March 16, 2018

Participants:

MC Members: Jesse Trushenski, Joe Margraf, Jackie Watson, Heather Hettinger, Joe Larscheid
John Boreman (Constitutional Consultant, non-voting)
Dennis Riecke (Constitutional Consultant Apprentice, non-voting), and
Doug Austen (Executive Director, non-voting).

AFS Staff: Dan Cassidy, Drue Winters, Lauren Maza

Emerging Leaders: Hilary Meyer, Dan Dauwalter, Sarah Turner

Notes from the Management Committee Discussion

1. Due to lack of a quorum, the meeting could not be called to order to conduct business. Instead, an informal discussion took place among the participants on agenda topics not requiring action.
2. **Policy update** – Drue Winters
 - A. Status of RAWA – Austen reported on his participation in the March 13-14 congressional visits in support of the Recovering America’s Wildlife Act. In coordination with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the National Wildlife Federation, Austen and about 15 other participants (primary state agency directors or representatives) visited Congressional member offices to discuss RAWA. Austen visited primarily the offices of members from New Jersey and Pennsylvania and resulted in positive responses and some co-sponsorship support.
 - B. Coop Unit funding, NCC and related activities – Drue Winters reported that the President’s 2019 budget includes no funding for the Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Units. AFS is working on a letter to Appropriations Committee chairs and will be working with the National Cooperators Coalition to identify and implement additional actions on behalf of Unit funding.
 - C. Other updates – Drue Winters reported that the working group on the Magnuson-Stevens Act is moving forward and had been meeting weekly to identify key issues and develop recommendations.
3. **Constitutional Consultants report** (Boreman/Austen) – A scheduled discussion and potential motion on registration rates for the Atlantic City meeting was not addressed due to the lack of a quorum. Trushenski on behalf of McMullin requested that Austen send out the motion to the Management Committee for electronic vote. This was done and a full report on the process and result is documented below and in Attachment A.

4. **President/Officers report** – there were no officer reports.

5. **Executive Director and AFS staff report**

- a. Update on election timing and steps (Attachment B) – Austen reported that this timeline reflects the delayed Fisheries publication but that the elections will easily be completed in time for adequate notification of the winning candidate to be prepared to attend the Atlantic City meeting.
- b. Meetings Oversight Committee (MOC) - discussion on revised charge and possible AFS Procedures as proposed in the Attachment C. This will be handled as a revised charge to the current Meetings Oversight Committee by AFS President McMullin. The need for future changes to AFS Procedures will be evaluated after the committee has operated and better understands how it will best work effectively.

6. Adjourn at approximately 3:55

Addendum to March 19 Management Committee Call

**Electronic Vote of Management Committee on Atlantic City Annual Meeting
Registration Rates**

The following email with Attachment A was sent to the Management Committee members on March 19, 2018

MC members -

Due to challenging schedules, we were unable to attain a quorum for today's call of the Management Committee. As a result and due to the need to resolve the issue of registration rates for the Atlantic City meeting, Jesse Trushenski, in her role as the presiding officer during the call, has asked for an electronic vote on the topic. Attached is the background that was sent with the MC agenda. The motion is:

Proposed motion:

In order to better address annual meeting costs, it is proposed that AFS annual meeting registration rate guidance should incorporate the following changes:

1. Student registration rates will be set at 50% of Member Early
2. Young Professional rate will be set at 75% of Member Early
3. Retiree rates will be the same as the Student rates.

Please respond with one of the following choices by noon EDT on Friday, March 23, 2018:

- A. Approve
- B. Do not approve
- C. Would like to discuss further

Thank you,
Jesse Trushenski and Doug Austen

Votes for response A (Approve) were received from the following members. There were no votes submitted for options B or C

Joe Larscheid
Scott Bonar
Craig Bonds
Joe Margraf
Steve Lochman
Jesse Trushenski

Randy Schultz
Brian Murphy
Jackie Watson
Heather Hettinger
Rebecca Krogman

The motion passed.

Attachment A

Atlantic City Registration Rate Adjustments

The Current Model – implemented in 2015

- The non-member registration fee is the member registration fee plus 250% of the cost of annual member dues (rounded up to the next \$10 value).
- Non-member retirees and non-member young professionals pay the same fee as regular non-members.
- Late registration would be the early plus a 30% markup for all categories.
- Student registration would be 30% of regular.
- Retired and Young Professional registration would 40% of regular.
- One-day would be set at 50% of regular registration and is the same for member and non-member.
- Guest registration should be established so as to approximately cover the costs of attending all networking events (e.g. socials) and the trade show reception.
- Regular and young professional members from Developing Countries pay the “Retired & Young Professional member” registration fee (40% of regular registration fee)

Example of registration fees structure at Tampa meeting

Registration Category	Early Registration (Ends July 8, 2017)		Regular Registration (After July 8, 2017)	
	Member	Non-Member	Member	Non-Member
Regular	\$480	\$680	\$620	\$880
Student (need ID)	\$170	\$230	\$220	\$300
Young Professional, Retired, and Developing Countries	\$290	\$680	\$680	\$880
Daily – Circle: M, T, W, Th	\$240		\$310	
Guest – includes all 3 networking event and coffee breaks (excludes student social)	\$180		\$250	
Spawning Run	\$25		\$30	

The Problem

- Registration fees barely cover total expenses
 - This means net meeting income is essentially from sponsorships and tradeshow
- The average cost per attendee (ACPA) of \$389 (average food cost is \$233) and some registration categories do not cover ACPA. The registration types that don't cover average costs are:
 - All student types

- Young professional members
- Retired members

Both students and young professional registration types are growing in attendance while professional member attendance is leveling off.

Proposed Motion:

1. Change Student rate to 50% of Member Early – results in increase from \$170 to \$250
2. Change the Young Professional rate to 75% of Member Early – results in increase from \$290 to \$370
3. Set the Retiree rate to Student level

This results in the following registration rate structure for Atlantic City with comparisons from the two most recent AFS meetings and the upcoming TWS meeting.

Reg Type	Kansas City, MO		Tampa, FL		Atlantic City, NJ		TWS Cleve, OH	
Member	\$430	\$630	\$480	\$620	\$495	\$640	\$525	\$575
Non-member	\$560	\$820	\$680	\$880	\$730	\$950	\$725	\$775
Student	\$130	\$170	\$170	\$220	\$250	\$330	\$325	\$375
Student nonmember	\$180	\$240	\$230	\$300	\$330	\$430	\$525	\$575
Retired	\$170	\$230	\$290	\$380	\$250	\$330	\$150	\$200
Retired nonmember	\$630	\$820	\$680	\$880	\$730	\$950		
Young professional	\$170	\$230	\$290	\$380	\$370	\$480	\$525	\$0
Young prof nonmember	\$630	\$820	\$680	\$880	\$730	\$950	\$725	\$0
Developing country	\$170	\$230	\$290	\$380	\$370	\$480		
Developing nonmember	\$630	\$820	\$680	\$880	\$730	\$950		
Daily	\$220	\$280	\$240	\$310	\$250	\$330	varies by type	
Guest	\$150	\$180	\$180	\$250	\$200	\$260	\$200	
Notes: Student and young professional rates were adjusted higher in 2017								
to 35% and 60% respectively for equity with daily and guest rates								

Attachment B

2018 AFS Officer Election Process:

1. Candidate statements are planned to be published in the February issue of *Fisheries*. If statements are not ready in time, they'll be published in the March issue in 2018. The following schedule is based upon February publication. If March, then all dates will be adjusted one month later.
2. Establish a time schedule for vote open and close. There is currently in the AFS Rules a minimum 60-day delay between announcement of candidates and the opening of voting.
 - a. *Fisheries* publication date (let's use March 15 as target date)
 - b. 30-days for write-in candidates (roughly April 15)
 - c. 60 days after *Fisheries* publication the vote is opened. (roughly May 15)
 - d. Vote open for 30 days (Vote opens on May 15 and closes on June 15)
 - e. Results to Vote Audit Committee on June 31. Two weeks for review.
 - f. Results shared with AFS officers and AFS President contacts both candidates to inform winner and thank the other candidate (first week of June)
 - g. Results announced to AFS membership once President has contacted candidates. This will be via e-newsletter, AFS web site and social media (**Martha and Beth**)
3. Additional vote messaging
 - a. *Fisheries* candidate statements published (**Sarah** working with Hilda Sexauer and candidates)
 - b. 30 days after *Fisheries* publication we publish candidate Q&A on web site, social media and bi-weekly e-newsletter. (**Martha and Beth**)
Need to author questions and get appropriate review and approval – who to lead?
 - c. Vote ballot(email) sent to all Active AFS members on April 15 and then weekly reminders sent each subsequent week
4. Tasks:
 - a. Establish purchase agreement with vote contractor (**Dan and Eva?**)
 - b. AFS membership contacts provided to vendor (**Eva**)
 - c. Write vote language (same as last year) (**Jasmine with review by Doug**)
 - d. Provide results (e.g., link to vote web site or other appropriate information) to Vote Auditor (**Jasmine**). Vote Auditors need to be informed of time frame and expected turn-around time so that they are ready to process their audit and certify results within the two week time period.

Attachment C

Revitalization of the Meetings Oversight Committee

Version 2.1 (February 25, 2018)

Purpose and need:

The Meetings Oversight Committee (MOC) has not been established in recent years and, as a result, there has been little structured dialogue among AFS members, leaders, and staff regarding the design, effectiveness, and employment of innovative approaches to our annual meetings. This was likely the result of a charge that was not sufficiently developed, an unclear delineation of duties between the MOC and the annual meeting program chairs and arrangement chairs, and a diluted role that was to address Topic-Oriented Meetings (TOM). These important discussions and decisions have been generally left to the individual chairs of the annual meeting organizing committees for each individual annual meeting and/or AFS staff. As a result, there is little learning nor is there any substantive thinking taking place regarding how AFS can better utilize its annual meetings as a unique and highly valuable forum for advancing fisheries science and conservation. This document recommends that AFS revise the MOC in order to assist in bringing continual assessment, learning, and design improvements into our annual meetings.

Background

The Meeting Oversight Committee is defined in the AFS Rules and expanded upon in the AFS Procedures. The original purpose was to both assess annual meetings as well as to review proposals

AFS Rules 14. Standing Committees

b. The Society has established the following standing committees:

- xiv. MEETING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE provides overall meetings review for the Society to ensure coherent planning and development of Society and unit meetings.

for Topic-Oriented Meetings. Unfortunately, little of this has taken place in recent years yet it has been recognized that the society needs to better evaluate, learn from and improve our meeting design in order to ensure that participants have a high quality experience. Some key recommendations include:

1. Meeting evaluations (web survey, focus groups, interviews with organizing committee members, etc. and other tools) need to be better planned, constructed, results compiled and recommendations employed in the design of future meetings in a more thoughtful, disciplined, and consistent manner. This needs to be reflected in a committee membership and terms of service that cover at least 3 years.
2. Membership of the MOC should include at least one previous meeting arrangements and/or program chair, a 2nd or 1st Vice-President, AFS members who attend not only AFS meetings but are able to participate in, analyze, and learn from the annual meetings of other scientific societies. At least one graduate student or representative of student members or early career

AFS Procedures (pages 54-55)

Meeting Oversight Committee

Purpose:

Provides overall meetings review for the Society to ensure coherent planning and development of Society and Unit meetings. (Article IX 2. L)

Composition:

Seven AFS members including the AFS first vice-president. If review of Topics Oriented Meetings (TOMs) becomes a considerable task, the committee chair may request the AFS president to appoint a TOMs subcommittee of an additional four members.

Duties:

The Committee will provide guidance to AFS on how to improve efforts to attain Society goals (e.g., member services, information transfer and outreach, aquatic stewardship) through Society and Unit meetings. The Committee will formulate broad AFS meeting objectives and procedures to ensure the annual meeting is a meaningful gathering and consider the extent to which AFS should be involved actively in other types of meetings apart from the annual meeting (e.g., TOMs). The Committee will develop ideas regarding meeting-related elements in the overall AFS Strategic Plan and work with the AFS Strategic Planning Committee to incorporate its recommendations into the AFS Strategic Plan. Other duties may be assigned to the Committee by the AFS president as needed.

The Committee will also review and, if warranted, approve Topic-Oriented Meetings (TOMs) submitted by AFS divisions, sections, chapters, or individual members. The committee will approve or reject each proposal based on scientific merit, general appeal, and timeliness of the topic. The committee may solicit comments from experts to assist in the review. Once approved, the proposal would be submitted to the AFS Executive Director to determine the extent of AFS financial support for the TOM. The Committee will publicize by email, the AFS web site, articles in *Fisheries*, etc. the opportunity for AFS members to submit TOMs proposals. In addition, the committee will maintain contact with appropriate committees or individuals in other fisheries societies worldwide and international organizations with fisheries interests to stimulate joint sponsorship of TOMs, particularly at international locations.

Operational Guidelines:

None specified, except that a subcommittee to deal with TOMs may be requested in the future.

members needs to be involved. This could be a good opportunity for involvement of an ELMA person as a project during their one-year term in the ELMA program.

3. AFS Meetings Oversight Committee should explore the literature and best practices of meetings design and information conveyance in order to explore new approaches from fields outside of fisheries, ecology and natural resources. This should include more involvement in ASAE and CESSE, probably from staff but possibly also from a motivated AFS member.

4. A significant role of the current MOC is to review proposals for Topic-Oriented Meetings. This has not been a role of the MOC in recent memory. This aspect of the MOC should be re-evaluated and either affirmed with a process developed (possibly along the lines of a proposal, justification, budget, etc.) or completely eliminated.
5. Develop a set of “Best Practices” to serve as guidance for future AFS annual meetings. We regularly seem to trip over the same issues at annual meetings due to the lack of corporate learning. For example, we regularly debate the need for a Thursday evening social event or bands at receptions (host committees often argue for bands at the Sunday night opening reception when we know that it results in a disaster, etc.). Other items should be assessed such as the student reception where we’ve heard conflicting reports about the value of isolating students for a costly event when they may prefer some activity that better engages them with working professionals or faculty.

Option #1 – President Committee Charge

The AFS Rules definition of the MOC is sufficiently broad to incorporate all of the proposed changes described above. Although the AFS Procedures define certain responsibilities and membership for the MOC, they are either antiquated or not relevant to the current situation and thus would essentially be suspended until the committee is re-established and is given an opportunity to invest critical thinking into better defining a new role and propose replacement language for AFS Procedures and, if necessary, AFS Rules. This would be done through a specific charge to the committee from the AFS President. Once that is completed, the committee would report to the president recommendations for revisions to AFS Procedures and, if necessary, AFS Rules. This clearly is a more expedient and efficient method of moving this forward.

Option #2 – Procedures Modifications and Committee Charge

Proposed (draft) language or revision to AFS Procedures have been developed (below). This would provide a clarified role and committee membership, would only need Governing Board approval, and could be easily updated by the Governing Board after the committee has had time to operate and potentially provide recommendations for improvement.

AFS Procedures (modified by simple majority of AFS Governing Board)

Meeting Oversight Committee

Purpose:

~~Provides overall meetings review for the Society to ensure coherent planning and development of Society and Unit meetings. Explores new approaches and provides recommendations on meeting design to improve science delivery and participant experience and to enhance the overall effectiveness of the AFS annual meetings. (Article IX 2. L)~~

Composition:

~~At least seven AFS members including the AFS first vice-president. If review of Topic Oriented Meetings (TOMs) becomes a considerable task, the committee chair may request the AFS president to appoint a TOMs subcommittee of an additional four members, and at least two previous annual meeting general meeting or program chairs or host committee chairs. May include upcoming annual meeting host committee or program chairs. All appointments may be for 1 to 3 years with terms renewable by the AFS President.~~

Duties:

The Committee will provide guidance recommendations to AFS on how to improve efforts to attain Society goals (e.g., science delivery, member services, information transfer and outreach, student and professional development, aquatic stewardship) through Society ~~and Unit meetings~~annual meetings. The Committee will formulate broad AFS meeting objectives and procedures to ensure the annual meeting is a meaningful gathering ~~and consider the extent to which AFS should be involved actively in other types of meetings apart from the annual meeting (e.g., TOMs)~~. The committee will actively research meeting design ideas employed by other science societies and in the meeting design literature to identify approaches that could be considered for incorporation into AFS annual meetings. The committee will also work with AFS staff and experts, as appropriate, to develop and implement an annual meeting evaluation process. The Committee will develop ideas regarding meeting-related elements in the overall AFS Strategic Plan and work with the AFS Strategic Planning Committee to incorporate its recommendations into the AFS Strategic Plan. Other duties may be assigned to the Committee by the AFS president as needed.

~~The Committee will also review and, if warranted, approve Topic Oriented Meetings (TOMs) submitted by AFS divisions, sections, chapters, or individual members. The committee will approve or reject each proposal based on scientific merit, general appeal, and timeliness of the topic. The committee may solicit comments from experts to assist in the review. Once approved, the proposal would be submitted to the AFS Executive Director to determine the extent of AFS financial support for the TOM. The Committee will publicize by email, the AFS web site, articles in *Fisheries*, etc. the opportunity for AFS members to submit TOMs proposals. In addition, the committee will maintain contact with appropriate committees or individuals in other fisheries societies worldwide and international organizations with fisheries interests to stimulate joint sponsorship of TOMs, particularly at international locations.~~

Operational Guidelines:

~~None specified, except that a subcommittee to deal with TOMs may be requested in the future.~~

Annually, the MOC will work with AFS staff and upcoming annual meeting hosts (local arrangements and program committees) to provide recommendations on meeting design and new approaches to increasing the overall effectiveness of the annual meeting. The MOAC will also work with AFS staff to develop, implement and analyze the results of an evaluation of the annual meeting. This can be accomplished through web-based surveys, focus groups, individual interviews or whatever means the MOAC deems to be appropriate.