

AAPT Board Meeting

February 20, 2015

I. Opening

A. Call to order: 5:05pm

Andy opened with thanks to Dave and Emily for their past work for the AAPT. We applauded.

B. Roll call: Andy Carpenter, Dave Concepcion, Emily Esch, Christina Hendrickson, Rory Kraft, Rob Loftis, Scott McErlith, Andrew Mills, Jennifer Mulnix, Rebecca Scott

C. Approval of Minutes of July: Approved as corrected by consensus

D. Approval of Agenda: Amended, then approved by consensus.

II. Committee and Other Reports

A. Executive Director (Esch)

Around 200 on membership, down a little. Not unusual on “off-year.”

Deferred other discussion until later items.

Between T&L workshops and publishing, all is good.

B. Treasurer (Kraft)

Balance in accounts: Checking: 2,098.80, Savings: 71,151.60,

TTL: 73,250.40

Brief review of last cycle budget and performance

Q: About refunding conference attendees. A: We ended up where we budgeted for the conference, though going into it we thought we were going to miss the mark.

Q: What was the impact of single day-registration? A: we got a fair amount of people opting to do this, especially considering the location was rather remote. Consensus was to continue the policy.

Brief discussion about role of finance committee

Andy thanked for finance information.

C. Communications Director (Hermberg) – skipped because Kevin had travel problems.

D. Teaching and Learning Workshop Expansion (Concepcion)

The expansion of T&L workshops came through the survey work done at beginning of Dave's term. Brief review of the history of the workshop attempts. We have a one-day version – 8 hours. Basis was a session held in San Diego. Recently did it in Pittsburgh, upcoming in San Francisco. Looking to do one in Boston but need a host. Possible in Cleveland State, Philadelphia. Longer picture is to train more facilitators, and have eight a year in big cities. Regional teams would lead them. By end of two years from now could have something stable where they regularly recur. The funding of them is that the workshop is free, but attendees need to become member of AAPT (\$25 for grad student membership). Host institutions often have their students attend for free. If they become regional, the cost becomes quite small as we are not paying for travel costs.

Andy points out that this helps the growth of the organization. Dave “we are halfway to the vision.” Pittsburgh wants us back.

About 800 people on the market each year, not all of them new. Guesstimate is 300 new graduates. So eight regional conferences a year could easily hit 10% of the graduates in any year.

Jennifer asked for us to put together an outline of what is needed for a host institution. Dave: we know now that really we just need a room. Housing, meals, etc. all have not been an issue. People are accountable for getting themselves there. The idea was that people would be local. But it turns out that folks are coming in from all over for them. We do have a one sheet version of what is needed. The host institution provides breakfast and space. Attendees are on their own for lunch. End before dinner time.

Discussion about how to set-up the ongoing aspects was deferred to the discussion in A below.

Rory pointed out it would be nice if the workshops highlighted in some way the *Philosophy Through Teaching* volume to make it more visible.

Question about repeating this in conjunction with APA meetings. Seems like they did not really understand what we were looking for. Dave is going to restart those conversations again.

III. New Business

A. Standing Committees/organizational structure (Esch)

Started with continued discussion of the T&L workshop, in the context of the T&L committee. It would be good to have a committee who focuses on these workshops, instead of foisting it on the existing T&L Seminar committee.

Andrew points out that rather than forming a new committee, if the T&L Seminar committee really does little more than picking the facilitators now, it might be a better thing to give it to that committee and have the members appointed appropriately. Emily pointed out that what we need is a charge for the committee, and a version of different models based upon resources for different host institutions. Clarified that the board would charge the committee, but the committee would come up with the ways forward with the new charge.

Dave to come up with a draft of the charge, send along to Emily, then distributed to board for comments. Estimated timeline is within a week to Emily from Dave.

Speakers and Awards – since teaching fellow project had not been worked out, the thought is that this committee will probably have slightly less work than had been the case. Dave encouraged this committee to develop an award for Teaching itself (not scholarship of teaching, or service to the profession, but teaching itself.) Scott: last idea talked about, is that instead of the fellowship being an award, it would be the funding of a project. This is not what Dave was looking for, but agreed that it was a worthy thing. Jennifer: this would be splitting the “you are a good teacher” from the “here is money for a project” aspect. This would be fixing the fellowship, but not addressing the lack of a Teaching Award. Discussion about how we would go forward with this (charging the committee to get best practices, etc.). Andrew pointed out a concern about if this is where we want to spend the effort of the members of the AAPT to get this award together, given the other work we are looking at doing. Rebecca pointed out that the fellowship/grant project might be attractive for graduate students as a differentiator when they go on the market. Rory: perhaps the solution here is to split the speakers (for the conference) from the awards aspect. A new program committee would do the speakers as well as do the proposal review, etc. Scott and Andrew separately pointed out this would solve some of the back and forth for scheduling.

Consensus was to split Speakers from Awards. Consensus was to charge the Awards committee to go forward with researching and proposing the systems for application to grants for projects, and feasibility study for teaching award.

Lenssen committee: Dave gave summary of the process for getting the Lenssen prize picked.

Publications committee: Let us have one. Consensus.

Communications: Need to have a group to help market/brand. Rory: Understanding from Kevin is that a larger role would be good, including commitment for content from people (Lenssen readers, exec committee members, etc.) Andy: what we need is an idea of what our strategy is for our

messaging. We can put stuff on the website, FB, Twitter, but without a strategy it ends up being a little scattered. Emily: This is somewhat looking forward to the design work planned for later, but can we go forward with the Exec Committee working with a group to revamp the communications? Jennifer: What is the goal of the strategy? More members, improving teaching? Consensus is that goal is impact on the profession.

In the midst of this, formalize that we have an Executive committee of Exec Director, President, VP, Treasurer, and Director of Communications.

Consensus is that the EC could go forward with looking into consultant to help with strategy, which would then make clearer what a communications committee should do.

Dave to be a committee of one to come up with the grant application to the APA for continuing funding the grad student travel for the T&L seminar.

B. Organizing APA Sessions (Esch)

Consensus is to have the at large board members split the work of doing the APA sessions work instead of the model we have been following of one person doing all this work. Christina is the Pacific for 16 and 17. Rebecca will do Central 16. Rob will do Eastern 16. Andrew to send information to at large members as to process.

C. Conference Journal Series (Esch)

This is referred to the publications committee.

Title of the series to be determined in the publications committee. AAPT should be in the name somehow. Not titled with Proceedings.

D. Conference Site Discussion (Esch)

We have a proposal for Saginaw Valley State. Rob and Emily are going soon. We also likely have a proposal from NC A&T. May be for '16 or '18.

Further discussion to occur on phone conference.

E. Logo/Site redesign (Hermberg)

Considered folded into the earlier discussion about strategy.

F. Proposal to pay Executive Director (Mills)

Andrew: ED is an unpaid position. All of them have done an incredible amount of work. Model for most organizations is to provide some funds to recognize the work.

It was clarified that a discretionary fund for ED and president exists, at \$250 which can be spent without board approval.

Question was how much work is done by ED. Per Emily, probably 15 – 20 hours a month.

Question about the pleasure of position. Emily: For people who are interested in process and procedure, there is some enjoyment in going through it. There is some positive impact on P&T process at home institution.

Q: Would we be able to attract someone without a stipend. Jennifer: This is a different point than recognition for work.

Scott: What about an assistant ED. Emily: Problem is how to split the work. Dave: The president really serves that function in many ways.

Andrew: What about funding a 5 hour a week work study? Emily: That really wouldn't work.

Andrew: So this really is about recognizing work, or perhaps something like funding a course release to enable the time to do this. Emily: It is probably about the work of a course.

Scott: possible formula is ED work – volunteer work = time x. How much money per time?

Rory: would it be to provide a course release stipend or to the ED?

Consensus: likely would be hard to work through the systems of an institution. Would be money to the person.

Scott: What would be the best model, Emily? Emily: probably would help ED not take teaching overload, etc.

Scott: Would this make a difference for looking for future ED? Emily: probably would make the caliber of people better.

<< Emily leaves the room. Discussion continues in executive session, including looking at impact of various stipends on the budget models.>>

Consensus was to do \$1500 a year for next two years, aspire for \$3k a year if/when finances allow. We reevaluate in two years.

<<Emily returns.>>

G. Budget Models (Kraft)

Consensus was to go with the “break even on conference” model, with modifications for the previous spending approved. This is for the current two year cycle, at which point we will have to look again at if we continue to break even on conference.

In the midst of this, we should advertise more fully that the registration for the conference is higher to subsidize the T&L seminar.

H. AAUP 1940 Statement (Kraft)

We agreed to endorse.

IV. Announcements - None.

V. Adjournment: 7:15pm.

These minutes approved by the Board May 12, 2015