

ISC/SCI Executive Meeting Minutes

20 January 2024, 1 p.m. EDT

Meeting was called to order at 1:04pm

Welcome (Jolanta Komornicka and Maggie Billard) and Roll Call (recording secretary Patti Phillips)

Participants: Wendy Savage, Judith Nylvek, Christine Dudgeon, Ronnie Seagren, Jolanta Komornicka, Celine Parent, Alexandra Peace, Jess Herdman, Emma W. Johnson, Maggie Billard, Vicki Gregory

Margaret De Boer, Tanvi Mohile, JoAnne Burek (regrets)

1. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda (Ronnie/Maggie). Carried.

Conference report was added to the Consent folder and today's agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes: 11 November 2023 Executive Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes from November 11, 2023 (Maggie/Celine). One abstention. One objection. Minutes not approved. Delayed and moved to next meeting.

Action: Members will provide more information to executive for discussion at next meeting.

3. Consent Agenda

New information added to the Conference report (today) and added to agenda.

Regional Updates:

- a) **Central Canada (Ontario) | Centre du Canada (Ronnie Seagren and Emma Warnken Johnson)**
- b) **Prairies and Northern Canada | Prairies et Nord du Canada (Jess Herdman)**
- c) **British Columbia | Colombie-Britannique (Judith Nylvek) (no report)**

d) Eastern Canada | Est du Canada (Wendy Savage)

Committee Reports:

- a) Archives (Alexandra Peace for Christine Jacobs) (no report)
- b) Awards (Jess Herdman for François Trahan)
- c) Book and Periodical Council (Ronnie Seagren) (no report)
- d) Bulletin (Vicki Gregory) (no report)
- e) Communications (Céline Parent)
- f) Conference 2023 (Maggie Billard)
- g) Publishers' Letter (Mercedes Brian) (no report)
- h) Finances (JoAnne Burek)
- i) Outreach (Jess Herdman for Siusan Moffat)
- j) International Liaison (Margaret de Boer)
- k) Membership (Tanvi Mohile)
- l) Mentorship (Margaret de Boer for Carlisle Froese)
- m) President's Report (Jolanta Komornicka and Maggie Billard)
- n) Web Administration (Christine Dudgeon)
- o) Webinars (Jolanta Komornicka for Matthew MacLellan) (no report)

4. Items for Discussion

a) Side-by-Side Indexing Pilot Project (Jolanta Komornicka)

There was nothing to report for January. To date, the largest number of participants was six indexers in any given month and many of the same faces tended to be there. In light of low numbers and the monthly cost \$24.28, Jola recommends discontinuing the program.

Discussion:

Members expressed disappointment, but felt it was a good pilot program.

- Were there any new indexers in the space? We don't know.
- Is the monthly cost only for a separate Zoom account? YES
- Could we use the general Zoom account instead and set up specific times for use?
 - It would have to be organized by an executive member and the time would have to be blocked out in the schedule.

- Would it be worth keeping the side-by-side account for one more month and advertising to members that we plan to shut it down?

One member admitted they didn't really understand how it works: Is it available 24/7? Could it be explained again to members?

Sending regular reminders could be helpful. New people may try it this time around. Could we keep it till the end of fiscal year or for one more month?

Motion to approve that the side-by-side indexing project be extended one additional month and a focused informational campaign be undertaken to let members know that if it's not used we plan to cancel it.

(Alex/Jess) Carried.

Further discussion:

In the blurb being sent to members, we should state the trial program will be ending February 24th.

Action: Alex will send the memo (after having Ronnie and then the executive review it). It will then be sent to all usual places by Tanvi and Christine (e.g., membership, listservs)

A new zoom link can be added.

What about regular timed reminders, to gmail accounts, all possible locations, including to regional reps to share with members?

Action: Official memo will be sent to Tanvi and Alex or Ronnie will post something on the regular list.

- Do we have parameters for deciding whether to keep the project going (i.e., monthly quota) after the next month's pilot extension?
 - As a metric, what about two meetings a week with at least two people?
- What makes it financially worth it?
 - Right now the cost amounts to about \$1.65 per person per meeting.
- Are people ok with the trial period?

- It's not a permanent decision. We're not locked in: it's a month by month contract.
- Maybe, when preparing the blurb, add why it is a good thing to use.
- Could we add to metric, that it is based on an average of 2 meetings per week?

It was noted that sending the memo to the listserv has the added advantage of generating discussion.

b) Survey Committee (Wendy Savage)

Wendy asked to discuss the timing of the survey, which had to be postponed in the Fall.

Discussion:

The co-presidents agreed we should do the long survey now, rather than wait: so delay rather than re-schedule.

Continuing is also important because we'd planned to add a question about members' experiences with the AGM's hybrid format last year, so we'd need the answer sooner than later.

- Are short surveys different?
 - We should still do the Fall (short) survey. We have (or may have) new members, it keeps us in rotation, and people are more likely to answer short vs long surveys.
- Is there anything else people want added to the survey?
 - What about asking whether people consult the references on the website? Not about the metric, but it will get people to go to the references and consult them: motivational perhaps!
 - We could add a comment section with this question, too, where members specify which resources they use, rather than us providing a list.

The past president reminded us that we can only have 10 questions, since that is what was budgeted for; otherwise, we need a motion to add it to the budget. We'd need to have the updated cost in the budget.

In theory, every policy should be reviewed annually. Realistically, we could pick (randomly) one or two policies to review each executive meeting.

- What is the review procedure? By committee or executive?
 - We need to develop this.

Jola and Maggie (co-presidents) will sit down and figure out how to contact the committees/liaisons and send it to the executive.

Action: Wendy will work on the survey policy (Alex offered to help her). Forty-nine dollars is set aside in budget.

Jess Herdman left meeting at 1:56pm

c) New Indexer Resources Committee (JoAnne Burek)

Jola summarized the report, since JoAnne could not be here.

The committee has developed a content calendar. They feel they've moved beyond the committee's initial purpose. It is now for indexers of any level and for multiple audiences (nb. good example of a policy review). They have proposed a new name for the executive to discuss.

Discussion:

- What about "Indexing Resources" (rather than Content Marketing)?

Content Marketing is the latest jargon/buzzword, so the term will likely change. A number of executive members agreed that we need something that clearly defines the committee's purpose.

- Do committees have terms of reference? If so, and the committee has moved beyond theirs, are we talking about a new committee?
 - There are three questions: product and purpose, name, and what they do.
- Where do we find the current policy for that committee?
 - Go to Board Folder. There are also policy documents (in the policy and procedures folder).
- NIRC is also a tricky name (not as transparent for new people).

Others agreed we should keep the name simple: “Resources” for example, which links to the mandate.

Executive members were agreed the calendar is good idea.

We also have to be careful about putting too much stuff under one umbrella (resources is very broad). There are many things already on the website under resources, apart from those for new indexers.

- Should we move the discussion since the liaison isn't here to speak to it? And there are only two people on committee.
- Would it more apt to call it “beginners guide to indexing”?

Someone else felt the committee is doing more than that, so suggested looking at their mandate.

- But are they going beyond that mandate (new indexers)?
 - They are going slightly beyond, as resources are for everyone. Maybe we should update the name and then the mandate.

In the report, they outline what they're doing and it's useful content for all indexers.

On the website, however, it still appears to be information mainly directed at new indexers (people at start of their career).

- Do we need more input from the chair of the committee (JoAnne)?
 - Our next meeting is the budget meeting (not as much time to discuss).
- Do we need to know specific questions from JoAnne?
- Do we need to go back to them and ask what they want the new mandate to say, and thus the name change?

JoAnne's proposal does suggest both of these points.

Suggestion was made to send something back to JoAnne and ask what they had in mind for the name on the website.

The three questions to ask are about the mandate, name on the website, and name of the committee.

Action: Maggie and Jola will go back to JoAnne with these three questions. They will also suggest the following name as one example: "Indexer Resources and Marketing."

We should explain why we're not keen on the proposed name (i.e., too broad). Having "Marketing" in the name is fine (the "content") part feels too limiting/jargony.

However, someone else felt the "Marketing" aspect in the name is confusing; does it refer to themselves or the Society? By-Laws Committee (Jolanta Komornicka)

d) By-Laws Committee (Jolanta Komornicka)

JoAnne and Lisa have been doing work on by-laws.

However, Jola doesn't think they are ready/complete. The co-presidents (Jola and Maggie) have received concerns from members about the process; thus, they suggest we form a by-laws committee.

If so, how should that committee function? We need more eyes on the process, so how do we do that? What about a series of sub-groups in the following order (see also documents) with the aim of getting it finished by the AGM for vote and ratification:

- JoAnne and Lisa
- Past Presidents (institutional memory)
- Executive members
- Townhall (all members) (will be impacted by how Society is run)

Jola wanted to make it clear the co-presidents are not trying to take charge, just to be present at all meetings with goal of getting things finished.

Discussion:

We need to compile a list of past presidents and people who originally wrote the Constitution.

- What was degree of concerns?

Some people felt blindsided and that membership should have been more informed.

The emails reflect a desire for more information, not necessarily that people are unhappy about the fact incorporation is happening.

Past president agreed. We should have been more specific about what we're planning to do.

On behalf of the co-presidents (past and current) and executive, Jola acknowledged a mea culpa; we need to be more scrupulous going forward and have more eyes on the bylaws.

For previous members who did so much work on developing bylaws and the Constitution, it may have been a bit of a shock

- When was the Constitution written?
 - June 2, 2017 and amended May 2018
- Alex noted that before 2017 there was no central record keeping/record of documents; it was all done through emails.
- One member suggested this is an argument for incorporation—we'll have to keep records.
- Christine also has archives (note)

Going forward, we'll want to have many eyes on it to get it right. For example, there are questions about representation (more members in Ontario) based on our discussion from previous meetings.

- What would the Committee (with subgroups) be defined as?
 - All members of ISC, but not all have to participate (subgroups).

Members were agreed that more people is better and for continuity (institutional memory). Given the point about institutional memory, would it be helpful to have a short Ppoint presentation to give to all subgroups, so they're caught up to speed before they raise concerns and vote?

It will be especially helpful at the townhall--where many people are likely to show up. And we could inform people what the process is to follow when a gap is found in the bylaws.

- Is the AGM an artificial deadline?

- More important to do a good job; others agreed.

The bylaws committee is meant to slow things down and get it right.

After the townhall, we could dedicate an entire executive meeting to incorporation and go through each bylaw line-by-line.

- Do the bylaws have to be approved at an AGM?
- Given that the executive and membership feels this is a good thing, would it be better to have a full year? Or is there a downside?
 - We'd continue to run the bylaws that we have. We are technically already incorporated. Does that impose a deadline on us? We need to ask JoAnne.
- Do we need to follow provincial and federal bylaws?

Executive agreed we have our own homework to do.

Next steps are to form a committee. The timing of things will depend on which rules we have to abide by (e.g. provincial and/or federal).

- We need to speak to JoAnne and do our own research.
- First order of business is to construct a timeline.

Action: Executive members are to do research/educate themselves on incorporation.

Motion to approve the formation of a bylaw committee to suggest revisions to the bylaws in light of incorporation and to be chaired by Jola and Maggie and composed (at least initially) of past presidents of the Society (Jola/Maggie). Carried.

e) Incorporation (JoAnne Burek)

See report update.

The executive suggested we deal with this document at next meeting with JoAnne present.

It probably also needs to be discussed with newly formed committee before our next meeting.

5. Action Items

6. New Business

7. Next Meeting

Next budget meeting date: March 9th (initially) proposed.

8. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:41pm (Ronnie/Maggie). Carried.

Fiscal “Word of the Day”: 5 minutes discussing or answering a question related to fiscal matters.