Consultative Meeting of CIES Executive, Futures, and Review Committees in Preparation for the Exec Co Meeting and the BOD Meeting at the CIES Annual Conference in Montreal
March 31, 2011
Teleconference

Present: Maria Teresa Tatro, Ratna Ghosh, Jason Lane, Alan Wagner, Erwin Epstein, Gilbert Valverde, Aaron Benavot, Gita Steiner-Khamsi (joined later in the meeting), Treisy Romero.

William James Jacob joined the conversation at 11:00am to address the report of the SIG Review Committee.

David Post was not able to participate due to technical difficulties. He joined for a few minutes.

Issues on the agenda:

- Executive Director
- Website integration
- Fundraising and funds allocation
- Changes to the Constitution
- Historian Review

Meeting commences at 9:10am

Tatto points out that the discussion of proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws will likely take a longer time, thus proposes to leave that for a future meeting. Epstein mentions that what Lane has proposed to move forward on this issue is a good idea (which is to select those topics on which there are no concerns and vote on them to be approved, while for those items on which there are concerns or observations then proceed with the discussion).

Ghosh suggests that in order to facilitate the discussion among the Board of Directors there be a space online, an online forum or chat resource. She supports what Lane has proposed and suggests that this process is followed on the web. Lane agrees to establish an online resource to develop the discussion by the end of the following week, to inform members about it and request the vote on the continuation of the historian.

Tatto proposes that since Joel Samoff has not been able to finish the report on awards, the revision of the report on awards be postponed for next week. She adds that Benavot and Samoff will get together to discuss the work they each are doing with their committees and bring together their common points. Tatro also mentions that Wiseman, who is chair of the Review Committees, will do a summary of the reports of all committees. Some people will have additional reports next week.
**Allocation of Funds and Fundraising Committee report**

Valverde comments that he circulated the agenda after meeting in East lansing. However, there are some things that are not clear. The response to the circulation of the agenda focused more on a tangential matter: the issue of the Executive Director (ED). Although it wasn’t central, it was the item that most people wanted clarity on. The questions were addressed by David Post with the attempt to develop what an ED might be. Only a couple of committee members have participated requesting that the ED’s actions be further detailed. The main issue is to establish the priorities for the committee.

Tatto clarifies that the name of the committee is *Allocation of funds and fundraising*. It originally emerged given the huge mandate to move the Society forward and thinking of ways to do it. Now the most urgent thing is to discuss the ED and the website issues.

Valverde had prioritized items during the meeting in East Lansing. Fundraising, however, has come to the fore of the issues. He had attempted to focus most of the discussion on the items to support the work of the Executive Committee. He raises the question of what the Executive Committee (EC) would want to prioritize.

Epstein points out that it’s hard to think about issues without having the budget at hand.

Wagner states that part of the budget for this year is laid out, but that there are still some budget items that have to be dealt with, and a question is whether the budget would incorporate items that are being discussed now. He suggests working with the previous year’s budget with some modifications. Epstein supports that the 2010 budget be distributed being that given the number of demands and proposals put out it would be impossible to have this years’ at this point. Wagner agrees to have budget sent later in the day. Ghosh agrees with Epstein but adds that having more knowledge on the disbursements to date, would give good idea of what is happening.

Epstein suggests that Wagner make a list of all proposals for expenditures, with those provided in Valverde’s committee report and the proposals he sent for hiring help for the archives. He also suggests making a list of all the different proposals. Wagner agrees to send the budget later in the day and the list of expenditures and proposals next week. This will allow to project possible expenses and establish priorities. Ghosh mentions that she would like to see the whole operating budget and also the investments – the kinds of investments, the returns.

Wagner provides the rough totals: more than half million in net assets. Investment account about $80,000 in mutual accounts with Wells Fargo; the rest is very liquid, so it has been trending up.

Aaron Benavot joins the conference.
Tatto states that her idea that more thought need to be invested in action number one as stated in the Future’s report [fundraising]. She also points to the need to schedule meetings outside of the annual meeting to continue to do this work.

Tatto adds that the main fundraisers have been the president-elects and feels that some of these funds should be allocated for the operation of CIES. It would better if we decide on important items and have them as line-items in the budget such as for meetings with the Executive Committee (EC) without having to negotiate every time. She raises the question of the possibility to financially support several meetings of the EC, and to propose the policies and procedures to do this. Once we have an ED his/her main role would be to “run” CIES business and raise funds under the BOD.

Epstein agrees but raises one question: fundraising for what? He points to the need to set the priorities of expenditures. He adds that the idea of the EC meeting is of high priority; the EC used to meet once a year outside annual meeting; those meetings were important and should be restituted. He suggests doing them once a year.

Lane agrees stating that the organization calls for that the meeting of the EC more than once a year. His concern is fundraising for meeting expenses, which should be established as operating costs in the annual budget.

Tatto proposes to have money allocated so that there is one trip a year for the EC and to add this as an action item.

Epstein states that this is something that in general terms would be incorporated to the Bylaws. Ghosh supports that notion.

Tatto proposes to have this incorporated into the budget. She also points out that travel expenses need to be assigned to the president who travels during the year to regional meetings, for example, and that there should be more than the amount set aside in the budget ($500) for discretionary use.

Valverde raises his concerns over the issue: one, being able to have a worthy product by the Montreal meeting, with the several issues raised. He is not clear on the guidance given to his committee. He had assumed priority was to be given to the allocation of funds. There’s still the question of whether this committee should be looking at specific recommendations to support the EC.

Tatto clarifies that the priority of the committee has always been the fundraising. She mentions the existence of the investment committee for the allocation of funds.

Ghosh adds to Tattoo’s points the need to consider travel expenses of past presidents to the CIES meeting and to add this as a budget item. Epstein agrees.
Ghosh points out the need for the funds to be targeted when doing fundraising. Funds should be assigned for a specific activity. She adds that the money from membership should be used for operating costs. Tatro agrees but supports the idea that they can also be raised for the operating costs of the organization.

Epstein brings up the need to have a list of all endowments that have already achieved; in order to show prospective funds, it should be first clear what has already been accomplished. Tatro adds to this point the need to also list the expenses for which there is no endowment, such as the New Scholars awards.

Valverde agrees to work on what appear to be the central items for the committee to work with and to circulate them within 2 days. He clarifies the expectations: collect information of successful fundraisers of the past regarding their approaches, connections, networks which may be useful to have a systematic source to build on. Tatro clarifies that the committee should only, with respect to the issue of support for the EC, make recommendations about how to support its work. Epstein and Ghosh agree.

**Development of CIE Scholarship**

Benavot states the 3 issues the committee was charged with: 1) To establish a scholarship for Latin American (LA) scholars after Cecilia Braslavsky. The proposal has been submitted with the reports distributed; 2) Examination of the awards given by the society, both CIES awards and SIG’s awards. This includes a discussion of the extent of these awards, criteria used and other questions raised. From the discussion at Michigan State it was decided to await some of the work that Samoff has been doing, who has agreed to expand his view of many of these matters because of his experience and knowledge about the history of awards; 3) The issue of scholarship in the society. The main idea that has emerged is to think of scholarship not as an object but as a process. He refers to the question raised by Steiner-Khamsi, to which he specified a couple of scenarios regarding the Braslavsky Award. He is open to suggestions with respect to the work of the committee.

Epstein commends on the work of the committee. He raises the problem that a set of criteria hasn’t been set in terms of proposals for awards- criteria for endowments, for memorial awards for outstanding work, for non-honorific awards such as the international travel award (ITA). He highlights the need to establish criteria and review resources for awards.

Benavot states this is something that is being worked on to discuss at the annual meeting. He intends to use the process of the Braslavsky award and expose the criteria being used to define the LA scholarship for the board to consider how reasonable this criteria is and if it should be used with future award proposals.
Ghosh points out that the Committee should consider as criteria that there should not be an award which is not funded, even if it’s not fully funded it should have some funds of its own.

Tatto comments that it is also important to establish what should be defined as an award. Ghosh agrees and adds that awards should be categorized.

David Post raises his concern for Bereday Award which is not funded. Tattoo states that this is also something that should be considered as part of the budget and fundraising.

Benavot points to the need to address all issues: standardization in criteria, guidelines, funding, endowment.

Epstein raises a constitutional issue: the Bereday and Kelly Awards are incorporated into the bylaws; others are not yet. It would be difficult to delete these 2 awards. So there should be caution in what is incorporated into the Bylaws about awards.

Ghosh points out that fundraising is not enough. It should be an endowment which should be kept and its generated interest used. Unless there’s an endowment there should not be an award.

Epstein expands that there is a standing investment committee and that maybe its provision should include fundraising. Tattoo recalled having proposed it but Carnoy said no, that the investment committee invests.

Valverde expresses his concern that the discussion is not only towards funding for different goals, but that issue of having a new officer whose main role is fundraising. He suggests there may be a need for some standing group of the society to overlook that part. He agrees to make a recommendation in this sense.

Tatto commends on the work of the committees represented in the meeting.

Benavot suggests that the discussion is carried out by email while Samoff and he have the chance to discuss the issues, and once the outline is defined it can be decided if it’s sufficiently developed to share with the rest of the Board.

**Constitution and Bylaws review**

Epstein expresses that the changes to the constitution is an ongoing process, a major reason why he proposes to have a committee. This proposal of changes to the constitution is the most extensive since a lot of ideas in these had been neglected and ignored. He encourages the approval of a standing constitution committee.

Tatto extends her appreciation to Epstein for his work and expresses her concern on how to make the constitution more known to the membership. She also points out that there is not a good induction process for society’s elected vice presidents or other board members on these matters.
Tatto raises the question for meetings the following week, one with the board of directors to discuss constitutional changes, and another meeting related to the Benavot and Samoff’s committee’s work.

A program is tentatively scheduled for Thursday from 9 to 11.

**SIG Review Committee.**

Jacob provided the conclusions of their work with SIGs chairs, based on qualitative feedback. They interviewed all SIG leaders, about 30 chairs. A survey was also sent out a survey to the CIES membership. The report will be ready on the 21st and Sent to Tattoo and the Secretariat.

Gita Steiner-Khamsi joins the teleconference.

Epstein points out that the survey made by the committee was very well done. He raises the following issues: (1) are guidelines for the admission of new sigs going to be established? Is the only requirement that 15 people join to admit a SIG? (2) are SIGs going to have their own website, newsletters? There should be some kind of control over them since they are a face of the Society. He suggests the future publications committee might be able to assist in that regard.

Lane comments that there are also liability issues in terms of publications. There has to be insurance for CER. If any of SIGs want to formally associate with the journal that’s another issue. SIGs are not aware that they need approval from board for several things.

Tatto asks whether a provision about this has been put in the Bylaws. Ghosh supports the notion and the need to establish controls for SIGs.

Epstein identifies the provision in this regard: Art 4 section 5 i: the SIG committee shall advice the Board of Directors on admission of SIGs’. The committee would be obliged to report to the Board on all proposals.

Regarding publications Epstein refers to the proposal for the publications committee.

Tatto expresses the need to communicate all this to the SIGs.

Jacob comments on the gap in leadership in the SIG’s that occurs due to the discontinuity from leader to leader, who always have to re-learn. The proposal from the committee is to establish 2 chairs and have differed transitions so that the can knowhow be given to the new leader.

Steiner-Khamsi suggests that before giving the proposal to the Board, feedback from the SIGs be obtained.

The issue of governance of SIGs is raised by Ghosh. Epstein points out that nothing in the bylaws stipulates how SIG chairs are appointed. Steiner-Khamsi comments that it can be a matter of governance.
Jacob comments that from the interviews it’s evident there’s no overarching procedure as to how SIGs appoint leaders and that there’s no continuity. Some are appointed; others follow a democratic process, others volunteer. There’s not even a term limit.

Ghosh opines that there should be some regularity and it should be defined. The question is whether they should appoint their chairs or establish guidelines.

Tatto comments on the importance of distinguishing between what would be regulated of SIGs: when SIGs represent CIES in publications, websites, awards, but in terms of governance they basically should follow a principle of self governance.

Benavot suggest that Jacob and the Committee look carefully at the proposed changes in the Bylaws and reflect in the report any particular thoughts as well as the concerns not reflected in the proposal to provide the Board the opportunity to consider those as well.

Regarding the submission of the reports Steiner-Khamsi suggests that a short version of the report be provided to the Board by the 15th of April, given the difficulty in finishing the complete report by this deadline.

In relation to the highlighted panels that SIG’s are assigned during the conference Steiner-Khamsi suggests that they only be given one highlighted session. Ghosh agrees; having many makes the highlighted characteristic lose significance. Valverde questions that the number of highlighted panels assigned is based on the membership number and not on the substance of their proposed topics. Jacob and Ghosh agree.

Epstein raises the question of the hold on accepting or approving new sigs and when it expires. Tato clarifies that it would be in the next Board meeting, when clear criteria is established. The BOD voted to establish this hold in the last annual conference due to the lack of clear guidance.

**CER Liason Committee.**

David Post has left the line; Epstein comments on the committees’ work.

Epstein comments that the committee asked for information from UChicago Press. The journal is in very good shape. Editors have done a very good job. UCPress also has done a good job. There are still some questions from the information Michael Cunningham provided that need to be considered. Epstein suggests that the deficit periods are linked to the year 2000-2001, when the CER was delayed for almost a year. He mentions as one of the issues the change in the impact factor in a certain period. He adds that there has been a large increase in the number of complimentary subscriptions and the questions remain as to why. He adds as a third point that membership data access should be made more convenient for the Secretariat.

Benavot suggests that the explanation for the change in CER impact factor is that previously book reviews and even bibliographical essays were included in the pool of articles to be checked
and to be cited, decreasing the ratio of cited material from CER. When Post asked to exclude that material from the pool, the impact factor went up.

Agenda for following day meeting, from 9-11am: Discuss Transitions Committee work and information on the budget.

Meeting is adjourned at 11:42