

**NACIS Spring Board Meeting
Chicago, Illinois
March 12, 2006 9 am – 4:12 pm**

Present: Dennis McClendon (president), Martin Gamache, Max Baber, Fritz Kessler, Jenny Marie Johnson (vice president), Jim Anderson, Susan Peschel (treasurer), Trudy Suchan (past president), Erin Aigner, Margaret Pearce (secretary), Renee Louis (student member), Lou Cross (executive director)

Absent: Brandon Plewe, Mary Beth Cunha, Michael Hermann, Joanna Seeber Mensher

Minutes from Oct 12, 2005 approved; minutes from Oct 14, 2005 amended and approved

Treasurer's report | Susan Peschel

Susan presents 2005 budget projections and actual expenditures through 12/31/05. There is a need for one committee that overlaps between conferences for institutional memory and to minimize costs of expenditure mistakes (most recently, electrical outlets and “hosted bar”). The transition to online payment by credit card has been well received and can be counted as a positive step. The added bonus is that the money market interest revenue offsets the credit card charges. American Express charges require special processing so are additional time commitment for Susan. Should there be special instructions for conference registrants regarding payment by American Express? No, Susan will simply process them in batches. Most charges come in on Visa/MC anyway.

Marketing/promotions committee | Michael Hermann

Discussion of promotions committee is based on written report submitted by Mike prior to board meeting. To items in this report, Lou adds that there is also a need for promotions to develop a member logo kit. Enthusiastic members are currently pasting the NACIS logo into their web pages and electronic stationery with their own ad hoc “proud member of...” as additional text. Committee should develop a standard design for distribution to membership. Discussion turns to the question of print advertising. Mike recommends that we not pursue print advertising. Lou thinks it's a good way to reach out. Trudy points out that Martin von Wyss already submitted a report to the board outlining which publications we should pursue for print ads along with the associated costs. Discussion continues on the pros and cons of print advertising as a supplement to web banners and email. Martin Gamache suggests that as a compromise we run print ads specifically to advertise the annual conference, rather than running general NACIS ads year round. Board agrees to this strategy and recommends that the budget be amended to include estimated costs for print sources for 2007. Local arrangements for Madison should be contacted for additional ideas about publications in which to advertise conference. The promotions committee also needs to revisit web advertising; the conference announcement is not currently on Directions magazine or any ESRI conference announcement web pages. Make use of last year's conference announcement for AAG newsletter as template for this year. For Madison conference, we can track which ads are effective by adding a line to the conference registration form asking “how did you hear about NACIS (web, print, or word o' mouth)?” Additional important item

for promotions committee to implement for Madison is setting up NACIS merchandise. Now that we have the logo, we are ready to move on to mugs and t-shirts from Café Press. A note advertising NACIS merchandise could be sent out by ebulletin to membership. Final item for this committee is the need for a specific CartoTalk web banner advertising the Madison conference.

Web page

The order in which custom cartography companies are listed needs to be corrected, at the very least by listing companies alphabetically, and if possible also geographically. Geographical order could be accessed through a clickable map, or by simply giving user the option of sorting alphabetically versus sorting geographically. All companies listed must also be NACIS members. At the moment there is no formalized process for checking whether map companies have renewed their memberships or not. Mark Harrower has been maintaining the list of labs and companies separately from membership list that Susan is keeping. Recommendation that two check box fields be added to membership renewal form inquiring whether member has a custom cartography company or a university cartographic laboratory to list at the NACIS web site. Mark can then check membership status on a regular basis by using administrative access to the web page.

***Cartographic Perspectives* | Jim Anderson**

Jim presented *CP* 2005 budget. Indexing has begun with Ebsco and a contract has been signed. Indexing will go into effect for first issue of 2006, *CP* 53 Map Art special issue, which is ready to go to press immediately. Status of *CP* 54: all content is in and formatting is in progress. Issue 54 will quickly follow issue 53 to get journal back on schedule. John Krygier will be assuming editorship in 2007. What will the changes be under this new editorship? The policy under Scott and Jim has been to share activities with board for direct input; will this relationship with board continue? Question about whether we should print additional copies of *CP* 53. Currently we carry a surplus of about 150 copies each issue anyway. Board recommends that Jim run 20 additional copies and leave it at that. Primary concern is that the journal stay on schedule and on budget. Jim stresses that the budget must be balanced by looking at the year as a whole rather than on the basis of individual issues. Jenny will ask John to make a presentation regarding journal changes at second board meeting in October.

Copyediting: What are the options for improving *CP* copyediting? Should we hire a professional copyeditor? Currently, Scott includes copyediting in his editorial responsibilities and receives the designated copyediting fee for this service. Do we have sufficient funds to hire an outside copyeditor? Working with freelance copyeditor may be good option. Jim will be person designated to send copy out to whomever we hire. Erin will talk to copyeditors she knows to get an interested person and an estimate. This new policy for outside copyediting will begin with issue 54 so that some changes put in place in 2006.

Back issues: Ebsco indexing is in effect for all forthcoming issues but does not apply to back issues. What will our policy be regarding public searching and access of *CP* issues

through 2005? Plan is to sell extra back issues at Madison fire sale, then make a complete set available through the web site in downloadable PDF files. Discussion about the extent of material to be made available with agreement that back issues must be offered in their entirety, not selected pieces only. Martin will lead the committee to make this happen. Jim will provide Martin with information regarding which issues are already available in complete PDF format. In addition, Susan will provide Martin with one remaining set of CP that can be pulled apart for scanning. Martin will make a report at fall board meeting about how all this will come together and whether the bulk of the work will be outsourced.

Executive Director's report | Lou Cross

Membership communication: The current 2006 membership is 303 members renewing based on one email reminder. Another reminder by physical mailing is pending. A call for papers for Madison will also be mailed out soon. Should members have an option about electronic or paper communication? There is a spectrum of opinions among board members about how this matter should be handled. On the side of paper, advantages mentioned include: physical presence of program, hassle of maintaining data about which format each member prefers is not worth cost savings, decrease in membership because there is no visual reminder to renew, envelope stuffing could be outsourced to printer. On the side of email announcement with URL link to PDF preliminary program, advantages mentioned include: cost savings, PDF efficiency of no lag time between sending preliminary program while changes are simultaneously being made to program, recent experience with email membership renewal was popular, stuffing envelopes involves the conscripted labor of one's children. Between these two ends of the spectrum is the third option of postcard announcing conference with URL address written on postcard. Ultimately, the discussion comes full circle with decision not to replace paper preliminary program with electronic program because no consensus can be reached at this time. We will revisit the issue at the fall meetings by asking members upon registration: if given the option, would you like paper or electronic preliminary program? This will indeed be another checkbox field courtesy of Lou.

Replacing the irreplaceable: Lou was appointed by the board to serve a four-year term and this term is now up for renewal. Should Lou remain beyond a four-year term, should we appoint him for a second term, or should the position move to a new person? Lou signs contracts and other official matters so position should be maintained in a formal way. A second four-year term commitment might be appropriate now but we should then state that after the second-year commitment, the position moves to someone else. A formal job description is needed in order to clarify duties for when we appoint a new executive director. Lou will write down his list of responsibilities, and Trudy and Jenny will assist by writing a formal job description based on Lou's list.

Banking: There is a need for either a national bank with better branch distribution or else transition to online banking with Netbank. Jim points out that whichever bank we choose, we should make sure the account can be bundled with credit card business. New treasurer and new executive officer need to decide which setup will be most efficient for them. Lou

and new treasurer will choose new bank with online bank management and at fall meeting this change will be formally authorized by board.

Program chair report | Jenny Marie Johnson

Student poster competition: The program report begins with a discussion about how to better advertise the student poster competition and a general examination of poster competition logistics and differences with the other competitions. Why is the competition about “posters” rather than simply about printed maps? This is a different approach than the interactive and animated map competition, which was also set up to encourage student participation in NACIS. After some discussion, the board agrees that two different approaches is fine and will continue for 2006. Fritz will continue as student poster competition organizer for the Madison conference. Both Fritz and Dennis will be responsible for formally promoting the competition for Madison but they will also share publicity materials with others for informal promotions. The competition will be advertised in the general program announcement and call for papers. Would it also be possible to contact geography departments directly with invitations for students to enter, or is this too much work for board members to accomplish? If the number of submissions is less than three, the competition will be canceled. In addition, the full competition specifications will be added to the NACIS website, just as the full specifications for the interactive/animated competition are posted. Why is the submission deadline so early, particularly when the interactive/animated deadline is only a week before the conference? Because Fritz needs time to order foam core ahead of the conference. A few board members request that the submission deadline be pushed closer to the conference to accommodate student schedules and natural tendency to procrastinate; if this means that the foam core must be purchased locally at the conference site, so be it. The question is also raised as to why the award for the poster competition is less than the award for the interactive and animated competitions. The board votes that all student competition awards be \$500, regardless of format. In the same spirit, all three competitions should be advertised on the program announcement flyer.

Workshops: Board agrees that there will be no more Saturday workshops at the annual conference. For Madison conference, workshops will be incorporated into PCD and not part of the main conference, so a note about workshops should not be part of the announcement flyer. Incorporation into PCD will move workshops to Wednesday rather than Saturday, shifting room reservations to the front of the conference. Workshop discussion segues into a discussion about vendors and their presence at the conference. A general no-vendor policy is in place for the conference. The boundaries of this policy need some re-definition, however, because of software reps in attendance as conference participants and invitation to reps to speak at PCD. After some discussion about the merits of different types of vendor involvement and visibility at the annual conference, the “no vendors policy” is left in place. The participation of software representatives at PCD for interaction, workshop, and/or critique is perceived to be a positive and popular contribution and not the same thing as a vendor exhibit.

Other 2006 Madison concerns: Shall leaflets for outside organizations or journals be allowed in the delegate packets free of charge? They can be set out on a table rather than

inserted in the delegate packets. Glen might be gathering materials for the registration table so he can be in charge of assembling those materials on the table as well. But should we charge to put ads in packets? What exactly would we like from outside organizations? Board deliberates merits of fees versus sponsorships and other non-cash forms of support, and decides that a good compromise would be to experiment this year by allowing ads in packets in return for underwriting portions of the conference. Another issue is the low amount of honoraria for speakers. Back in the day, NACIS speakers were typically local people or NACIS members, but now we have more renowned speakers being invited to the conference so our honorarium policy should be adjusted to reflect this change. NACIS should cover conference registration, lodging and travel as well as a formal thank you gift in some form, such as a book of photos of the host city or similarly commemorative item that is not a plaque. In addition, program chair (veep) shall have a “not to exceed” figure that would assist him or her in extending formal invitation to possible speakers. This would make the program chair’s correspondence and transactions with potential speakers more efficient. Board moves that program chair may spend up to a \$1,000, including no more than \$500 as honorarium, to acquire a plenary speaker and cover travel, lodging, and registration. The last item for Madison conference is NACIS Night Out: Jenny is taking any suggestions for sites for this traditional communal party, as well as for Saturday field trip possibilities.

Nominations | Trudy Suchan

Four board member positions, one student board member position, treasurer, and vice president are all up for rotation. Trudy asks for last nominations for all positions.

Voting procedures

The discussion about nominations leads into discussion about voting procedures for 2006. Options are: vote on the web, vote by email, paper ballot inserted in prelim program, paper ballot separately mailed, phone-in, or vote at meeting. Vote at meeting disenfranchises people that can’t participate in meeting, although there could be some kind of absentee ballot mechanism in place. We can’t go back to the old way of putting ballot in paper program announcement because of online registration. Max suggests that we have a ballot incorporated into online registration; web registration would be configured so that the ballot pops up as part of the registration process. This seems like a good idea, but how would one-person one-vote be tracked? We can’t track ballots by IP address because multiple people from one lab will vote. We can’t track ballots by name because this compromises anonymity. Perhaps we move to email ballot instead. Lou suggests embedding a key in the email ballot so that the responding email would be counted only once and could not be counted twice. From the server, a “send ballot” query generated, then pre-formatted ballot is sent out with unique code; everyone receives their unique code and a URL link. When a member then logs into that page from their unique link, the code authenticates them as NACIS member, submits their vote, the key code is automatically canceled, anonymity maintained, and only one person votes. This solution seems good to all board members; solution will be announced at business meeting at fall conference. There are no associated costs so no need to raise web page line item in budget to cover costs for voting procedure changes. This does require a change to the NACIS bylaws, however, and such a change cannot be made without a membership vote

at the conference. So, for 2006, the paper ballot will remain in place for all voting, and in 2007 we will move to web ballot. Trudy will be in charge of the paper ballot and voting for 2006.

2007 / 2008 conference venues

Where will NACIS conference meet in 2007 and 2008? Dennis requests that we generally avoid unaffordable travel cul-de-sacs that have no attractions of their own. Dennis reports on southern California: having trouble meeting \$100 sleeping room rates for LA area. Pasadena doesn't look good, Ontario is a maybe, LAX is a maybe. In San Diego, he has found two properties in Mission Valley area that are within our window of affordability. If we raised the target room price, there would be other options, for example \$149 would bring us into Pasadena. Golf course resort in Industry, CA is eager to have NACIS but it's off the beaten track. We have paid \$129 before but \$149 is getting out of our price range. In sum: we could go to southern California in 2007. Jim reports on Washington, DC: rates are stratospheric. Trudy and Ginny already did some rates research and found that venue rates are too steep and intended for conferences much larger than ours. Jim looked into other options, and then focused in on St. Louis as affordable alternative. He looked at 5 properties, and all 5 meet our price and space needs. Hilton St Louis Frontenac is one option. Room rate can be tied to federal per diem, currently at \$101, max would be \$109/night. The drawback is that there are no restaurants to walk to, would need some kind of shuttle to food. Would this still work, given the centrality of eating well to the success of the conference? Whichever venue is ultimately chosen, at least one person must physically visit the property to empirically assess whether it would work out. Venue can't be chosen based on phone conversations alone. Lou supports St. Louis location as NACIS friendly. Lou adds that we need to work on the long-term lock-in for meeting locations, so we should book 07 and 08 venues simultaneously in order to put long-term planning in place. Missoula follow-up: they are interested in 08 but not in 07; no reports have been submitted to the board in any case. Jenny suggests Springfield, Illinois for 09 because it will coincide with the anniversary of Lincoln's death and associated commemorative events. Baltimore and State College are other future options. Board members vote that conference venues shall be St. Louis in 07 and San Diego in 08.

AV concerns

A lingering problem with conference planning is the question of who is responsible for AV setup. Lou says that having ad hoc AV, with one IT person assigned to cover every room, is not sustainable for every conference. A solution needs to be found for 2006 conference if possible. Board also votes that NACIS will no longer provide slide projectors or overhead projectors as optional room equipment available for speakers.

Relationship with other map societies

The US is a member of the ICA, with CaGIS acting as the administrative entity of that relationship. NACIS has some kind of relationship to ICA just by virtue of the fact that we are a map society. What the nature of that relationship is, we don't know. Max reports that the US national committee (via CaGIS) is assembling funds for US participation at the Moscow ICA in 2006 and requests that NACIS assist with this effort. Funds could be earmarked for publication and/or delegate traveling to conference. There was a long

discussion about the merits and drawbacks of collaborating with other societies in a monetary way. Monetary contributions would strengthen our ties with ICA. Would such contributions be aligned with the NACIS mission statement, however? We could ask that our contribution support a nonacademic participant or a NACIS member specifically representing our organization. This looks like a problematic area for NACIS because participation in ICA will operate at an individual level. Does NACIS have a reason to send a representative to ICA? An obligation? One opinion is that we should be using our funds to encourage people to get to our own conference, not sending people to ICA. It's problematic for us to support a special publication of CaGIS because it competes with our own journal, so a benefit to our organization is questionable. Lou suggests the alternative that NACIS could support the specific publication of the report on the state of cartography in the United States. If this looks like a good direction, we will need to figure out cost of special issue, and then earmark those funds. Jenny says we need to give a hard look at the relationship of ICA, CaGIS, and NACIS and define our identity with respect to these other map societies. If we do make a scholarship to ICA, Jenny points out that we will need to educate the membership about why this is important. So, for immediate response to ICA on our willingness to contribute: short answer is no we are not ready to contribute, but we are interested in buying some of the aforementioned reports. Remaining assessments concerning our relationship to other map societies is tabled for discussion at first fall meeting. As a related issue, we will also discuss the need for scholarship funding to support student participation in NACIS. Trudy, Max, Martin, and Jenny will all be involved in how to appropriately manage NACIS support for ICA and what that support might be.

David Rumsey

Dennis says that we never gave David Rumsey any formal thank you gift. Dennis would like permission to spend up to \$200 on something commemorative of the NACIS anniversary conference at which Mr. Rumsey spoke.

Budget adopted

The 2006 budget was approved with the following amendments: additional copyediting (estimating \$500 for the 06 budget), and student poster award increased to \$500. The 2007 budget was approved with the following amendments: \$500 student poster and \$800 copyediting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:12 pm.

Next meeting is October 18 in Madison, Wisconsin.