Agenda for GOHWP Executive Board Meeting
(10/03/14 - 3:00 PM EST / 7:00 PM GMT / 9:00 PM SAST / 15/01/14 - 8:00 AM NZDT)

1. **Call to Order**
   a. **Attendees: Alex, Stu, Ashley, Mary, Doug, Kristen, Ishbel, Tara**
   b. Team using Vsee—seems to be an issue connecting more than 5 people, reverting to skype. Ashley will call Vsee to identify problem
2. **Approval of Previous Minutes – minutes approved with no issues**
3. **Portfolio Updates** – 5 mins each
   a. Blog and newsletter: Tara noted that the blog has new content. Ashley is working on how to publicize the new content; Tara will work with Ashley to push it out in multiple channels.
   b. Social Media: Ashley and Alex discussed changing the name of the FB group, it may not be possible. Ashley also reached out to Jeff about LinkedIn page in an effort to get all platforms to have a uniform look. Reports good progress on moving forward on povio listserv (see Web update).
   c. Web: Plans in place to shut down povio, will send out notice to subscribers before transition on roughly 31 March. There is an email drafted to inform people of forum and direct them there and encourage membership in GOHWP. Doug has also created subscription option on blog as well. Recommends sending an email to all members notifying them of new content. Alex asked about setting up blog so people see the whole entry instead of an abstract—Doug answered that it is probably possible and can look into it if there is interest.
   d. Membership: Doug will give full update later in minutes. Regarding setting membership fees; hard to estimate costs at the moment, may need to put that question on next month's agenda
   e. Stu: suggested an email Delphi process to find out what has been going on in the HWP field; proposed idea to approach leaders in humanitarian issues, could ask "What can GOHWP do to make more connection to goals and issues in the field?" Will need a volunteer to assist, timeline roughly June-July. Process would help us analyze what we need to do in terms of advocacy. Ashley volunteered to help. Goal would be to reach out beyond field and beyond current news to find things we may have overlooked outside of psychology. Would be an iterative process involving communication manager and committee.
   f. Kristen and Ashley posted a sample syllabus on the site under Teaching Resources. Kristen thanked Ishbel and Ashley for liasing with Doug to get new content on web site. Wants to get a discussion going about what we should be doing re: teaching. Kristen brought up a recent IOP article re: teaching of I-O, and plans to post something on the forum to let people know about the article and highlight the article from Joel Lefkowitz that mentions GOHWP. Group agreed that this is the best way to spark a discussion among members. Kristen and Alex's work on the guide will be supplemented (see below for more detail).
   g. Mary: see below for discussion re: code of ethics that Mary has been developing. Also reached out to Steve Atkins re: registration process.
   h. Alex: has been working on student guide, see below for details. Alex has been thinking about student involvement in conferences; will start something at SIOP, also wants to cover ICAP in Paris and Pan-African conference. Wants to reach out to members to find out if anyone is going.

4. **New Business**
   a. Alex/Kristen – Feedback on structure of HWP guide (20 mins)
      i. Alex and Kristen have put a great deal of effort into the guide in order to make it a useful resource for academics, practitioners, and students
      ii. Alex walked the group through the student section of the guide as well as the overall structure and asked the group for feedback.
      iii. Proposed profiling students as part of the guide and offered some suggestions. Tara's graduate student may be a good profile candidate. Doug suggested using student profiles on blog as well.
      iv. Alex also mentioned his desire to make sure that all aspects of HWP are represented.
      v. Mary noted that a lot of the examples in the guide seem to cross over across categories, which may create issues that don't need to be created. Alex agreed and offered another way to communicate the information.
      vi. Tara suggested that the guide can also include suggestions for students working in labs that are already related to HWP—students can encourage their advisors to identify as HWP as opposed to change their actual research focus
   b. Ines/Kristen – Chain of communication for updating website (10 mins)
      i. Ongoing conversation from previous web site: question of who web information should be sent to (should Kristen go through Ines or straight to Doug). Decision was made to send things straight to Doug for posting instead of through Ines. Kristen asked about keeping relevant people in the loop before posting. Ishbel suggested that the group send things to Doug and cc anyone else who needs to be kept informed. Doug agreed that the process was efficient and that we can adjust on the fly if we need a new process in the future.
      ii. Alex noted that we have lots of arms in our online presence; it's hard to keep track of it all. Would be helpful to keep everyone in the loop. People who manage particular portals can be responsible for posting new content. Doug mentioned that there is a way to have blog posts also appear on our Facebook group page and he will look into it. Alex suggested that the forum should be the first stop and group agreed. Decision was made to post all new content on forum first, relevant portfolio mgrs will be responsible for keeping tabs on forum and bringing content up when appropriate. Doug asked where it should go, the public or private forum? Decision would be made on case-by-case basis, but default is to go to public forum unless there is a reason to keep it private (e.g., bylaws, or other internal organizational issue).
   c. Doug – membership update (10 mins)
      i. When people sign up for GOHWP, they do so under the web site/qualtrics. Doug reviewed all apps since November and sent them welcome emails/encouraged them to subscribe to blog. Doug has now set it up so new membership applications send an email to Doug.

      ii.   Summary of current membership: 182 members, 9 are undergraduates. 103 females, 29 countries represented, none from South America. 90 from North America, 22 from Europe, 19 from Africa. 51 new members last year, 19 in the past few months. Doug raised some concern about overrepresentation from some parts of the world, asked about possible connections in South America specifically. Doug will send out one-pager summarizing current membership breakdowns.

     iii.   In working on the membership dues, Doug asked what the dues would be used for. This will be held for discussion at our next meeting.

  d. Mary – Code of Ethics (10 mins)

      i.   Mary thanked Doug and Stu for their work in pulling together other ethics codes from other organizations, which Mary used to generate our "code of ethical behavior." Meant to communicate to members about what the organization expects of them and points them to other relevant codes.

      ii.   Tara suggested a relevant piece of language from APA regarding practicing outside one's area of expertise/competence. Ishbel added to this by suggesting that we add such language into the introductory section which already specifies that people are also expected to follow the code of their professional associations as relevant. Mary asked about how to get it onto the web site. Ines sent message that she approves of the code. Decision made to obtain feedback from Stu and then post it to forum. Alex raised a point that people might have a problem having the code of ethics imposed on them, and to improve transparency we should give people the opportunity to give input. Mary noted that we are giving people a range of codes to draw from, and that if people had serious objections they would make it known. On the other hand Mary noted that we have emphasized transparency and inclusion. Ishbel noted that we have two kinds of members, including 89 members who have been with us from the start, who might want to provide input. The decision was to post it on the forum and invite comments, but frame it as "this is our code of ethics, as of XX date it will be official."

  e. Kristen – database discussion (20 mins)

      i.   Started with a ton of information that was all over the place and attempted to organize it. We currently have a list of organizations, some are listed on web site, unclear how decisions were made

      ii.   Big questions:

         1. How do we market it?

         2. How do we get information from people once they've attended conferences, published, etc

         3. Alex added: What are our inclusion criteria for who/what/why things are listed on the website?

     iii.   Tab specific information

         1. Organizations: mostly pulled from website

2. Pubs: all pulled from what is on the website already; probably needs updated- reach out to membership to ask for pubs as they become available

3. University and programs: vetted programs only right now; some look related but it's unclear without verification, so we should stick with only the programs we know are legitimate

4. Scholarship/funding: little info available

5. Jobs/internships: little info available

iv. Next step: come up with a clear criteria for inclusion in each tab, and be very explicit about that on the website (list of resources, specific criteria, a spot for members to submit their own suggestions for each category)

1. Ishbel proposed for pubs section: come up with categories and ask people to submit with tags for categorization; once we've come up with criteria and categories, push a message to the membership asking for them to submit their work, using a form which categorises it all for us.

2. Kristen: for vetting with scholarships and internship how should we go about it?

   a. Ishbel suggested that it should potentially be updated in the forum rather than a page on the website because of the changing nature of jobs/scholarship opportunities

   b. Ashley proposed a sub-forum devoted to jobs because of the high volume of questions about that; Alex mentions the need as well, as it might encourage people to keep returning to the forums

   c. Ishbel added the proposal of an individual sub-forum for conferences

3. Kristen proposed that she takes a look at criteria that will go to all EB members for review; Alex added a reminder that rather than having a member-driven pub page, we need to be more specific to avoid a "CV dump;" in order to grow, we need to make sure we are able to

4. Doug- do we want to create sub-forums now or will we wait?

   a. Ishbel proposed now; but should this be on the public or members only forum?

      i. Doug said both seem reasonable options, open-sourced (public) seems nice in terms of getting information out to people, but then if we take it away after the members-only, dues time comes around it may be discouraging; Ashley provided input that in some way we need to provide a value to our members for joining the organization and not undermine our value as GOHWP by making everything available to everyone; Ishbel discussed that the dues scale will be structured

for income, and should include access for people who are unable to pay dues (whether or not we actually test for this); Alex brought up the point that we don't have dues now, and so what is our long-term vision of what we consider members, and so we may need to rethink the value of a public forum—we could provide public info via our blog/Facebook etc.

ii. What is the value of the public forum? Doug- revisit the question next month to see if we need both a public and members only forum; Ashley will need to hold off on the email re: povio; Ishbel suggested that the blog changes the landscape of how we communicate; Alex proposed we need to think about what the purpose of each communication platform is; Ishbel brought up the point that people are limited by their own anxiety about posting on the forum because of the public nature, and therefore retaining just the members only forum might be more appropriate; Doug said that we could only have a members-only forum that we call Povio, and the email will need to be revised to reflect that; Alex proposed that we think long-term (1-2 years down the road) about how we want information to be spread and what membership entry will look like in the future- do we set a low bar for membership inclusion with access to information for members only, or do we set a high bar and retain a two-tiered system (public and members only)

iii. Ishbel proposed that in order to be inclusive we could have a fee which people can opt out of, and then if people say they can't pay, we don't have to make them prove they can't afford it; have a more long-term view of what the dues structure might look like; Doug brought up point about content for members/non-members, donation vs. dues, etc.; we will hold off on shutting down Povio; Ishbel will add "everything" to agenda next meeting – dues, member value, vision, communication purposes, etc.

  1. Doug asked if this is a question for the EB or for the entire membership; Ishbel suggests revisiting the membership survey, specifically the question regarding whether people are

willing to pay dues; Doug will look up that information to inform discussion next meeting

  f. Ishbel – Full membership meeting(s) (5 mins)

    i. Ishbel asked about whether there would be a full membership meeting at SIOP; she plans to organize one for ICAP in Paris, so there would be 2 full membership meetings in a span of a couple of months. We will discuss via email, as we ran out of time.

5. Other Business

  a. **N/A**