14 June 2013 – First Board of Directors Meeting


President Heske asked people to introduce themselves and noted that all those present were welcome to participate but only members of the board were welcome to vote.

Heske moved to appoint Don Wilson as Parliamentarian, motion passed.

Recording Secretary Lanier moved to skip the reading of the 2012 Abridged Minutes from the 2012 meetings of the Board of Directors and approve them as published. Timm approved, motion passed.

Heske began with a series of comments discussing the upcoming meetings. This included the five-year contracts for publication and membership management, for which the society is in the process of receiving and considering bids. In addition, the second board meeting will include a discussion of meeting venues. Other topics of interest include budget deliberations, joint memberships with other societies, and presentations from potential publishers.

Secretary-Treasurer Van Den Bussche presented his report. He noted that in 2012 society experienced its fourth consecutive year of decreasing membership. In 2012 the society had 225 nominees, and as of 24 May 2013, the society has received 205 new nominees. Additionally, 103 individuals have reactivated their memberships. He added that there have always been problems with names on the membership list. Many individuals find themselves on the dropped delinquents list and want to pay. As a result, they have decided to run the membership report as of May, and many individuals find themselves on the dropped delinquents report. In 2012 and so far in 2013, 10 individuals have passed away in the past year. 396 individuals that were members in 2012 have not renewed their membership by 24 May 2013. Ron moved that the names of the new
nominees be approved at the members meeting for membership. Wilson seconded. Ron moved that the 396 individuals on the dropped delinquents list be dropped at the members meeting. Wilson seconded.

McLaren added that some of the people on the deceased list also appear on the dropped delinquents list. Van Den Bussche accepted the friendly motion and offered to clean up the list.

Heske clarified that this year the membership committee was tasked with trying to recover dropped members. Elmer Fink took the list and sent personal emails, and actually made a big dent in that list. The first Secretary-Treasurer’s originally report included everyone from 2012, and we’re trying to clean this up and address the issues with the lists as well as possible. We’ve made progress and more needs to be done. Motion passed as amended.

Van Den Bussche continued that there were no new patron members but that the society welcomes 1 new life member. He noted that day there are 638 life members and 53 patron members, make up 31.4% of society and are instrumental in our success.

Van Den Bussche continued that the society took in $258,148.98 in revenue, and expenditures of $364,787.42. The timing of the revenues and expenditures made it necessary to transfer 106,645.44 from the reserve fund. The Future Mammalogists Fund received contributions of $13,142.50. The Latin American Student Field Research Fund received $7,098.50. The African Students Fund received contributions of $4,005. The Oliver Pearson Fund received $691. The ASM General Contribution Fund received $3,601.50, and the ASM Century Club received 300. He noted that these funds remain very beneficial to the society and all contributions are welcome.

Heske noted that we haven’t solved our membership problem but we’ve slowed the rate of membership decline. Our funds had considerable growth this year, a little less than the market average. This included over $300,000 growth in our reserve fund, so we’re doing well financially.

Kelt moved to re-appoint Ron for another year as Secretary-Treasurer. Seconded by Mares. Motion passed.

Sudman presented the Report of the Trustees. During the Trustees Report, Sudman noted that we wouldn’t be in this position without the previous trustees. Thanked Fi Choate and Ron Van Den Bussche, as well as Darla Cannon (our financial advisor). The reserve fund is up from last year, which is a good thing. Our current standing is just above $3.6 million. He noted that we have nearly reclaimed what we had since before the crash. This is better than being down, although slightly worse than the SNP500. Overall, the Reserve Fund is in good standing. Mares moved to accept the report of the Reserve Fund. Seconded and passed.

Sudman continued that the Pooled Income Fund continues to vacillate back and forth. This is a vehicle that can be used to generate some income. One individual since the end of 2012 has donated some funds. Sudman noted that individuals can donate cash or stock and will continue to receive income as that fund grows. At their demise that
money goes into the operating funds. Sudman encouraged you to consider this financial vehicle. Mares moved to accept the report on the Pooled Income Fund. Heske seconded. Passed.

Tomasi moved to reappoint Ron Van Den Bussche (whose term is up in 2013) as a Trustee. Timm seconded. Motion passed.

Heske thanked all the society members who do great work, and noted that the trustees have been doing a great job managing our funds and the society is doing very well on the financial front. We would like to grow some funds, but we will focus on that.

Karen Ridgeway, for Allen Press, presented the publications report. She noted that this past year has continued a trend in increasing ASM revenue for the ASM journal. For the first time we achieved over $400,000 in revenue, so the royalty that the society received was 15% (just over $60,000). There was also a more than 50% increase in advertising sales. In terms of advertising, Allen Press is trying to find ways to encourage advertisers to spend their money on the website. Articles in press are now being posted as online early (Articles In Press). People are citing them and the reaction has been generally very positive. Allen Press is marketing this year using a GAP analysis, which allows them to identify libraries with similar journals but do not currently subscribe. They are in the process of approaching those libraries and anticipate that that will encourage some subscription growth. Because of all of the marketing efforts the readership and the availability of the content has increased all over the world. The Journal of Mammalogy has readers than ever before. There are two new initiatives this year. One of them, called Cross Check, is an online software program that helps detect plagiarism. The incidence of plagiarism is going up. Based on a system called Authenticate. This will be helpful to identify plagiarizing. They anticipate getting this system in place by the end of the year. The other new initiative is OrcID. It’s a program to establish a unique identifier for every author pursuing publication. This is a relatively new movement but appears promising. They are working on establishing these protocols by the end of the year.

Heske asked about increased royalties (this year we’re up to $60,000 from $48,000), is this a trend? Ridgeway replied that she is hoping that it’s a trend. They are working hard to hit that level or above this year, but she cannot predict it at this point. Heske replied it looks like we’ve got an upward trend, and he is trying to determine whether we can count on this amount of revenue. Ridgeway replied that she tends to be conservative, and recommends planning on $48-50,000 Tomasi asked for clarification on the crossing the 400,000. Dolochek and Ridgeway explained the numbers those numbers include the member contribution as well. The percentage increase above the contract allows ASM to hit the second tier of the contract.

Dormer added his notes with respect to the membership numbers and that they will be kept as up to date as possible. He compared membership numbers last year. Since the end of May another 65 people have joined. This will continue until we start campaigning for 2014. This makes an about 5% increase in membership revenue since around this time last year. He noted that the lists for membership are run daily and posted on the website on the ASM accounts specifically.
McLaren asked about the title change on Table 5 in the Secretary-Treasurers report, and noted that the Dropped Delinquents list is now called Non-Renewed, not dropped delinquents. She asked why we would drop people who were members in 2012 and not renewed in 2013. Van Den Bussche replied that he would have moved to drop them in the past, because they had not paid. Several people had paid and he would change the report. Heske clarified that instead of calling them delinquents we changed the name. It was just a courtesy name change. We want them back, and we didn’t want to call them ‘delinquents’. McLaren responded that we know many people don’t renew until September. They’re still on that old cycle. How much confusion are we getting because of that changed designation? Van Den Bussche replied that 3 years ago we decided to only carry these folks one year and drop them. We’re doing the same thing, but we’re calling it something different. McLaren responded that many people renew in September. Heske and Van Den Bussche agreed, and Heske clarified that we’d like to change this process. Those people are in arrears by 6 months. He noted that they would like to get away from the process of voting on membership.

McLaren pointed out that the previous problem was that people who would pay late would be members for the next year (e.g., 2014). Heske replied that the list is updated. McLaren pointed out that when she contacted them they said that they had paid their dues and were assigned memberships for next year. Heske replied that it wouldn’t happen anymore. McLaren noted that we’d like to be consistent. Heske responded that if folks pay now, they’ll be members for 2013. We’re trying to track it differently so that we’re not carrying membership.

Dormer added that at some point at the end of the year we should start pushing new memberships to the next year to stimulate revenue for the next year. Joining shouldn’t put our members in an awkward position as to which year they are renewing for. Tomasi asked if members know which year they are applying for. Dormer replied that they can look at their order history. There are two different ways that memberships can be purchase – one way is up front where they fill out a form online and it’s applied to the current year. They can also go into the website and pull up an older order and pay for it.

Tomasi asked if come fall members are renewing for 2014 or if they are paying for 2013. Nick responded that they would be directed to 2014 around September. Unless they want to pay for 2013. Heske noted that it’s tricky. We need to get people into the cycle of paying early. So far, we haven’t been doing this well. It is unclear when we stop sending non-renewers their journals. Nick replied that the effort to pick up non-renewers have improved from years past. We do make efforts to reach out to them and pick up lapsed members from those years, we reach out to them and suggest they sending in notices. Often those letters will be accompanied by a letter from the President. Heske added that people get enough contacts with us (4-6 emails).

Hopton asked if non-renewers are they told their last journal is the last. Heske didn’t think that they were. Hopton responded that it would be really great to do. Nick replied that we could do this with email. Mares added that AAAS and Science do this and it’s very effective. Hopton responded that something stuck to the journal packaging would be great. Heske agreed that it would be great, although the online only members won’t get that announcement. Hopton asked if the online only members had the option to
automatically renew. Dormer replied that if we don’t have their approval to renew it becomes a lot more administratively intensive.

Sudman noted that the licensing revenue is 25% or more of their financial income. That means that less and less of us are going through these entities to get the journal. Go through BioOne or JSTOR to access the journal and generate revenue for the society. We should all be doing this. Ridgeway replied that several of our marketing efforts are geared to do just that. We’re trying to drive traffic through the BioOne Site.

Doug Kelt presented the report of the Publications Committee, pointing out that this is an exciting year for publications. A few highlights include the new publication and new association management contracts, the electronic Table of Contents (automatically sent unless members opt out), in-press articles are accessible as Online Early (until they come out in the journal; already 92 articles have been put online early). Ridgeway added that it goes through copyediting and proofs, but it’s still 3-4 months sooner than publication.

Timm asked if authors can opt out of online early, for example if there are new taxonomic assignments. Ridgeway replied that yes, although the ICZN now accepts the online publication as the publication of record.

Kelt acknowledged the outgoing editors outgoing Associate Editors Matina Kalcounis-Rueppell, Madan Oli, Paul Stapp, and Samantha Wisely, who are stepping down from the Journal of Mammalogy.

Kelt noted that Mammalian Species will not do an annual compendium in 2013. Only 7 were completed, so they will be deferred until next year and do a double year compendium. We’re at 900 MS as of last year. Jane Cigard has taken over the ME position at Allen Press for Mammalian Species.

Kelt moved to nominate these two new Associate Editors: Marjorie Matocq and Keith Aubrey. Seconded by Kilpatrick, passed unanimously.

Kelt noted that everything else is in the report. He turned over things to Merritt, who seconded that the rest of the information is in the report.

Tomasi moved to reappoint Joe Merritt as editor for the Journal of Mammalogy. Seconded and passed.

Kelt, speaking for Meredith Hamilton, noted that the 900th Mammalian Species just came out.

McMillan, filling in for Richard Stephens, presented the report for the Grants In Aid Committee. He noted that we are awarding 30-31 GIA in 2013. The committee would like to request that we fund 33 awards, as that the society funds are on the increase. They are also requesting $2000 to start investigating an online submission program for the GIA awards and the fellowships. These funds will streamline the process of submission, taking all five files and collating them into one file.
Heske asked Hopton to comment on making the electronic submission process easier. Hopton estimated that it would cost about $2000 to do this. The design firm suggested that the applicant can upload any files and on the server it will be combined. He noted that file-naming conventions are important, but we’ll be ready to move on with it.

Kilpatrick asked if this will include letters of recommendation. Hopton replied that the system will send the referee an email with a link. The referee can click on the link and upload the letter and upload it and it will be automatically linked to the proposal.

Tomasi asked if there is an annual fee for this software. Hopton responded no, the $2,000 is the cost to purchase the software.

Cook asked if other committees use the software. Hopton replied that they can. We’re trying to make sure that we can use it for all of our online application submissions.

Hopton presented the report and budget request from the Informatics Committee. They are requesting funds to pay to host the ASM Website with In-Motion Hosting. It’s a virtual hosting platform. There are some difficulties with tables that may be the fault of the hosting company or may be the responsibility of the design firm. We have contacted the design firm to work directly with the host to fix these difficulties, which will cost a minimum of $6-8,000 a year. He noted that there are other costs associated with the redesign. This whole redesign process involves creating a series of training videos. However, when things like the GIA Committee request for new submission come up, we need to request additional funds.

Hopton also noted that the website redesign involves a big lag time. Trying to get a company to dedicate a big block of time and have a bunch of volunteers to get their material together so that it’s posted is very challenging in terms of timing, especially when our budget doesn’t get approved until June. He noted that the floating budget line ($20,000) will be spent in a few months.

Sue asked if there is 24 hour management of the website, and if something goes wrong who will fix it. Hopton replied that right now the company doesn’t want to admit that it’s something they’ve done wrong. However, trying to identify a new company to work with is challenging. If we seriously want to consider going through a managed hosting option, it will be around $6-10,000 every year, which may not be worth the cost.

Heske asked if the website usage is the problem. Hopton replied that it might be. The database table is becoming corrupted. He thinks he now knows how to fix it.. Heske noted that this should be one of the big items we consider funding, so that when we go forward we know how to manage the website. Although we have a lot of expertise, we can’t always count on having a key person in place to respond when there are technical issues. We need to develop our resources so that we have professional help.

Tomasi asked if is there space on this site that can store all of the applications. Hopton replied that there was. He set up an FTP server that the chair of the GIA committee and the committee members can go to the server and access the document directly.
Heske added that we’re setting up a Members Only section that will be populated with member information. Richard Stephens has suggested including general mammalogy lectures. The society is also open to other ideas.

Janet Braun presented the report of the Program Committee, noting that most information in the committee’s report. This year the program committee added a number of new components to track meeting attendees. There are 86 first-time attendees this year. She noted that by Mid April, at the end of the regular registration period, 58 individuals noted that they were new members of the society. She said that they will send their names to the Education and Graduate Students Committee, so that they will contact and include them.

Braun continued, noting that we have a couple of budget items included in the program activities fee. In 2014 there will be a workshop on professional interview strategies (put on by the Education and Graduate Students Committee), a popular science writing workshop, and two symposia – one on museum resources in undergraduate education and the other on Xenarthran Biology. The Capstone Speaker is also covered under the Program Activities Fund. The Program Committee is requesting funds to cover site visit expenses to future meeting venue sites as well as society administrative expenses (BOD meetings, catering, AV, etc.).

Braun repeated the request from last year to carry over any residual funds (which not supported by the board), to add program components on to the meeting so that the meeting budget can actually sustain last-minute requests. She noted that they have been able to provide funding for last-minute program activities requests with the support of the President’s Contingency Fund and some creative financial management. Approval of the request would give the committee much more flexibility financially in adding program components to next year’s meeting or to future meetings.

Braun discussed the meeting venues being presented for 2015. Venues were evaluated based on cost, opportunities for activities and field trips, and collaborations with nearby museums or universities. Presentations will be made to the membership for Raleigh North Carolina (hosted at the Downtown Marriott and Convention Center, in collaboration with North Carolina Museum of Natural History) and Jacksonville, Florida (at the Hyatt Regency Hotel on St John’s River). The committee also considered North Carolina State University, but after reviewing the financial proposal the meeting registration fees would be a minimum $100 more because of facility rental fees, no for-profit participation as sponsor or vendor, and a restrictive policy on alcohol (limited to 1 hour, no cash bars, and no kegs).

Olson asked about the preliminary estimates for registration. Braun replied that the committee is trying to keep the estimates the same. This year we offered a retirees rate and a lot of people took advantage of it. Next year there will be a special deal for K-12 teachers and high school students.

Cook asked about the costs for picnic, banquet, and housing. Braun replied that hotel will be $129 (Jacksonville) or $169 (Raleigh); the banquet and picnic costs haven’t been determined. Cook encouraged the committee to keep those costs down. He noted
that if the cost of the banquet is as high as it is this year we can’t afford to bring students. Braun replied that the cost of the banquet in Oklahoma City will be considerably lower, this cost is just high for Philly.

Tomasi asked if there will be dorm space on campus for Raleigh. Braun replied that they looked into dorm space on campus for students only. They would be responsible for their own transportation, but that the dorm rate would be around $50 a night.

Anderson asked if the rooms could be shared. Braun replied that it was suite style ($50/night). Anderson asked about the distance, and Braun confirmed that it was fairly far and not walkable.

Lidicker asked about the request that a university campus would be one of the options. Braun replied that they have received no interest from any university venue in the last few years. They sought this out specifically because of the interest on the part of the NC Museum, but the university site wasn’t competitive.

Lanier asked about the early abstract submission closing date. Braun replied that putting the program together late in the semester conflicts with the end of the semester for individuals on the committee. She noted that most of abstracts are submitted during the last 48 hours and that doing the editing and program preparation takes time. Braun feels that the timeline is comfortable for the committee and allows them get the program out early.

Heske asked about the rolling over of the funds generated from each meeting. He noted that planning symposia and workshops so far out is good, but he agreed that it also makes it difficult to be flexible and change quickly. This presents a difficulty in terms of planning, and he asked about what the funds might come out to. Braun replied that she will try to come up with a baseline number. She noted that we were very limited on what we can offer our speakers based on the numbers we had last year but we’re hoping to be able to offer better packages in the future (e.g., travel funds).

Tomasi added there are two things that we need to consider. The Program Activities Fee should be used for inviting people, etc. and it could roll over to fund last-minute activities. The residual is different. The idea of the residual is that if we have money left over one year we use it to keep costs low the next year, and as long as we have the activity fee we’d be able to pay for program, etc. Heske agreed that we could just mandate that it’s spent the next year (e.g., reduce the cost of the banquet tickets). Timm agreed, noting that we have to keep costs down. Olson asked if the program committee keep track of the past costs. Braun replied that she has a couple of years of data, but not much, and the data that she has is mostly limited to what was published in the journal.

Sikes presented some comments from the Animal Care and Use Committee. He noted that NIH OLAW has adopted the AVMA regulations. He noted that the ILAR guidelines don’t fit for wildlife, nor do the AVMA guidelines. The AVMA revised their guidelines and NIH OLAW has adopted those guidelines. They have asked for comments on implementation. We provided comments as did the American Ornithological Council (AOU). In our comments we encouraged NIH and the USDA to not require those
guidelines for wildlife research but instead to default to taxon-specific society guidelines. We may need to respond to the decisions that NIH OLAW makes with regard to the guidelines and our comments.

Anderson asked about this change with respect to the Bioscience paper published by Sikes et al. and the discipline specific guidelines. Sikes responded that the paper and they had made good headway. He noted that the National Science Foundation now recognizes the taxon-specific guidelines. His recommendation is that we keep citing those articles and make it clear that they are relevant to our work.

Timm presented comments for the Archives Committee, and he thanked Matt and Mary Hopton. The Hoptons are exploring different ways of saving pictures for archiving. He asked that everyone send the committee pictures, particularly those from meetings. Al Gardner added that the individuals in those comments should be identified.

Heske brought up the bylaws changes and the electronic discussion about the bylaws. The board voted to approve half of the changes and table the other half. The bylaws changes need to be approved by the Members Meeting. Heske noted that we can’t do all of our business within just the one meeting a year. Lidicker had suggested that Ed add a paragraph about confidentiality of online voting, however Genoways thought that voting should not be confidential. Either way, these changes will be sent to the members for approval. The question is: should we respect confidentiality of the voting as appropriate? Not every vote has to be confidential, but votes can be confidential as needed. As a public forum, should we make these public or allow them to be kept confidential?

Tomasi pointed out that he couldn’t remember ever doing something by secret ballot on the board. He doesn’t think everyone needs to ‘reply all’, but it should be open so that people can request it or access it somehow. Heske agreed that his feeling is that his view is that nobody’s vote should be secret. He agrees that we could officially document the votes. Kelt agreed that he doesn’t foresee the need for confidential votes, but as written it’s easy enough to leave the clause in without damage.

McLaren pointed out a problem with the wording: it’s not clear whether it’s confidentially within the board or if all of the votes are supposed to be available to the membership at large. As a practical matter a quorum of all of the board is 14 or more people, and she (personally) doesn’t want to be cc’d on 14 or more emails on every vote. That’s often why she replies individually. Dormer added as a point of observation that we could also do a survey, and restrict it so that only the board individuals are able to vote.

Lessa suggested a friendly amendment: confidentially is something that the president can bring up as needed. Heske noted that as this is a bylaws change it’s worded now and we either need to take it out and resubmit next year or leave it as is. Lessa and Mares agreed to leave it.

Lidicker commented that the change is meant to be a permissive and sensitive guideline. It’s meant to be sensitive to the fact there could be sensitive votes; it doesn’t
say that everything should be confidential. Heske agreed, pointing out that we should operate in general and our votes are not confidential. There will be a list of names and a tally, but it’s a reserve clause just in case something comes up.

Lidicker asked if our votes on the awards were confidential. Heske said that they are right now. Hopton reiterated McLaren’s question - is that within the board or the society? Heske noted that in the case of ASM awards it would be best to be confidential within the board. Mares agreed; award votes should always be confidential. If someone doesn’t receive an award, it can sow animosity where none is required.

McLaren added that at the Alaska meeting there were things that were discussed in a preliminary way at the board meeting and told to people at the first social. People were really concerned about what they had heard. She found concrete, external documentation on confidentiality of our discussions in the board meetings. Timm added that internal confidentiality of the meetings was set down in Roberts Rules of Order.

Link suggested that develop a new way to vote electronically. This would also discourage the use of ‘Reply All’. Heske agreed and offered to look into it.

McLaren noted that some accountants want to see the board vote on anything that involved financial decisions. The CPA (of another group she was involved with) wanted to be assured that there was a quorum and what the count was. Heske asked if this meant we should keep track of the counts on the budget votes. McLaren thought we should, particularly for electronic votes.

Heske noted that we need a motion to strike this clause. No motion being made, Bylaws change Clause ‘C’ was left in the proposed Bylaws changes.

After a short break, Heske began a discussion on the budget. He noted that when we look at these numbers, we tend to argue the bottom line (4.5% transfer) and argue about a few thousand dollars. What we don’t realize that as scientists we think these are real data but the numbers that go into the spreadsheet are really fuzzy. These numbers represent estimates of costs, but they aren’t definitive. The error around those estimates is really big, and given that the differences we argue about really amounts to rounding errors. The reality is that the difference between proposed and actual transfer can be quite large. Over the past 9 years we have never transferred 4%. Overall, we’ve been very conservative as a society.

Heske showed a table put together by Kelt showing the proposed vs. actual transfer. The 8-year average of the actual transfer is 2.8%. As a result, it may not be worth worrying about a small investment pushing us over 4.5%. The reserve fund is doing well (around $3 million).

Eileen presented the budget that was distributed prior to the board meeting, with some columns collapsed. She noted that these are rough numbers and some will change. The estimated revenues are relatively flat picture (although we’re estimating $48,000 in royalties, based on 2011, instead of the $60K that we may actually receive based on 2012). If we increase the estimated royalties to 50K for the year, it brings the total estimated revenue to $226,000. The estimated expenditures are $392,000, which means a
potential transfer of about $166,000, and comes in at 5.3-5.4% of our running 3-year average.

In terms of expenditures, Heske noted that the President’s Contingency Fund in 2013 was $9,000. We’ve put the consulting (KFW) contract funds on the PCF line. This will be overspent in 2013, because of the consulting contract. The PCF supports many things that aren’t in the budget but don’t have a budget line (e.g., $250 for each newsletter, workshops in the meetings, and Horniday plaques).

New expenditures are requested for the Development Committee. Heske noted that we can’t keep squeezing our members (they can’t give more), so next year we’d like to put together a committee with Dave Schmidly. Schmidly estimated that with about $5000 in seed money and he and his committee could approach potential donors seeking endowment funds and sponsorship. Heske suggested adding $5000 to the budget (on the PFC) for him to pursue corporate investors. Discussion ensued about adding a specific development committee line. It was added to the budget based on general agreement, although they may not often need a budgetary request.

Lacey asked about the cost of credit card fees. Van Den Bussche replied those fees are now being charged to us. Allen Press used to subsume those costs, but now we’re paying them. He suggested making it equal to the 2012 rates.

Heske noted that the Allen Press member contribution has been difficult to estimate. The membership has been declining for the past few years, but the amount we are being charged for membership management keeps going up (we are budgeting the same amount as 2012), but that it’s difficult to anticipate.

Other committee requests include: a request from the ACUC for a retainer paid to Ellen Paul; the Education and Graduate Student Committee requested $750 for a student mixer and $300 for banquet tickets; Informatics requested $492 in annual operating costs, $10,000 for ongoing work (including the GIA additional request); the Program Committee requested funds to select the next venue and the board meetings; the Publications Committee request is the standard request; the Grants-In-Aid committee requested $49,500 to increase the number of awards funded; Honoraria and Travel Awards requested an additional $2,000 for early career travel awards and an additional $3,000 for student awards beyond their regular request; funds requested for the ASM Fellowship were constant with last year but the Latin American committee asked that their request be reinstated to last year’s level.

Heske noted that the ASM-AIBS Committee had put in a new request. Last year we decided last year in our budget that we could no longer afford the ASM-AIBS fellowship given the amount of funds that AIBS expects from ASM. Cook sent us a new AIBS proposal where instead of having a Washington intern they’re having a 2-3 day workshop where students go to Washington and meet with legislators. They could take up to 3 students for the program, with a cost of $4250.

Cameron felt the expense was not really worth it. He is concerned that ASM won’t get much for those funds. Timm agreed with Cameron, suggesting that instead we
add the funds to the ASM fellowship because we really cut the fellowship when we trimmed the budget a few years ago.

Mares disagreed, noting that a lot of our students aren’t going to be field biologists. He pointed out that this program this lets them learn how they can apply their skills in other ways. The experience may help them figure out how to take mammalogy and apply it across a broad spectrum of careers. As most people aren’t going to be researchers and professors, an experience of this sort may help them consider how to influence policy. Linzey agreed with Mares. She pointed out that the majority of students who’ve done the former internship program have gone into public policy. While the $15,000 request from AIBS is too much, we could support 3 students for a greatly reduced amount of money. McLaren added that this expenditure doesn’t necessarily just benefit the student; it is really an investment in the support of science in the political arena. It could have different ends for the society. Bell pointed out that this would be a valuable opportunity for graduate students to get exposure to how policy works.

Lidicker noted that most of the comments that have been made favoring this expenditure seem to be directed towards the interns. This program is three days and it’s really a workshop. He wonders if the experience is worth the investment from ASM. Lanier suggested specifically funding active ASM members this program, so that members who are vested in the society can learn these valuable skills.

Cook responded to comments, noting that he feels this is a good deal. We’re getting students with a lot of exposure. The Ecological Society of America and the Botanical Society both have being engaging in this program with the AIBS for quite a few years. He recommends opening this opportunity up to early career scientists as well, and likes the idea of specifically preferring active ASM members. ASM should be doing more than just research. He argued that we should engage more with policy; if we don’t this society is going to continue to decline as are the species that we study. This program could really make opportunities for engagement more apparent to many of our members.

Sikes agreed, noting that everything on the Animal Care side has been reactive. If ASM was more proactive we wouldn’t be in this position with IACUC standards. Ferguson pointed out that having more mammalogists in Washington, even for three days, would be well worth it. In terms of the total budget this request is quite modest. Given general approval, and with no major disagreement, Lacey tentatively added the budget request for the ASM-AIBS.

Lacey turned the discussion to the membership in SCAW, PRIMER, ACUC, ALAC. None of these items were contentious.

Cameron brought up the fact that based upon Hopton’s comments earlier, we should add $8,000 to the budget to start the process of finding someone to manage the website and prevent website crashes. Hopton and Hekse agreed; noting that if we start now we can put something in place so that by 2015 we can have someone else running & maintaining the website. Based upon general agreement, the $8,000 was added to the Information Committee request, bringing the total request to $18,492.
McLaren asked about the AP Member Contribution. For 2012 it was $68,000, why are we estimating that it will be $73,000 in 2014? Heske indicated that the number was a conservative overestimate. Leslie pointed out that based upon pg 8 of the Allen Press Report the formula is given, and that based upon the formula in the report it looks like it may drop next year. He recommended changing it to $64,000.

Fink brought up a request for funds from the membership committee to produce an updated brochure about the mammal society. A request of $500 was added to the Membership Committee request for the brochure creation and publication. It was generally agreed that this brochure would be made available as a pdf on the website.

Lacey noted that after these changes the new bottom line is $404,000, with a projected transfer is $178000, which puts the current estimated transfer at about 5.7% of the rolling 3-year average. Heske noted that this represents the ‘Blue Sky’ budget. Mares agreed that based on Leslie’s slide of proposed vs. actual transfers, this is budget is acceptable. The projections we are making are safely conservative and we’re not approaching fiscal irresponsibility.

Cook asked if the 3-year average was increased because of the downswing, and if it has been evened out. Heske replied ‘no’, that because of market fluctuations we would take the last three years, average it, and not take more than 4.5% of that. The 4.5% is based upon the budget that closed Dec 2012 (the average of the 3 previous years). If we went on the $3.6 million we currently have, we’d be under the limit. Our policy is to base the estimated percentage on the 3-year average.

Merritt asked why the Shadle Fellowship has not increased. Heske replied that we don’t know until right about this time of year on the amount of the Shadle. It dipped low one year so we passed a box and everyone added some money to keep it right around $4,000.

McLaren asked how much less we’ve spent than actually projected. Our goal should be put in more realistic numbers for the budget. Obviously, we’ve been pretty conservative and perhaps we don’t need to be quite that conservative. If we had better numbers, we won’t fight about what we’re spending. Heske agreed, and suggested we talk about the issue during the Membership Association Management meeting.

Mares brought up IRS regulations with regard to non-profits. We’ve been extremely fiscally prudent by following the 4.5% rule, and part of that is because everything keeps growing. This represents new income. McLaren noted that part of our ability to follow the 4.5% rule due to the fact that we’ve been very conservative.

Mares argued that given that we’re now looking at 5.7%, and we were fine last year this should be fine. Mares moved that the budget be accepted. Seconded by Patton.

Timm proposed a friendly amendment, that the budget be accepted as presented and modified herein.

McLaren asked about the figure on the year to date Life and Patron Member revenue. She asked if it includes new revenue (it seems kind of low). Van Den Bussche
replied that these are the payments for life memberships that people have made as of May this year. McLaren pointed out that consistently we’ve approved $8500 for a number of years. Is any of that the income generated by that subaccount, or is it a projected $8500 of new infusions? Heske replied that those were revenues and the other things transferred around. That number has no impact at all on our percent expenditure – it gets automatically transferred to the reserve fund.

McLaren clarified that her question is actually with regard to the low amount we have received so far. Van Den Bussche replied that a lot of people make their contributions in September, after the meetings, and it often jumps up later in the year. Tomasi asked if those individual payments round numbers. Van Den Bussche wasn’t sure – they’re typically round numbers.

Heske recommended that instead of passing the budget we leave the motion and second on the table, we come back at the second board meeting they can be revisited.

After the lunch break, Heske noted that members had asked that we vote on the budget now. Lacey added that this includes all of the changes suggested this morning and leaves the transfer at 5.7% of the rolling average.

Tomasi brought up the fact that we don’t track the funds that we get as residuals from previous meetings in the budget. Meeting residuals were showed under revenues, but they’re not rolled over from year to year and aren’t used to reduce the cost of the meetings. Meeting residuals from last year were around $16,000; if $800 under expenses but the rest disappears. Tomasi suggested that there should be a line under expenses to allow the program committee to spend that money the next year. Right now it’s going into the reserve, and we need to show what happens to the meeting residual. Heske reminded everyone that when we wanted to hire the consultant for the publications contract, and we counterbalanced with some of the meeting residuals. Tomasi responded that spending money in this way is not transparent.

Heske argued that the amount of meeting residuals is difficult to anticipate. Tomasi agreed, but replied that we should try to make sure we are transparent about how these funds are allocated. Van Den Bussche added that with K-State taking over he would get the financials really quickly. But, if we go back to a university model it could take a couple of years. Van Den Bussche suggested using the projected residuals from the contract (about $8,000) for the budget.

Tomasi noted that if we’re in the business of running meetings we should consider rolling those amounts over into the next year. We put that amount in there and spend from it as needed. He suggests that we track that fund separately. More discussion ensued, including comment from Brock.

Olson asked if the money from Allen Press is earmarked specifically for the host institution. Leslie replied that it is not. They also contribute to the scholarships. Link noted that that is what the money is it being used for now. Van Den Bussche replied that we have already transferred the money to the committee for the meeting. It’s already been sent to K-State. Further discussion of meeting costs ensued. Mares noted that with
more participation comes more costs for the meetings; he suggests that the board should not micromanage the Program Committee.

McLaren noted that the discussion about future meetings was upcoming, and that the financial picture affects the decision. Heske agreed. There is a lot of everything that goes into the budget. Tomasi believes that running the meeting ought to be a zero-sum game for the society. We should use the profits from the meeting to enhance the meetings. Mares argued that it’s all coming out of the general fund where everything goes. Heske agreed with Mares; if the funds all go into the general pot we can all decide how it gets spent. Tomasi argued that the benefits should go towards the future meetings.

McLaren agreed that it’s useful to have the budget be transparent so that we can see the big picture. Heske replied that we can do it, but it’s hard to make it a zero.

Lacey noted that the unintended consequence, this change increases the apparent transfer from the reserve fund (just over 6%). Mares pointed out that in practice we will still be under 4.5%.

Heske called the question on accepting the budget proposal. All in favor, no opposed, no abstentions.

Heske brought up a suggestion from Hugh Genoways to have a Life Membership drive. Currently our Life Membership is about $1800. If we put it in a pot and draw 4.5% of it’s about what our annual dues are. Even though it comes up regularly, it might be valuable to bring in the members; it was generally agreed that recruiting members is a reasonable goal. Discussion ensued.

Cook asked when we last raised membership rates. Heske noted that it was Portland. Cook asked if there was a formula for the lifetime membership fee. Heske noted that it equates to around 25 years of dues. Cook asked if we lose money on lifetime memberships. Heske argued that it’s a push; we’re not paying for the members after 25 years because their dues earn interest. Furthermore, we don’t have to worry about chasing non-renewed members.

McLaren pointed out that in the current contracts we have there is a per-member cost, but it’s considerably less for online only. What about making life memberships online only? Sikes agreed. There needs to be an option to pay for a lifetime membership over 2-4 years. Many students would pay it but would need to spread it out. There also needs to be a sunset for the offer, because most applications will come in at the last minute.

Patterson pointed out that life members now account for a large proportion of our membership and our publication costs. He wondered how many of our life members would be willing to move to online-only and save the publication costs. Heske thought that it may be about $12/member per year saved for online only.

Tomasi suggested that people who just paid for online memberships may feel cheated. Hopton asked how we would deal with people who are in the middle of paying into a life membership. Sudman suggested that we offer them the discount rate. Heske
pointed out that this is not unusual (i.e., many people inadvertently purchase things that later go on sale) and maybe we shouldn’t worry about it. Sudman suggested that most probably wouldn’t mind having their life membership costs reduced.

Mares argued that moving all memberships to life memberships wouldn’t be a big part of the budget (only about $7,000), which is generally negligible with regard to the budget. Heske asked what he recommended. Mares recommended going with an expert member consultant. If we keep loosing membership, we won’t exist.

Bell added that she is more concerned about student annual dues than life membership dues. Ferguson agreed that Life Membership is not the solution for student declining membership. Life members are going to be committed but we’re never going to have a society with only life members. What gives our society strength is the size of our membership, and we should encourage more student members and more members with reasonable rates. Heske countered that he wouldn’t throw away the life membership idea because it doesn’t work for all members.

Lidicker is in favor of a drive for members, and it can be for life members as well. He expressed concern that we’re not really considering the fact that we need to cover the costs in the future and we don’t know what costs will be. Heske thought that the membership drive option would be better that messing with the annual dues rates, because we’re going to have new numbers on the publications and management contracts shortly.

Tomasi pointed out that another approach might to discount the membership allow people who have been members to switch to a life membership. We could allow them to apply up to the last three years of annual membership dues towards being a life member. Heske responded that the simplest thing would be to pick a number and put out a sale and not get too complicated. Lanier suggested that online only shouldn’t cost us much in terms of management fees. Heske and Lidicker agreed.

Heske noted that Rodrigo Medellin suggested joint memberships for ASM and the Society of Conservation Biology (SCB). Tomasi thought it was good idea in principle, but asked how we would you divide up the membership fee. He suggested that we keep it separate and offer discounts. Heske agreed that accounting for the funds would be difficult, and we don’t know if SCB will approve the idea. Tomasi suggested that if not the SCB we might consider other mammal societies. Heske suggested we set up an ad hoc committee.

Heske brought up 100th anniversary meeting. He noted that the society was founded in 1919, but first meeting was 1920. As a result, the 100th anniversary meeting will be 2020 but the 100th anniversary of the society will be the year before. Anderson asked about the year of the 75th meeting (1994). As a result, the 100th anniversary celebration should be in 2019.

After a break for lunch, Kelt introduced the publications bids, noting that soon after last year’s meeting he was charged to figure out what to do for renewing the publishing contracts. Along with Kauffman Wills Fusting (KWF; the publishing
consultant) the committee developed an RFP for Publishing and another RFP for Association Management. He noted that if we stay with Allen Press there is no transition, but if we switch to a different publisher we need to figure out the transition details. In terms of Association Management, we sent out 10 requests, got back 2 proposals, and they’re really different, so the committee will consider those bids separately. The goal for this afternoon is to hear publications bids. At the second board meeting, we will identify two potential publishers so that we can follow up with them and try to get the best deal for ASM without ramping up rates for university or individual subscribers.

Cara Kaufmann introduced the publisher bids, noting that publishers were excited to try to improve the journals and figure out the best way to market the Journal of Mammalogy and ASM. We sent out She suggested that we pay attention to the summary of the financials. Publishers submitted bids for the next five years (2015-2019); giving them time to build the journal but not locking ASM into a very long-term contract. She noted that we asked that very detailed sources of revenue (sales, reprints, PPV, open access, etc.) over the five years. This is one of the reasons that the bids are so different: royalties, the editorial stipends, signing bonuses, and guaranteed royalties all vary among bids. The publishers also differed with respect to what they will the society for distribution to the members.

Allen Press provided a total next guaranteed income of about $40,000, and a projected income of about $350,000, over all five years. They are not willing to guarantee as much, but they’re a smaller company. Oxford University Press (OUP) is guaranteeing almost $1 million of their $1.2 million projected income. It’s a very aggressive bid that shows confidence in the journal and their ability to produce it. Taylor and Francis is offering about $950,000 in guaranteed income over the five years, and their projected is at $1.15 million.

Mares asked how the bids could be so different. Kaufmann responded that this economy does not favor smaller publishers. Also, Allen Press is trying to make a profit on their printing press, whereas other publishers are working through US or oversees vendors and have gotten their costs way down. They reach larger parts of the globe, get discounts on composition and type setting, and spread out the costs on the mobile and digital platforms. It’s distribution and costs savings for bulk. Allen Press had $1 million in their production costs and they didn’t want to change it. We brought this to their attention, but they’re not interested in altering their bid.

Tomasi asked if there are their differences in quality and timeliness when publishers work with oversees vendors. Kaufman responded that although there are horror stories with ever publisher, but on the whole there is no difference in the quality and the speed is better because they’re working 24 hours a day. She suggested we look for are the kinds of things that different among these bids: quality checks, global reach, transition, manuscript management systems, online platform. Also how the product lines of different publishers stack up. How similar are they? For example – does it help that Taylor & Francis have a lot of zoology journals? OUP doesn’t - which could be better or possibly not.
Heske asked about the difference in the signing bonuses. Kaufmann replied that they are rolled into the guaranteed royalty. Patterson asked if these projected revenues include revenues from aggregators (e.g., JSTOR)? Kaufmann replied that they are included, but it’s important to talk to the publishers about how they would foresee that transition (i.e., other publishers wouldn’t necessarily work with BioONE).

Taylor and Francis Proposal

Anthony Triolli, Sarah Cochran, Margaret Walker presented the proposal from Taylor and Francis. They began by briefly focusing on what differentiates T&F from other commercial publishers, and explain why we are the ideal partner for ASM. Taylor and Francis is the academic and scientific division of a company called Informa, which provides academic, scientific, professional, and commercial business services. They publish over 1750 journals, with over 200 focused on zoology. They take a small team approach to journal services – with a dedicated team on marketing, editorial, and production. The T&F philosophy is to provide significant financial return to their partners, as well as member services to retain and grow membership, provide an industry leading platform, dynamic marketing and sales, and an individualized plan. JM and MS would be key additions to the zoology portfolio and they would be flagship titles in these offerings.

They noted that T&F follows a professional and structured productions process, with submissions that are completely electronic and a dedicated production staff located in Philadelphia. Their options include rapid online publication, fast track, print on demand locally, and print less frequently (e.g., 12 issues but print three at a time). They also offer an online platform for our content (pdf and html).

Meg Walker presented the sales strategy. They anticipate preserving our existing subscriptions (title by title and through consortiums). Existing core subscriptions need to be protected. We will not undersell your content. 97% renewal rates. Usage is the most important metric in ensuring renewals, and we will work to try to increase and grow our usage. Our content will be included in the T&F libraries (e.g., T&F Combined or T&F Science and Technology), as well as the T&F subject divisions. Online access will make content available to students and potential users. This increased access drives usage, renewals, revenue, and journal longevity. Content is also being made available to foreign markets, in particular in developing nations at either a reduced cost or free. After looking at the relationships with JSTOR, BioONE, and EBSCO, they concluded that it would be worth continuing the relationship with those aggregators.

Sarah Cochran presented the marketing strategy, noting that T&F would design a marketing plan specifically for JM and MS. They would work with the global teams to ensure that both journals would have the widest visibility possible. They would target key markets. Usage is one of the most important factors that libraries consider when determining whether to keep subscriptions and get new subscriptions. They want to make sure are promoting all of our hot topic articles – e.g., we can make hot articles free, provide press releases, etc. T&F offers multi-channel marketing – including e-mail campaigns, high impact author promotion, virtual special issues (e.g., editor’s choice, important themes, sets of articles), brochures and catalogues, cross promotion, social
media marketing (Facebook and Twitter accounts), conference attendance (International Conference of Zoology, etc.), publicity and press releases, and promotion wherever T&F goes.

Anthony Triolli continued, indicating that T&F proposes an excellent financial package. They will bear all financial risk, provide a 25% royalty, $80,000 annually for five years, $120,000 to support editorial offices, up to $13,500 for journal editorial board meetings, $5,000 annually for the ASM student award, e-access with a $30 subscription, access to *Mammalian Species* at $4/subscription, and a $50,000 signing bonus upon signing a contract with T&F. The 5 year contract will begin 2015. All pricing will be set in collaboration with ASM. Online color will be available at no cost. ScholarOne and editorial manager will be available to ASM at no cost. ASM members get a 15% discount on any other T&F journals or books.

Kelt asked about institutional rates and circulation strategies. They are about 60% over what they’re at right now. How will that impact institutional reach? Triolli replied that when we first received the RFP he immediately thought our journals were undervalued. They feel that there won’t be any impact with regard to institutional subscriptions or sales deals. They don’t like to push prices. They enter into a deal and we like to see what price the market will accept, but we try not to have prices increase much year-to-year. The standard price increase is 4.5% year to year, but we try overall to be responsible in this price increase.

Kelt asked about non-US subscription rates? Triolli replied that their pricing is now global. Kelt asked about breaks for developing countries. Walker replied that there are now breaks to developing countries based on GDP.

Cameron noted that many intuitions are dropping printed issues. How do you envision those changes affecting our journal? Triolli replied that few places just get print anymore. It’s a bundled subscription. T&F will start with bundled and reduce for online only. As far as subscriptions go, when these deals are made we require institutions keep their subscriptions. Protecting our core readership is important. Walker continued, noting that people are moving online and it’s a good thing. It shows usage – librarians can track it, and the online links can drive users to multiple papers.

Mares asked for an example of a journal where they have expanded it’s reach and it’s improved it’s impact factors? Cochran responded that they have grown subscriptions for journals they’ve taken on, and there are a number of journals whose impact factors have increased (e.g., *The Journal of Lake Management*).

*Oxford University Press proposal*

David Crotty (OUP main point of contact), Alison Denby, Erin Ganley, Caitlyn Matuska, and Rebecca Seger presented the bid for OUP. They introduced the OUP mission to advance science and education, noting that these goals require commercial acumen. It’s of strategic importance to OUP to partner with societies like ASM. Commercial success is driven by the success of our journals. Over 85% of our titles are in the top 50% of our category, and as a result our readership and subscriptions have been
Everyone at OUP works on fewer journals than our competitors do. In the proposal those are their initial suggestions and as we work together we can come up with strategy for the journals and for ASM. They are committed to development and growth of JM and MS, and an extensive in-house development team will work to drive innovation and promote cross-fertilization of content to offer a two-way information flow.

Rebecca Seger gave the sales and market presentation. She noted that OUP will market JM globally, with their 70+ sales team. They will sell to all types of libraries. They can and will drive dissemination of our journals. Understanding the differing demands of these territories is key for expanding and growing our journal. Their pricing is fair and flexible. They will return the investment back to the research community. They have global relationships with over 1000 consortia and libraries. They offer a high level of transparency in sales and will get our journals immediately into the hands of users in India, Mexico, etc. Increases of market penetration in the Infectious Disease Society of America (IDSA) resulted in a 40% growth in North America and they believe they could do this with our journals.

The projected growth with OUP is very high. They would transition ASM from BioOne and identify BioOne customers and target them for transition with sales and marketing strategies to maximize opportunities. They believe they can reach those 1300 BioOne customers and bring them into the OUP customer base. Focused efforts will help place emphasis on our brand and our journal, will far surpass our current revenues, and get your journal into more hands globally with a sustainable model.

Alison Denby noted that the decision to transition from self-management to OUP is as seamless as possible, and we have set up a team to help journals make this transition. They are really careful in trying not to disrupt too much in transition. They are not tied to one system, and are hoping to minimize disruption to every aspect of our journals. We control all major policy decisions (including pricing).

Patterson asked how much of the projected editorial office support is the online handling services? Denby replied that what we haven’t done is projected for ME costs. They have freelance MEs who work with many of their journals, and they support those costs.

Chip asked about open access. Crotty replied that most of their science journals are making everything free after 12 months and it hasn’t hurt our subscription rates. They are working with a group called CHORUS to identify who has funded each article and automatically tag it.

Mares asked about what mainly interests OUP about JM compared to the other journals that they are handling. Crotty replied that they are looking for quality journals that don’t have a long tail of “junk.” They were particularly interested when we saw that our journal may become available. They don’t want to force librarians to take low-quality journals, and we want to build a strong portfolio in these areas. Seger added that they are interested in growing in our research areas, and they are excited to potentially acquire this flagship journal in the field.
Melanie Dolochek (publishing and marketing) and Karen Ridgeway (publishing manager) presented the bid for Allen Press. They noted that since the beginning of their relationship with ASM (2000) we’ve experienced significant growth in every measurable aspect: 66% increase in revenue, 162% increase in royalties, 196% advertising sales, and usage is 6X higher. ASM downloads were more than 3 million and visitors to the journal came from around the globe. Allen Press is not a large commercial publisher. They’re interested in helping societies self-publish. They’re a cooperative publisher. It’s difficult for societies with one or two journals to do well in the current playing-field, but their goal is to help societies do this.

They noted that Allen Press offers ASM a number of things: control, support, autonomy, independence, responsiveness, and ownership. The *Journal of Mammalogy* is an important title at AP, they want to help us further the society’s mission. They are offering a number of things in their proposal – free online color, lower color figure fees, faster time to publish, continuous workflow, more content (increased page budget up to 2000 pages annually), a new mobile website, manuscript tracking for editors with automatic contacting of reviewers who are ate, copyright transfer forms, greater revenue (15% royalty of growing revenues; $50,000 guaranteed annual payment), a change to member contribution model (all members receive free online access which should improve cash flow to the society), and new strategies for *Mammalian Species*.

Allen Press has proven that they have ASM’s best interest in mind, and they’ve demonstrated a sincere interest in continuing the relationships with ASM beyond just the financial return. They thoroughly understand the readers and have relationships with the editors, authors, and readers of the journal. We hope that you’ll see value in our continued relationships.

Tomasi asked if the guaranteed revenue is annual. Dolochek confirmed that it is.

Kelt noted that we’ve been with AP for 13 years. He asked what they envision doing for the next five years to increase our access? Dolochek replied that subscriptions through aggregators, such as BioOne, will be important.

Timm noted that color is a big cost and the $450/figure isn’t much better. He pointed out that need to make the color more available to more authors. Ridgeway replied that online only color is free, and important because at least 90% of authors are getting their information online. It’s expensive to print color, especially when we’re printing the sort of runs that the journal has.

Olson asked if it costs the publisher more to publish color images online than to publish greyscale. Dolochek confirmed that it does. It is more labor intensive because they have to do a fair bit of Quality Control.

Kaufman noted the projected return to the society is lower than the other competitive bids. She asked if they would be able to address the discrepancy directly. Dolochek replied that as a service provider they co-publish a small number of titles. Larger journals have 1000s of titles and treat print and typesetting as a commodity. They
get volume discounts. They’re larger vendors and their production costs are far less. The A&P costs are higher for producing the journal, but they do not treat production as a commodity. It’s treated as a craft at Allen Press.

First Board Meeting, continued

After a short break, Heske opened up the floor to comments, questions, and discussions.

Mares noted that all of us who have been involved in the journal have worked with AP for a long time, and I’ve noticed diminishing quality in the service we’ve been getting. The two presentations outside of AP were very good. OUP has an excellent reputation, and he thinks it would be a good fit. The answer they gave about putting together a package that would include us was good.

Timm noted that KU has been pushing open access publishing, and the biggest problem they have encountered is from T&F. Their librarians think that T&F is the most irresponsible publishers out there. He thinks that for ethical reasons we should take T&F off the table.

Lidicker noted that there were philosophical differences between T&F and OUP.

Sikes added that with T&F life and patron members get electronic access at no cost, but print would be an extra $30/year (we would need to negotiate that).

Kaufmann noted that the $30 for life and patron members is already built in, so that they will continue to get print. It’s already set it (member contribution that the society will make to the publishing agreement).

Sikes added that they had worked with OUP recently for a paper. They turned in the galley proofs and one of the things that really concerned him was that the copy editor had stuck in a bunch of commas that changed the meanings of the sentences. Leslie suggested that we need to let go a bit with regard to publishing. Sikes responded that they had to type every mark. Kaufmann responded that into every contract we will include the right to change copy editors and to set the style guide. We can even have them copy edit a couple of manuscripts that have already been copy edited so that we can compare them.

Tomasi noted that one of the big differences in these summary points is the editorial stipend and office allowance. The other two are 2-3x that of Allen Press. Is there something we’re missing. Right now AP provides a copy editor. Kaufmann replied that other journals do as well. The only thing that’s not included is that Allen Press supplies a ME. The other journals have the ability to supply a ME, but have not written it in.

Anderson asked if Kaufmann has any idea how much contracting an ME would cost, and how much that would burden that would take off our editors. Kaufmann replied that a full time ME could usually handle between 500 and 1000 manuscripts a year, and costs around $80,000. However, compensation varies widely ($40-120K per year, before benefits).
Kaufmann noted that we should have a managing editor over one or both journals, but different societies feel differently about whether it should be a university person or an editorial. As long as we build in any kind of contract that ASM can take the journal back within our control and have those monies returned to us (or replace that person if it’s not a good match) it may be worth trying.

Heske pointed out that those duties are a lot of things that Merritt is already doing right now. Merritt responded that we just need a better comparability between these three groups Kaufmann pointed out that sometimes they use MEs to be part of production, sometimes they are set up as the main contact.

Lidicker asked if this ME concept includes the person who chooses reviewers. He pointed out that we don’t want that to be outside the control of our society. Kaufmann said that we can retain control of the reviewers if we want to put it in the contract.

Tomasi asked about the copyediting. Kaufmann replied that copyediting is provided by each of the publishers that responded. Each one would create a style manual with you to ensure that your journals are grammatically correct but your style.

More discussion ensured regarding the guarantee. Kaufmann noted that it’s possible that it could be as much as $250,000 over the 5 years.

McLaren made a point of reference on the 50K, she made reference to the payments they currently have ($8500 for meeting expenses). This would be an increase of $6500.

Patterson noted that he thinks we might be missing the boat on pushing our journal nationally and internationally if we’re not going with a bigger publisher. Kaufmann replied that AP relies on the sales forces from aggregators.

Tomasi noted that AP talked about helping the society self-publish. It wasn’t clear to him that this meant something different from what OUP and T&F offered. Kaufmann replied that we were very specific in our language and made all of the publishers repeat it back to us. As far as using the word self-publishing, she thinks the reason that we heard it so frequently is that it’s something that AP says but it doesn’t help them anymore. There is and was a sense among societies that they were going to lose control. There is no difference in the level of service, and what we need to do is expand our distribution.

Sudman noted that with Southwestern Naturalist they do everything. Allen Press only provides a printing outlet. Tomasi asked if the society maintain the copyright. Sudman replied that they did. Tomasi asked if in our case, AP maintained the copyright. Kaufmann clarified that we do retain the copyright and would with all of these publishers.

Ferguson asked if they would they manage our membership contracts too. Kaufmann replied that those bids are separate.
Anderson asked about growing the journal and thinking towards the future; have we asked the companies to only provide bids where we maintain page charges? Does that remain open in the negotiations?

Kaufmann replied that we did not ask them to suggest the best way to handle it, we just told them what it currently is. Having worked with many publishers, if they really think something is off they will modify things. A few years ago publishers decided that they would eliminate page charges, but that’s swung the other way with OA – where the cost of publication is shared with the authors. If you have good ideas you can talk to publishers and see how they respond. She suggested that anything that we should add or change anything that we would like. Now is the time to do that as we get into these contracts. We won’t have this kind of leverage for a really long time. There will be some flexibility built into any agreement, but it will be different for what they signed up for and it will be tricky. Even the most cooperative publishing partners are living on plan.

Heske mentioned that one of the things he was worried about was the page charges, and one of the things we’ve recently touted was free page charges. He noticed that T&F and AP say that it’s staying the same, but is not sure about OUP. It’s good for us to have those sorts of member benefits. Kaufmann replied that they could, as could color charges. More discussion of charges ensued, and Kaufmann noted that the feedback on T&P from librarians was really concerning.

Kelt added that OUP’s suggestion to take us out of BioOne and put us in their legacy system is really good. Even if you terminate our agreement our content is still there. With BioOne our access is terminated after a certain amount of time.

Kilpatrick asked about the long term prospects for Allen Press. Kaufmann replied that it depends. They have had some losses. Small journals are really suffering.

Anderson noted two things that are very favorable for OUP: The ability to get us into more libraries, and the system to get manuscripts into submission and review. They’re both really big plusses. My gut feeling is to continue negotiations with OUP and T&F.

Seeing no further discussion, meeting recessed at 4:52 PM.

16 June 2014 – Second Board Meeting


The discussions on publications proposals and meeting venue issues were continued.
Linsey noted that all of the reactions we’ve heard indicate that we’re moving away from AP. We’ve heard some negative things about T&F, but if we’re going to have two options we will need to keep them in the running to have leverage with OUP.

Kelt noted that was his impression after speaking with Cara was that the best approach would be to negotiate with the top choice, but to keep the other three waiting while negotiations occur.

Tomasi doesn’t agree that AP is necessarily off the table. While there have been some issues, they could have the opportunity to fix them if we gave them feedback.

Heske countered that it’s not the whole issue. The issues that affect the rankings are threefold: 1) our projected income over the next five years. T&F and OUP are guaranteeing a substantially better financial package. Issue (2) is technological expertise. Allen Press is doing okay, but it’s been like pulling teeth to get things done and they’re falling behind. 3) Global breadth. Along with the budget, this is a really strong argument for OUP or T&F. Both showed maps of the world and demonstrated where they could expand their market internationally. AP doesn’t seem to have the ability to do that. AP make comments like the US market is kind of saturated, but the extent of the growth that they see for it is limited. AP didn’t really measure up in terms of what they were offering for the next five years.

Timm moved that we rank these companies 1) OUP, 2) AP, 3) T&F, and we instruct the ad hoc committee to move forward. Seconded by Tomasi. Cook and Kilpatrick disagreed with regard to the rankings.

Cameron agreed with the rankings, but wanted to know what is currently wrong now and in the future with Allen Press.

Kelt noted that on the financial side, Cara Kauffman returned to AP and let them know that on the financial side they were well below the other bids.

Kilpatrick thought that T&F could move us into the international market.

Olson asked to hear more from Timm about problems with T&F. Timm responded that while KU wants him to go with Open Access for his paper, but T&F won’t give anyone Open Access rights until a year after publication. T&F is one of the companies that increase the price on journals to the libraries. They don’t sell journals anymore, they sell bundles. And TF in our librarian’s point of view is one of the worst. For moral reasons we don’t want to deal with T&F, but I concur with AP is not going to internationalize us.

Ferguson asked that since it seems like OUP is number 1, do we need to choose between T&F and AP?

Kelt thinks we could just pursue OUP, and they are likely to come to a resolution. If it falls flat we can discuss alternatives through the rest of this out through email.
Lacey suggested that we either defeat the motion or modify it. Timm withdrew the motion. & Tomasi withdrew the second.

Heske assumed that KWF would go back to OUP with our questions to negotiate an offer, and we don’t need to have a negotiation with two different publishers. Leslie agreed. Heske asked how we want to phrase a motion to authorize the ad hoc committee and KDW to pursue negotiations with OUP. Timm responded that we can just charge them to further these discussions with OUP and come back to us with the best deal and a specific contract. Leslie pointed out that the committee needed to think about the negotiating points. Timm asked for color. Heske asked for additional follow up on meeting venues discussion that Eileen concluded during the Members Meeting.

Kelt responded that one thing that didn’t come up, was that being on University campuses is familiar and enjoyable. We talk about the Lake Charles meeting all the time, but he had a blast. It was horrible. If we can find ways to resolve some of the issues, he would really like to go back to a University Venue.

Heske thinks that as a result of this discussion we have more likelihood of doing a hybrid university model in 2016. Tony Ballard’s group is really professional, and great at doing (and fixing) things. They make some decisions on their own, but we try to get them to go back and redo them.

Cameron added that one of the things that he has liked about a convention center is that all of the meeting rooms are centralized. On college campuses that’s often one of the difficulties. Heske agreed that there were pros and cons. For example, costs for the banquet tickets can be pretty high. We don’t know which option is best, and we’ll see. We’ll try to get an option for 2016 that includes one or two meetings on college campuses.

Sikes added that even the notion of a hybrid model needs to be reconsidered a little bit. There is some technology and ability that we didn’t have a few years ago. For one of the conferences he planned a few years ago, they used a company called 1,2,3 sign up. We had instant information on where they had registered, when they had registered, etc. Even within a hybrid model there is still a lot of flexibility that was not there a few years ago.

Cook asked what the KSU group charges us to do the organization for the meeting. Van Den Bussche replied while he’s seen and signed the contracts he doesn’t recall, but it may be around $40,000. Tomasi pointed out so that adds $30 to every registration.

Kelt added that this relates to an ongoing discussion. The ad hoc committee met yesterday with the AMC companies, and the competing bid is interesting in doing meeting management. They may be able to give us a fairly competitive bid for association management.

Ferguson noted that it was pretty shocking that we don’t have data on meeting costs. The fact that we don’t know how many people registered or how many students are here is deplorable. We should charge the program committee with keeping track of those
data. Van Den Bussche replied that we do have data on the cost, he just doesn’t have it here. Timm added that Winston Smith can get those data, and we have a fiduciary responsibility to know what we’re paying KSU because that jacks up the price of all of our registration.

Olson followed up and asked that we take a close look and reevaluate what the Program Committee is charged with. When the meetings were hosted in Fairbanks, we had a booklet on how to host the meetings that was years out of date, and what happened to it? Tomasi indicated that he brought it up to date but doesn’t know what happened to it.

Olson asked about happened with having former hosts as part of the Program Committee? Kilpatrick replied that he was on the Program Committee. Cook agreed that he served on the committee as well.

Lacey pointed out that this was for positive or negative part of the transition (to managed meetings), but it’s a loss of continuity. By having a centralized service, some of that transition of information can be continued, instead of having information being lost as local hosts try to recover. Olson disagreed. He pointed out that he was able to contact previous hosts.

Lacey pointed out that what we pay KSU may remove part of the burden on hosts. Cook agreed it is a tremendous burden. Olson pointed out that the KSU folks don’t have the same perspective on the meetings. Lacey agreed, but noted that we can and should identify what the key components are and try to get them in the meetings. We’re more the sort of folks who when we’ve been charged we can use this to get things out there. Heske added that Tony Ballard would do what we asked for the meetings.

Tomasi indicated that up until last year this board and the society have really had very little to do with putting on the meetings. It’s nice to have 10 years of data, and the program committee should be helping the local hosts. But this society purposely divorced themselves from hosting the meeting. If the meeting was in the red, then that was on the host committee. Insurance costs were on the host committee.

Tomasi added that we need to clarify whether it’s more important to follow the rotation of whether it’s more important to have the meeting at the venue that we want. We need to have these priorities ranked. Heske favored this idea, noting the many emails he has received that pointed out ‘we’re off our rotation.’ Lots of local people can only go when it’s close. And if you look at the registration for this meeting, almost half of the registrants are new attendees. As you move it around the country you will draw in additional attendees.

Olson asked how many people aren’t attending this year. Heske clarified that he was just pointing out that it’s why we move the meeting around. There are people that this is important to. Linzey noted that we had this discussion as far back as ‘96 or ‘98 when she was president. And the board’s suggestion was that we still to the rotation if possible, but the critical thing was to find a suitable venue.
Heske clarified that if possible then was that we needed a volunteer. Now we ask Tony to find us a city within a region. It’s never not possible to meet in a region.

Bell asked what kinds of information or things can we gather that might be useful in carrying this discussion or decision forward. Is there anything that may or may not be useful that would be captured in a survey. Much of the data is anecdotal. It would be nice to solidify the information that we gather. Lacey replied that she can’t entirely answer that question. For the moment the biggest push would be to get people to respond and weigh in on the survey.

Heske replied that Tony wanted a survey ready to go, but we told him that we could not do it until we finished talking about this with the members. I’m not trying to hide behind Eileen, but she will be the president during these meetings.

Lacey followed up and that if we ask people to write down their thoughts. For example, which is more important location or venue?

Bell replied that the differences in costs were very important. Many students have no idea what the cost differences really come down to.

Hopton reiterated that we need data. If we look at our attendance over the past number of years, are we really flat? If we’re flat, there may be some variation, but we want to grow. We need to grow. If attendance is shifting based on venue type or location, we need to know that. We have a lot of new attendees. Will they come next year? Heske replied that the historic trend data may be less useful than you think. Membership is crashing. Times are changing. Correlation is not causation. It would be more effective to ask questions that Eileen suggested.

McMillan pointed out that we still need the data. This is important. Ask the people. Which is most important. We were unable to bring many of the students we normally bring because of the cost.

Matocq responded that even with this hybrid model we need to know the costs. We need some information from KSU about whether this model is feasible. If Universities have their own conference planners, we may need to pay both. Heske responded that our contract is annual. We don’t have to stick KSU. Our contract is through 2015.

Lidicker commented that we don’t want to be too rigid. If we want to decide on a format, why can’t we have a little more flexibility. It’s not necessary to have the same format each year. Heske noted that Felisa Smith tried to give me her proxy votes, but he told her we don’t do proxies. She was saying the same thing – why not do what is best at the time.

Mares noted that that was the original plan, but if we want to turn it around, we will need to bring in professionals. We have to turn the membership around. The meeting isn’t the problem with declining membership.
Heske responded that we’ve covered a lot of good points, and we’re going to move towards university venues for 2016. Hopefully, Tony got to hear a lot of the things that I’ve been telling him. We can push those things a bit more. As they learn us, they’ll do better.

Mares made the point that we can’t just pick a town. We can put out a call for proposals. Most places are booked years in advance. Most meetings are working five years ahead. We need to get ahead of the curve.

Heske opted to move on and discuss the tabled bylaws changes. With reference to bylaws change ‘C’, authority for disbanding standing committees. My interpretation of the bylaws was that the president appoints the members of the standing committees, and I took that to mean that I could disband one if I wanted. Based on discussion with Hugh, I’m not sure if I can do that.

Timm pointed out that we now have the opportunity to pool the board electronically.

McLaren added that we still have to follow Robert’s Rules of Order. Mares pointed out that he could just not appoint anyone to a committee. Heske responded that with Planning and Finance it didn’t seem functional when he became president, and most of the charges to the committee were defunct. Cameron disagreed, and though it was potentially functional. McLaren agreed with Cameron, and pointed out that as the chair the president should make it function. Heske thought that it was easier not to worry about the committee but just to get the budget done.

McLaren pointed out that based on precedent we needed a committee to determine committee changes. We had a strategic planning committee when Alicia Linzey was president and they brought a number of committee changes together and brought them before the board. It seems like the standing committees are more outside that purview. Heske responded that he just made the change based upon what seemed to work and executive privilege. He also re-named the Honoraria committee. Wilson replied that Hugh Genoways and Sue McLaren were perfectly correct. The president has the authority to name the chairs and approve the members of the committee, but not to create or disband the committees. Heske concluded that then the P&F committee wasn’t abolished.

Timm moved to abolish Planning and Finance. No second.

Leslie asked if does that mean that Planning and Finance is back in existence? Cameron replied it was a valuable committee. It taught the president about the budget, and that was important. Heske responded that it’s not really doing anything. The President teaches the President Elect about the budget. The committee doesn’t do anything. It’s all done by the board. McLaren replied that the Planning and Finance Committee should see the budget a few weeks or a month before it went out to the board. Heske responded that he did send the budget and didn’t get any response, besides a few comments from Chip Leslie.
Lacey asked if we still have a motion on the table. Timm replied that since it never was seconded it died.

Lacey replied that if it’s a valuable committee, maybe they should consider not only the annual budget but also planning. How do we go after long-term budget? What about working with Dave Schmidly and going after earning additional funding.

Heske asked how that role would be different from what the Development Committee does. Lacey replied that it might be a solution to make sure that the committee has a valuable purpose to focus on returns.

McLaren said that that was part of the initial plan for Planning and Finance. It’s really a philosophical problem for the committee. We can only do so much and bring it to the board. We always get tied up in the current budget. But we have a new model with Dave Schmidley. Planning never reached it’s full potential.

Heske noted that as far as he’s concerned there isn’t a lot of cost or benefit to having the Planning & Finance. But we can appoint some people and see where it goes. The other thing that he did was re-name the Honoraria Committee to Honoraria and Travel Awards Committee. Do we need a vote for that?

The general consensus was no.

Heske moved the discussion to online voting issues. He noted that it’s kind of a mixed response. It’s modernizing and inclusive, but obviously voting at the meeting brings everyone together.

Lacey replied that her sense at the member meeting was that we need an ad hoc committee to develop a couple of solid proposals so that there is something tangible for people to respond to.

Heske offered to appoint an ad hoc committee to give a couple of proposals about how to do this. There are ways to do this that would still make participating at the annual meeting a filtering process for getting our nominees.

Tomasi noted that one of the issues would be how the response time is. With some of the things that we do is to pick officers and nominate members of the board.

Heske replied that it was one of Hugh Genoway’s criticisms. We lose the cascading effect, but that’s true for most elections. Olson pointed out that we do that with the Shadle and ASM Fellowships. Kelt added we would need to ensure that the person who gets nominated agrees to serve.

Heske responded that he would like an up or down vote on putting together an ad hoc exploratory committee to bring us some more concrete options for this. Sue added there have been some misunderstandings about this, and we should try to have the ad hoc committee be called something different such as the Elections Committee. There has been some misinterpretation of it being a ‘Nominating Committee’. Heske agreed. If we have an ad hoc committee they should just help us figure out how to do the elections.
Brock expressed mixed feelings. He liked the idea of being more inclusive but he is a member of other societies where nobody comes to the business meeting because it’s boring. This may be a large percentage of why people come to our meetings. It would be nice to have the data on attendance so we can know the effect. Heske agreed, but said that we could duplicate effort online. This would also be true for meeting venues. He would like to push on the possibility and have an ad hoc committee explore the options.

Kelt **motioned** that we nominate an *ad hoc* committee for the purpose of exploring the possibly of online elections. Seconded by Kilpatrick. Motion passed unanimously.

Heske asked for additional business.

Cameron brought up the point that the supporting documentation on the Leopold Conservation Awards is inadequate. Horniday asks for two letters of recommendation. We should make them the same. Cook added that it’s the same. It’s a student award. Cameron responded that the Leopold asks for only a letter. We need to have a nominating letter an a supporting letter. Mares replied that he has nominated people and treated it like the Merriam. Heske asked if they want to make a motion for that? Timm responded that we don’t need a motion. Just charge the committee with doing so. Cook agreed and asked Matt Hopton to change the website.

Kelt added that the publications chair is eliminated at the end of this meeting. This position needs to be elected by the board.

Mares **moved** to nominate Doug Kelt as the Director of Publications. Seconded.

Timm noted that we need to make the director of publications a member of the board.

Kelt replied that the director of publications was already a member of the board.

Nominated by Heske. Passed unanimously.

Tomasi asked for a point of clarifications. The *ad hoc* elections committee is online voting or does it include online meeting venue votes.

Heske replied that he wasn’t going to pursue it. The general agreement was that it could be less contentious. Heske replied that the board tabled it. He wouldn’t have the same committee vote online for venues. He offered to work with the committee to determine a new way of voting online for venues, but we may not need a motion. He asked for a vote from the board to move forward with the bylaws change.

Mares **moved** that we move forward with changing the bylaws to have an online vote for the venue but we can present the venues at the annual meeting. Much discussion ensued. Tomasi responded that we just need to plan. Heske replied that he would just send around a vote once it’s polished up. Kelt pointed out that Heske could add it to the charge of the new *ad hoc* committee.
Timm asked if the Director of Publications needs to be Chair of the Publications Committee. Kelt agreed with the need to clarify the point.

Heske responded the new bylaw we just passed said the Publications Director is now the head of the Publications Advisory Board. The members of the publications board are now *ex officio* all the associate editors, the journal editors, and the editors of *Mammalian Species*.

Heske asked for a motion to remove the Publications committee. Mares moved to abolish the publications committee. Seconded and passed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:43.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF MEMBERS
UNABRIDGED VERSION

The ninety-third meeting of the members of the American Society of Mammalogists was called to order at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown by President Edward Heske at 11:27 A.M. on 15 June 2013, and recessed at 12:28 P.M. The second meeting on 16 June 2013 was called to order at 11:14 A.M. and adjourned at 1:08 P.M.

Recording Secretary Lanier moved that the minutes of the 2012 meeting be approved as published in the December 2011 issue of the Journal of Mammalogy; motion seconded and passed.

President Heske appointed tellers for elections of Officers and Directors and other measures requiring a vote of the members. Tellers were Elizabeth Kierepka, Adam Ford, Jason Malaney, Brooks Kohli, Lauren Dorough and Dakota Rowsey.

Secretary-Treasurer Van Den Bussche presented the statistical report on membership. Van Den moved to accept the 225 nominees from last year and 205 new nominees as of 24 May 2013 to membership in the ASM and to reinstate the membership of 103 individuals; seconded and passed.

Van Den Bussche moved to drop the 396 individuals who have not renewed their membership. Seconded and Past.

Heske noted that the membership committee has been pursuing non-renewing members, and this move has been somewhat successful. He suggested that everyone look at the list of non-renewers and contact people you know personally and help get them back in the fold.

Van Den Bussche presented the report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Van Den Bussche also presented the Report of Trustees for Phil Sudman, chair of trustees. He noted that the Reserve Fund reached a high of 3.7 million dollars in October 2007, the historic downturn resulted in the lost of 50% of the reserve fund. Recovery was slow; however, net values on all funds have increased in the last year, even though allocations to operations exceeded deposits.
Recording Secretary Lanier presented the Report of first Board of Directors meeting.

Heske noted that the board left stable or increased the funding for student research, travel awards, and internships, and fellowships. He described the new ASM-AIBS public-policy workshop program with the society. Heske also recognized last year’s ASM-AIBS public policy intern: Eve McCollugh.

Heske noted that our current Vice President, Chip Leslie, has opted not to stand for re-election this year. He has done a wonderful job year and has been incredibly helpful - chairing the ad hoc committee for bylaws changes and working on upgrading our Open Access.

Vice President Bob Sikes nominated and approved by general acclamation.

Recording Secretary Hayley Lanier was nominated and approved by acclamation.

Heske invited nominations for “members at large” of the Board of Directors, Class of 2016. Nominees included: Janet Braun, Leslie Carraway, Kris Helgen, Virginia Naples, Bill Kilpatrick, Rodrigo Medellin, John Kowrowski, Marjorie Matocq, Brett Riddle, Mike Willig, and Neal Woodman. Student nominees included: Casey Day, Adam Ford, Molly McDonough, Melissa Merrick, and Ryan Stevens. Nominators were instructed to post information about each nominee on the bulletin board for review by the membership, with the votes scheduled for the Second Board Meeting.

No resolutions were submitted to the Resolutions Committee this year.

Dick Thorington, for the ombudsperson committee had nothing to report.

Reports of other Standing Committees are available online. President Heske thanked all of the committees for all of their hard work, and noted that many of the committees had waived their report time to allow for more time during the second committee meeting.

Reports of the Animal Care and Use, Conservation, and Education and Graduate Students committees were then given respectively by Robert Sikes, Brad Bergstrom, Sue Fairbanks.

Guy Cameron chair of the Honorary Membership Committee presented the nominations for honorary membership, noting that this is the highest award that the society gives. Chip Leslie and Kris Helgen presented the first nominee – Colin Peter Groves. The nomination was approved by the membership by acclamation.

Cameron delayed the second nomination until the second business meeting. The meeting was recessed at 12:28.

Heske called the second members meeting to order at 11:14.
The second nominee for honorary membership, Fabian Jacksek, was presented by Past-President Micheal Mares. The nomination was approved by the membership by acclamation.

Heske presented proposed changes to the ASM bylaws, based on suggestions from an ad hoc committee led by Leslie, and including Past Presidents McLaren and Mares. The board approved about half of their proposed bylaw changes (below). Heske noted that it takes a 2/3 majority of the members present at the meeting to pass a bylaws change.

**Item 1** – ASM publications to life members;
**Item 2** – Changing the office position from Journal Editor to Chair of Publications committee, and defining the position as Publications Director and term of election to 6 years (equivalent to Secretary Treasurer)
**Item 3** – Changing the VP and recording secretary from 1 to 2 year terms
**Item 4** – Past-Presidents can serve as Recording Secretary, Publications Director, or Chair of the Trustees
**Item 5** – Formally approve electronic meetings of the Board of Directors
**Item 6** – Trustees will manage Pooled Income Fund
**Item 7** – text highlighted in blue

All items presented to the membership passed unanimously.

Reports from the Grants-In-Aid, Honoraria and Travel Awards, Human Diversity, Informatics, International Relations, Mammal Images Library, Membership, and Public Education Committees were given by Brock McMillan, Ginny Hayssen, Matt Hopton, Duane Schlitter, David Huckaby, Elmer Finck, and Virginia Naples respectively.

Heske added a few comments about the membership recruitment drive.

Janet Braun for the Program Committee postponed her report until the end.

Doug Kelt presented the report of the Publications Committee, thanking outgoing editors and welcoming two new Associate Editors. He also noted that the are looking for more Associate Editors.

Heske brought up the fact that the bylaws changes had been tabled on online voting. He noted that we’re doing all of our voting in the members meeting, but we could move this entire process online. Discussion ensued, with general agreement that this move would include more people in the process. Concerns were voiced that this may discourage attendance at the members meetings; however, most people favored the possibility for electronic voting.

Voting for Board Members class of 2016 was conducted. New board members are Marjorie Matocq, Bill Kilpatrick, Kris Helgen, Rodrigo Medellin, John Koprowski, Molly McDonough (student member) were elected by the membership.

Lacey presided over the discussion on future meeting venues. She noted that having seen what it takes to organize and run a traditional model, it may not be feasible to
go back to the traditional host meeting. But we have some latitude to determine what we want in the future. The cons to the conference model include the price increase, particularly in housing. The number of attendees in meetings is down from Wyoming to this year and next year. The pros to conference center model include the fact that there is no local host, and the meetings are more professionally run. The question to throw open to the membership is what is the best model moving forward: (1) professional meeting service, and (2) physical venue. What parameters are important to members: cost, geographic location, city size, program content, etc.?

Discussion ensued. Important points included the fact that having central locations for meals is very useful because informal interactions that occur during those informal meals is part of what bring the society together. Additionally, many universities now have conference centers that take a lot of the burden and planning away from the program committee on the meeting planning. Other important points included the fact that expensive meetings disproportionately impact attendance from students, postdocs, and attendees from small institutions.

Olson added that as a past Host Committee Chair it seems like we’re being presented with lots of negative data with the occasional positive plugs. All of a sudden things like location (cycling around the country) have seemed to come up a lot. Are we giving up without asking enough questions about the previous model of hosting meetings?

Winston Smith agreed, challenging the notion that professionally run meetings are better than non-professionally run meetings. He noted that he has all of the data on attendance and costs from multiple meetings in a row. He also has located meeting institutions from Seattle to Portland. It took some effort and cultivation. He had a 2012 state at Penn State and was shot down. It takes some planning and effort, but it’s not insurmountable.

Mac Macintyre asked if ASM be interested in retaining a professional meeting organizer as we do now? He has heard other people say that they alone at their institution would not be able to host their meeting, but with the help of a meeting service like K-State they may be able to do so.

Barbra Blake commented about the location. She thought that Philadelphia would be really interesting, but really hasn’t had time to go out and visit. She suggests we should aim for small, boring cities without so many taxis. What about a mixed model where we use dorms at $28/night and reduce the housing costs?

Generally it was agreed that the mixed meeting model could be valid. If we retain the conference services to do the portions of the meeting that are the most challenging we will be able to remove the largest burden of meeting planning making it more attractive to host the meetings (particularly smaller institutions).

Lacey followed up, indicating there will be a survey coming out from the program committee about these issues. She asked that those people with strong opinions complete the survey.
Heske added that the next meeting will be in the upper Midwest (Michigan to the Dakotas) and asked for volunteers to consider hosting a meeting at a university venue. Cody Thompson and Virgina Naples indicated a willingness to put in bids for the next meeting.

The invitation to 2014 annual meeting in Oklahoma City was given by Janet Braun. She noted that the meeting space will be in the Oklahoma City Renaissance Hotel and the adjacent Cox Convention Center ($119/night). Social events include a picnic at the Myriad Gardens, adjacent to the venue and sponsored by the OKC Convention and Visitor Bureau, and the banquet at the Sam Noble Museum on Tuesday June 10th.

Two competing bids were presented for 2015. Brandy Coyner, a member of the Program Committee, presented option for Raleigh North Carolina. Janet Braun presented the second invitation, from Jacksonville Florida. Based upon a vote by the membership, Jacksonville Florida was selected as the 2015 meeting location.

When no additional Business was brought forward, a motion was made to recess the meeting until the banquet. At the Annual Banquet a number of announcements and awards were presented.

Grants-in-Aid were awarded to: Jessica Walz (Ohio State University; B. Elizabeth Horner Award), Daniel Becker (University of Georgia), Sonny Bleicher (University of Illinois at Chicago), Cara Brook (Princeton University), Hsiang Ling Chen (University of Arizona), Kate Cleary (University of Idaho/CATIE), Matthew Davis (Yale University), Christopher Emerling (University of California at Riverside), Gideon Erkenswick (University of Missouri-St. Louis), Nicholas Fletcher (Cornell University), Leticia Gutierrez (University of Missouri-St. Louis), Talisin Hammond (UC Berkeley), Anne-Marie Hodge (University of Wyoming), Matthew Holding (Ohio State University), Anne Honeywell (University of Southern Maine), Caldonia Hubbard (University of Nevada-Las Vegas), Katrina Jones (Johns Hopkins University), Allyssa Kilanowski (University of Arizona), Rebecca Kirby (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Angela Larsen (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), Molly McDonough (Texas Tech University), Matthew Mumma (University of Idaho), Haley O’Brien (Ohio University), Lisa Powers (University of Illinois), Nelish Pradhan (University of Vermont), Jason Riggio (University of California, Davis), Torrey Rodgers (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Hae Yeong Ryu (Stony Brook University), Mariano Soley-Guardia (City College and The Graduate Center, City University of New York), Julie Turner (Michigan State University), Jennifer Wilkening (University of Colorado, Boulder).

The recipient of the ASM Fellowship in Mammalogy, C. Miguel Pinto (American Museum of Natural History) and the nominee for the Albert R. and Alma Shadle Fellowship in Mammalogy, Joseph R. Burger (University of New Mexico), were announced at the banquet. The Anna M. Jackson Award went to Elizabeth Kierepka (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), the Elmer C. Birney Award to Adam Ford (University of British Columbia), the A. Brazier Howell Award to Jason Malaney (University of New Mexico), and the Annie M. Alexander Award to Brooks Kohli (University of New Mexico). The ASM Undergraduate Awards were presented to Lauren
Dorough (California State University Fullerton) and Dakota Rowsey (Pacific Lutheran University).

The following awards were also announced at the annual banquet: Latin American Student Field Research Awards to Emma Gomez-Ruiz (Mexico), Romina Pfoh (Argentina), and Mariel Ruiz-Blanco (Argentina); the Oliver P. Pearson Award to Mariana Muñoz-Romo (Universidad de Los Andes); the C. Hart Merriam Award to Rudy Boonstra (University of Toronto Scarborough); the Joseph Grinnell Award for Excellence in Education in Mammalogy to to Dr. Ricardo Ojeda (Centro Regional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas); the Hartley H. T. Jackson Award to C. William Kilpatrick (University of Vermont); the William T. Hornaday award to Abdullahi Hussein Ali (National Museums of Kenya & University of Wyoming); and the 2013 Aldo Leopold award winner is Joel Berger (University of Montana).

The following resolution was adopted:

HOST RESOLUTION FOR THE NINETY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MAMMALOGISTS

WHEREAS, to the anonymous evaluator who reproached me for including a joke in my very first talk at these meetings nearly 20 years ago by pointing out that ASM is about science and not “standup comedy” I would just like to say [raspberry] and,

WHEREAS, limited resources resulted in mammalogists demonstrating rapid Giving Up Densities and additional strong selective pressures of $7.50 domestic beers resulted in the most rapid switching to alternate foraging patches ever observed at an ASM mixer and,

WHEREAS, in a tender moment following the simultaneous abrupt drought and early onset of simulated sunlight at the Friday social, the Vice President and Journal Editor were observed sharing the same glass of wine and,

WHEREAS, we learned from Brooks Kohli that, whether we call it Clethrionomys or Myodes, the northern red-backed vole is a different type of boreal forest species without an identity crisis; Elizabeth Kierepka taught us that faster badgers just aren’t all that special; Adam Ford, in his assessment of trophic cascades in East Africa, indicated that “cows + manure + rain = delicious” (we wonder if he tested that equation himself?); we learned from Jason Malaney that he really likes mammals that hop and that the older male mammalogists should not be concerned about their low “ED scores”; Miguel Pinto taught us that there are still a lot of new mammals to be discovered in the cloud forests of the Ecuadorian Andes if only he were tall enough to see them; and while we learned from Ryan Long that “Niche Mapper” can be used to map the energetic landscape, can we adapt this model to assess mammalogists’ consumption of Philly cheesesteaks and alcohol? and,

WHEREAS, the “Rate My Poster” gimmick shed new light on peer-review and the idiosyncrasies of voter turnout, collectively leading to rapid selection for multi-authored posters as a means of ballot-stuffing by coauthors and,
WHEREAS, a new ad hoc committee had to be convened to determine whether or not Doug Kelt is, in fact, an officer of his beloved Society and,

WHEREAS, a made-for-TV movie based on the Honorary Member nomination delivered by Kris Helgen is now in the works starring filibuster king Rand Paul and,

WHEREAS, President Ed Heske placed the entire ASM Board on an unannounced crash diet by running the 2nd Members Meeting right through the lunch hour and,

WHEREAS, as has been secretly suspected for years, and having now been confirmed via PowerPoint, ecological niche modeling is nothing but hand waving and,

WHEREAS, despite a fascinating presentation by Jim Estes on his career-spanning research on the ecological collapse of the North Pacific Ocean, several hard-of-hearing members of the Society are still puzzling over Doug Kelp’s alleged role,

WHEREAS, heated debate over the increasingly complex issue of meeting venues notwithstanding, Society members have one word for next year’s hosts in Oklahoma: basement, basement, basement and,

WHEREAS, in an effort to raise funds for next year’s meeting, Michael Mares has generously offered to show anyone willing to contribute $100 the contents of the hidden bottom compartment of his roller briefcase and,

WHEREAS, for an extra $100 he’ll let you try one on and,

WHEREAS, following a poorly-timed call to Charley Potter’s decidedly UN-silenced cell phone during the White-nose Syndrome Symposium, attendees were able to witness the first official ASM presidential stink-eye and,

WHEREAS, meeting attendees were subsequently led to wonder just what options President-Elect Eileen Lacey had on HER cell phone and whether or now they could get them, too and,

WHEREAS, the cost of internet at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown could have paid for accommodations at a Motel 6 and,

WHEREAS, meeting attendees lucky enough to visit the Mütter Museum of medical oddities learned to avoid the Soylent Ribs food truck across the street and,

WHEREAS, the cost of internet at these meetings combined with a 140-character limit made tweeting updates to the #ASMPhilly hashtag slightly more expensive than what it would cost non-members in page charges to publish them in the Journal of Mammalogy and,
WHEREAS, we learned from Grinnell Award recipient Jim Brown that his three most-recent Ph.D. students had to take off their shoes and socks just to count the rest of their academic siblings; we heard from Leopold Award winner Dean Biggins that extinction in the wild can at times be the ticket to salvation; and Merriam Award winner Jim Estes disclosed that Fee Willy is actually a free loader on sea otter snacks and,

WHEREAS, with the nearby US Open and the famous golf saying “drive for show, putt for dough” in mind, ASM members tried their luck with the putting green in the lobby in a feverish attempt to win some cash to offset next year’s meeting costs and,

WHEREAS, the fashion sense of a typical ASM attendee was cast in an unprecedented positive light by the typical attendee of the U.S. Open and,

WHEREAS, no matter what the hairstyle, mammalogists spent an inordinate amount of time in salons and,

WHEREAS, although “Philadelphia” isn’t a genus of New World opossum, it should be and,

WHEREAS, ASM members waited patiently in line at Starbucks to pay $4.50 for a nano latté just so that they could check their email and,

WHEREAS frustrated, land-locked, and delusional marine mammalogist Dan Odell, having spotted a small and very brave rodent bolting across the floor in front of the ice cream station at the picnic in the Reading Terminal Market, excitedly identified it as a pygmy whale mouse and,

WHEREAS, the American Society of Mammalogists commends the Philadelphia Downtown Marriot’s innovative sustainability and cost-cutting campaign that includes biodegradable key cards whose rapid decay begins immediately upon first use; elevators requiring a dizzyingly choreographed series of movements that encourage taking the stairs to higher floors; bathroom fans that don’t use any electricity whatsoever; and...wait for it... a highly effective internet disincentive program and,

WHEREAS, ASM members anxiously look forward next year’s meeting, where Jake Esselstyn will tell us, once and for all, who’s got the biggest balls of them all and,

WHEREAS, several attendees longingly requested that the meetings return to Fairbanks, Alaska so that they could warm back up and,

WHEREAS, prices at the hotel restaurant led to a new student mentoring program called “Dishwashing with a Mammalogist” and,

WHEREAS Honoraria Committee Chair Richard Stevens will make scientific history in the coming year by traveling back in time from 2015 to announce the recipients of the 2014 ASM Grants-in-Aid on Mammal-L before even he knows them and,
WHEREAS 7-Eleven and Subway have never played so prominent a role in feeding hungry cash-strapped mammalogists and,

WHEREAS, Frank Fish once again displayed his ability to sell ice to Eskimos, although not marsupials to distinguished Australian guests and,

WHEREAS, having already played the dog-ate-my-homework card at previous meetings, Past President Bruce Patterson had to invoke malaria as an excuse for missing the second Board of Directors meeting and,

WHEREAS, in a true and touching sign of the times, presentation coauthors Brian Zinke and Elmer Finck would like to announce their plans to marry, hyphenate their last names, and legally adopt me as their son, Link Zinke-Finck—To my two dads! and,

WHEREAS, this year’s meeting will end with bloodied ASM president Ed Heske being mobbed by rowdy but appreciative mammalogists to his frenzied cries of “Adrian! Adrian!”

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the American Society of Mammalogists meeting at their 93rd Annual Meeting at the Philadelphia Marriott, 14-18 June 2013, hereby extends our gratitude to the Program Committee and the K-State Conference Services for a fun, stimulating, and productive meeting.