

**MINUTES OF APS FAC/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Conference Call**  
January 16, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance..... 1

Call to Order..... 2

1. Meeting feedback ..... 2

    b. NAS workshop on “sensitive but unclassified” information – J.F..... 2

    a. ASAE workshop on “The Will to Govern Well” – J.F, G. B., JMD, S.N..... 2

    c. Shared leadership workshop I – J. S., J.F. (For this item, please see the report in agenda provided by Carolee Bull, in red. .... 2

2. Shared Leadership Workshop II – request for APS participation - J. S., J.F..... 3

3. ICPP bid outcome, Centennial planning – J.F..... 3

4. PPB workshop update – J.S..... 3

5. Recent motions to Council – vote results – J.F. .... 3

6. Preparations for Midyear Council ..... 3

    a. Mailing to Extended Council – update of Strategic Plan, new feedback form, etc. .... 3

    b. Relevant feedback from other groups ..... 3

    c. Agenda development..... 4

7. Timing of conference calls for Spring 2003 ..... 4

8. Other items. .... 4

Adjourn ..... 4

Next conference call..... 4

Attachments..... 4

**Attendance**

Present: J. Fletcher, G. Bergstrom, C. Ishimaru, J. Andrews, J. MacDonald, R. Ploetz, E. Stromberg, S. Slack, Biggs,

Staff: S. Nelson, M. Smith

Absent: M. Matheron, J. Sherwood

## **Call to Order**

President J. Fletcher called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Central

Agenda was distributed electronically January 7, 2003 (see attachment 1).

Items 1b and 8 were discussed out of order.

## **1. Meeting feedback**

### **b. NAS workshop on “sensitive but unclassified” information – J.F.**

J. Fletcher reviewed the highlights of the NAS workshop, where presentations were given by invited speakers from various groups representing the scientific and security communities, including the National Academy of Sciences, CIA, FBI, and three scientists whose publications in PNAS prompted strong debate by congress and public agencies on the biosecurity impact of scientific articles containing sensitive but unclassified information. Both sides of the issue were presented at the workshop. Most scientific information is used for the common good, but there are those that can use this information illicitly. Universities and scientists previously engaged in seemingly sensitive research with regulated organisms might not be willing to continue conducting research that falls into the class. Agencies like the CIA and Office of Homeland Security are charged with protecting US citizens from bioterrorism. The scientific community has an opportunity to make recommendations through Congress. J. Fletcher felt that federal agencies want scientific input so that reasonable policies are developed. Other societies such as ASM, NAS, and AAAS have developed statements on the issue. ASM is already considering ways to resolve some of the conflicts caused by the new policies and the long-standing agreement authors make to provide reagents (strains sequences, clones, etc.) available upon request.

J. Fletcher suspected that societies might need to develop policies specific for their journals. There is an assumption some policies will be common to all societies. Exec discussed possible impacts on APS and its journals. J. Fletcher plans to continue discussions on the topic with Exec, Council, and Pub Board. Discussions will include the views of the scientific community and those of the agencies charged with public biosecurity. A. Biggs plans to have this as an agenda item for the next Pub Board meeting. Following some discussion, Exec agreed that no action would be taken until after Pub Board has had time to review the issue. J. Fletcher will circulate the summary statement from the NAS workshop as soon as it becomes available.

### **a. ASAE workshop on “The Will to Govern Well” – J.F, G. B., JMD, S.N.**

G. Bergstrom gave a summary to the group. A major focus of the ASAE workshop was alternatives to the common decision-making process used in most governance structures. In this process, issues typically are framed and presented to the group so that a motion can be presented and voted on. The downside is that discussion and involvement of ideas is sometimes restricted under such a process. An alternative presented at the workshop would provide discussion, concept development, and consensus building prior to formation of motions. Governance under this scenario is not an organization chart so much as it is a flow chart. J. MacDonald and G. Bergstrom will put together a presentation on the workshop for the midyear council meeting. They will also think about possible ways of implementing this type of approach into the discussions on APS governance. Members of Exec who participated in the workshop all came away with a greater degree of confidence and comfort on the progress APS has made over the past couple of years toward a new governance structure. S. Nelson will get copies of the workshop's executive summary for distribution at the midyear meeting.

### **c. Shared leadership workshop I – J. S., J.F.**

CAST put on this leadership workshop, which was attended by J. Sherwood, C. Bull and M. Wimer on behalf of APS. J. Fletcher reviewed information in the report provided by C. Bull. (See the report in agenda provided by Carolee Bull, in red.)

## **2. Shared Leadership Workshop II – request for APS participation - J. S., J.F.**

The workshop in item 1c is part of a CAST series on leadership. Exec discussed sending a contingency to the next leadership workshop. The registration deadline for the workshop is the end of January. J. Fletcher conveyed J. Sherwood's view that participation in the last workshop was worthwhile, especially as it makes APS's leadership on strategic alliances visible at the national level. It was specified by CAST that at least two of the people who participated in the last workshop attend the next one. Other Exec comments indicated previous experiences with this forum were less productive than those of the recent workshop. Considering the relatively low cost associated with the workshop and the generally favorable input from participants, Exec favored continued involvement.

## **3. ICPP bid outcome, Centennial planning – J.F.**

APS was recently informed that the bid for the ICPP meeting in 2008 went to Italy. Italian organizers for the ICPP meeting indicated to J. Fletcher that the APS centennial would be acknowledged at the ICPP meeting.

J. Fletcher reported that C. Darcy is going ahead with the APS Centennial planning.

G. Bergstrom added that a poster on the APS 2003 annual meeting in Charlotte is being developed. E. Roskopf has agreed to set up the poster at next month's ICPP meeting in New Zealand.

## **4. PPB workshop update – J.S.**

J. Fletcher reported for J. Sherwood. PPB workshop plans are progressing. There will be a PPB conference call tomorrow. Attendance in the workshop will be discussed. Although funds for the workshop have not yet been received, planning is proceeding.

## **5. Recent motions to Council – vote results – J.F.**

J. Fletcher reminded Exec of the results on the recent vote on producing a CD of posters from the annual meeting. (Vote was in favor of the motion). She was very pleased with the volume and quality of email discussion on the motion.

As an aside, she mentioned that the process used by APS on issues such as the poster CD, in which an ad hoc committee is charged with focusing on a issue, doing research, and then making a recommendation to a larger group, can mean that the larger group doesn't always have access to all the accumulated research and discussion on the issue. In some cases, it might be advisable to modify this process so that decisions can be made at various levels of governance.

## **6. Preparations for Midyear Council**

### **a. Mailing to Extended Council – update of Strategic Plan, new feedback form, etc.**

S. Nelson, G. Bergstrom, J. MacDonald J. Fletcher and Staff have been working on a mailing that will be sent to the participants of the Extended Council meeting in Milwaukee. The packet will include an update on the strategic plan, a newly developed feedback form, an information update on the major issues handled by council since the Milwaukee meeting, and a copy of the strategic plan with insertions on the charges to specific committees, as interpreted from the annual meeting discussions.

J. Fletcher asked for input from the secretary on the role of the secretary in the new reporting system. No one thought that traditional annual and midyear reports would be necessary. The new reporting form should suffice. Reports will be sent to headquarters, and Staff will post the reports on APSnet. The secretary and M. Smith will go over the list of recipients for the mailing to be sure that all the people required to provide a midyear and annual reports are included in the mailing.

### **b. Relevant feedback from other groups**

No discussion.

### **c. Agenda development**

No discussion.

### **8. Other items.**

J. Fletcher: The Nature article on bioterrorism appeared in the January 9 issue. It contains prominent quotes from APS leaders. S. Nelson will look into the possibility of posting the article on APSnet.

G. Bergstrom: Program planning for the Charlotte meeting is going very well. A preliminary program was emailed to Exec/Fac. A new poster-viewing schedule along with its associated costs is being considered. There would be a single extended period for display of all posters. Exec asked for further information from S. Nelson on the availability of physical space at future meetings to accommodate this viewing format, should it be a success in Charlotte. S. Nelson will check to see if the sites that have already been booked would have space enough.

G. Bergstrom: Staff has contributed greatly to discussions on how to package meeting offerings to specific audiences, i.e. private practitioners, etc, for the Charlotte meeting. They are also discussing ways to make it financially appealing to groups who would not otherwise participate in the full annual meeting. Exec's discussion of the idea was very favorable, as long as these efforts do not take away from the purpose of the annual meeting. J. Fletcher will contact Claire Fraser regarding a possible Plenary Session for a biotechnology target audience.

J. Andrews asked if feedback had been collected from attendants of the Milwaukee meetings. S. Nelson will check on this.

S. Nelson added that Headquarters has a new tool for rapid creation and evaluation of surveys and questionnaires. This will be used frequently to solicit member input on key issues.

### **7. Timing of conference calls for Spring 2003**

M. Smith will schedule conference calls for the second Tuesday of every month at 9 central from March through July.

### **Adjourn**

Call was adjourned at 9:16 a.m. Central.

### **Next conference call**

The next call is scheduled for March 13 at 9:00 am Central

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Ishimaru

Secretary, APS

### **Attachments**

1. Agenda