



## **NIDCAP Federation International**

**Minutes of the First Meeting of the Board, 2004 – 2005  
Oklahoma City OK  
Tuesday, October 5, 2004**

### **Board Members Present:**

Heidelise Als; Jim Helm; gretchen Lawhon; Gloria McAnulty; Karen Smith;  
Roger Sheldon; Kathy VandenBerg; Bjorn Westrup

### **Staff:**

Assistant Secretary: S. Kosta

**Heidelise Als welcomed and congratulated the Officers of the Board of 2003 – 2004.**

### **Review of 2004 Trainers Meeting**

- R. Sheldon congratulated and thanked g. Lawhon for a program well done.

The Board reviewed this year's program session by session, made decisions with regard to the order of next year's program, and assigned responsibilities as follows:

- *Overall Program Development:* H. Als asked g. Lawhon if she would take on the job of conference program development again next year. g. Lawhon agreed to formulate and delegate for next year's program.
- *Greeting and Mutual Introductions:* Gloria McAnulty agreed to develop and moderate this session.
- *Accomplishments and Overview of Training Effort:* Jim Helm was asked to take on responsibility for structuring and moderating the entire session. He stated he would develop a handout template for each center to complete. It was suggested that he report more of an interpretation of the training trend rather than just report the numbers. It was suggested that perhaps each established center speak on their own center's progress. H. Als suggested that each center describe the sample trained, describe the strengths and their next steps. H. Als suggested that perhaps an image of the world could be projected on the screen as each center reports their progress and their respective part of the world could be illuminated on the image. Some board members expressed their concern about the time required to have each center report their own accomplishments. H. Als emphasized the need to report the numbers. A suggestion is made to establish another category of accomplishments that would include the number of invited lectures given by trainers. R. Sheldon suggested that we supply those who are not English speakers

with a handout that will coincide with the speakers. It is decided that each center reporting develop an abstract of sorts with highlights from the year. If 90 minutes are allotted again next year then each center would have 3.5 minutes to present.

- *NFI Membership Meeting:* B. Westrup pointed out that this could be a venue for more lively discussion, for example when reporting the goals and accomplishments of the NFI there could be a discussion of each point. J. Helm suggested that the members be asked for “new business” items in advance of the meeting so that they can be added to the agenda. H. Als reminded the Board that the members have been informed that they may bring forth issues they wish to be discussed at the Membership meeting. H. Als expressed that reading/highlighting the decisions only would be more efficient. Extending the length of the meeting is discussed, but it is agreed that the meeting be kept at a two hours.
- *Reflective Sessions:* The board discussed whether there should be a separate reflective session for trainers and center directors without trainers in training in attendance. g. Lawhon felt that simultaneous sessions should take place (a reflective session with directors, trainers, trainers-in-training and then have an “others” reflective session simultaneously). H. Als expressed she would like a trainers reflection circle and one where everyone could participate. It was pointed out that the observers discussion didn’t work b/c of the environmental constraints. The consensus is that a separate session for trainers and center directors is warranted, in which case then another session is necessary for trainers-in-training (including trainers and center directors). g. Lawhon asked who might head the TiT group. (L. Gilkerson is suggested).
- *Research Session:* Bjorn Westrup was asked to manage the research presentations again and he accepted. It was suggested that the research session be held earlier in the meeting because it is a way to get to know people earlier in the program. Most members expressed that its current position in the program is appropriate and it is decided it should be maintained as such.
- *Nursery Certification Update:* Its position in the program is discussed and it is decided that it should remain in the Tuesday morning slot.

The floor was opened for discussion on a theme for next year’s meeting and the following suggestions were made:

- Guidance—how one holds and guides a nursery, parent, trainee;
- Digestive tract issue; how does the gut hang in with the brain and the parent; innovation and evolution of the gut; staff issues concerning their own guts; positioning and the gut; Ginny Laadt is suggested as a possible speaker on the evolution of the mammalian digestive system; how does the staff support these digestive issues? Gut reactions to transitions from womb to the delivery room to the NICU to home.

The board agrees on the topic of the digestive tract which will be logical continuation of this year’s meeting on nourishment and nurturance.

- *General Session:*
  - A discussion began on whether H. Als should present an integrative talk relating to the guest speakers or present an APIB talk. It is decided that an integrated talk is preferred so she agreed to do that for next year and perhaps an APIB talk the following year.
  - Speaker suggestions will be explored. g. Lawhon suggested that during the first quarter of the year speaker suggestions be ongoing and by April have good idea of whom would be available. H. ALs suggests that the speakers be determined by the end of the year in order to secure someone for October. The meeting will be in the same format as it was with this year's feeding theme.
  
- *Work Sessions:*
  - K. VandenBerg agreed to take on a work session.
  - R. Sheldon agreed to take on the responsibility of a work session. H. Als asked Roger to contribute his experience and thoughts on the nursery criteria.
  
- *Summary and Reflection Session:* g. lawhon stated that she would like to ask Jean Powlesland to facilitate this session again next year as she received much positive feedback in her role this year.
  
- *Other Suggestions:*
  - B. Westrup suggested that more outdoor time be incorporated in the program.
  - A suggestion was made that evening activities end earlier than those of this year's meeting.
  
- g. Lawhon agreed to have a program developed by the April meeting.

### **Next Steps for the Board**

- The next board meeting is scheduled for April 25-27, 2005: M. Hiland and G. McAnulty will do a cost comparison of an east coast vs. west coast meeting.

### **Committee Updates since last meeting (Friday):**

- Membership Committee: (Kay Spence, Dorothy Vittner, Diane Ballweg, Monique Frierman and Ginny Laadt have all agreed to be on the committee).
- Communications Committee: J. Helm reported that the committee will speak with the individuals currently contracted to create the NFI website and assess whether to continue or break the contract; J. Helm stated that the committee members assume they can take on other contracts and move on them if necessary; no database hours have yet been logged by the database

contractor; the committee is looking to post the site by December 1, 2004; the committee will inform the board of the cost of a new designer if it comes to that.

- Fundraising committee: Linda Gilkerson and Sonia Imaizumi have agreed to join this committee; a reminder will be needed to send the 10 names to M. Hiland.

### **Quality Assurance Concern:**

g. Lawhon reported that there seems to be some confusion on the criteria for a training center in development. The concern arose over Edmonton's expressed aspirations to become a training center. Any prospective training center must have a master trainer working with them. She stated it would be helpful for all the board members to know which trainer is working with what centers. A discussion ensued on whether there should be a process to review everyone's status as a trainer. J. Helm suggested that perhaps there should be a nomination process from the trainer who wants a particular unit to become a training center. It is decided that there needs to be a clearinghouse before responding to requests from people for training and for desire to become a training center.

The facts/policies are reviewed:

- Currently there are only two master trainers;
- A trainer who does not aspire to be a master trainer should not take on training people at a center that is aspiring to become a training center;
- As soon as a center declares its desire to become a training center the trainer working with them must inform the master training committee (H. Als, K. VandenBerg, D. Buehler);
- H. Als will inform all trainers of what the policy is regarding becoming a training center.

**Action points:** M. Hiland will send the next list of action points (which will hopefully subsume the other action points from the July meeting).

### **New Business:**

J. Helm voiced a concern regarding allocation of resources. He emphasized the importance of all to be consulted or made aware of where the money is going, for instance, he explained he was not aware of M. Hiland's position until this trainers meeting.

K. Smith raised a general marketing question and asked if M. Hiland will be working on marketing and what its cost will be. How will it be done, through membership, newsletter, nursery recognition? She would like this topic to be designated as an item for the April meeting. K. VandenBerg will write an email to M. Hiland CCing the board.

The board discussed that conducting the meeting in the absence of M. Hiland is tough.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:45PM**