



NIDCAP Federation International

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors Moss Beach, California April 26-27, 2005

Board Members Present: *H. Als, D. Buehler, J. Helm, g. Lawhon, G. McAnulty,
R. Sheldon, K. Smith, K. VandenBerg, B. Westrup,*

Officers Present: President: *H. Als*; Vice President: *g. Lawhon*; Treasurer: *G. McAnulty*;
Secretary: *D. Buehler*; Assistant Secretary: *S. Kosta*

Staff Present: Executive Director: *M. Hiland*

Tuesday, April 26, 2005

9:00 a.m. H. Als called the meeting to order

H. Als welcomed the Board and reviewed the agenda.

Review of Minutes from NFI Board Meeting dated October 1, 2004

A number of editorial suggestions were made to be reflected in the October 1, 2004 Board Meeting minutes.

H. Als led a discussion regarding the purposes that the NFI minutes serve, including the importance of documentation of the evolution of the Board's history and discussions for the general membership of the NFI.

**Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously
VOTED: To adopt the minutes of the October 1, 2004 NFI Board Meeting with the
clarifications discussed.**

Review of Minutes from NFI Board Meeting dated October 5, 2004

After review of the October 5, 2005 minutes, a few edits were discussed and agreed upon.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To adopt the minutes of the October 5, 2004 meeting of the NFI Board with the clarifications discussed.

M. Hiland stated that the minutes should be sent to all members of the Board via email and all are expected to respond with suggestions for editorial changes. H. Als suggested setting a deadline. Clarification was made that all comments/changes should be sent to the entire board. M. Hiland reminded the Board that the minutes may be adopted via email.

Executive Director's Report and Update

- M. Hiland informed the Board that a copy of her letter of resignation was included in the packet, which she distributed at the start of the meeting.
- M. Hiland reviewed the accomplishments of the NFI pre- and post- her hiring as Executive Director (see attachment).
- M. Hiland reported having submitted the Bella Vista Foundation grant on January 7, 2005 and that she received word that the foundation never received it. She was encouraged to resubmit the application last week. The Foundation met on April 25th but no word of any action has been reported at this time.
- M. Hiland reviewed the NFI's strategic goals as established in December 2003:
 - Achieve stable funding base
 - Establish and disseminate the NFI identity: Continue to differentiate NFI and NIDCAP identities.
 - Establish five new training centers
 - Establish and maintain database
 - Initiate a multi-center trial

M. Hiland recommended that the Board hire a part-time executive director, whom she will support and train. M. Hiland also recommended the immediate hiring of a grant writer with healthcare expertise, and of an administrative support staff person. H. Als suggested combining the fundraiser/grant writer and executive director positions. M. Hiland explained that the fundraiser position could be trialed by the Executive Director to judge whether it would be beneficial to have such a person on staff. M. Hiland stressed the importance of hiring someone, who has experience in fundraising. M. Hiland stated that she has exhausted her fundraising resources and would like to open up for discussion the hiring of someone else to continue seeking fundraising opportunities.

H. Als thanked her and asked for her recommendations on how to proceed with the hiring process and asked if the NFI has enough money to do so. M. Hiland responded that there was enough money to hire a part time Executive Director.

Key Skills Set and Qualities of a New Executive Director

H. Als asked the Board to reflect upon M. Hiland's contributions to the Board in terms of qualities that she brings that should be embodied in a permanent Executive Director. A summary of the Board's discussion and thoughts regarding the skills that the Board values in Mary Hiland and that a replacement Executive Director should possess were as follows:

- External perspective
- Organizational experience and expertise
- Commitment to the NFI mission
- Successful fundraising
- Grant writing experience

- Organizational and administration skills
- Relevant life experience
- Willingness to work with the NFI and its diverse membership
- Vision
- Systems perspective
- Professionalism
- Connection with the community
- Communication and contact with external stakeholders
- Clarity regarding NFI identity and strategic direction
- Leadership skill
- Ability to translate the language of the NFI into organizational language
- Knowledge of the NFI's mission and services
- Sense of humor
- Financial and management expertise
- Grants management skill
- Working knowledge of legal requirements
- Accessibility
- Openness to a new organization's vision and type

M. Hiland suggested that other key skills that should be embodied in a new Executive Director should include: passion and commitment to developmental care and effective collaboration with the Board; membership organization experience, especially at the national, and perhaps international level, with knowledge of fundraising for a membership organization; and a background and set of contacts in developmental care at the national, and perhaps international level.

M. Hiland distributed to the Board two generic job descriptions as examples. One was an example of how the board might advertise the position; the other included a list of executive director responsibilities.

Board members expressed their opinions concerning the qualifications of the Executive Director candidates including location, with benefits of living close to the current NFI office in Boston for ease of access to the corporate records, and availability for meetings with the current NFI President. M. Hiland expressed her belief that she could have raised more funds if she were based in Massachusetts where the organization is incorporated.

M. Hiland has identified someone, who is a search expert in Boston. This person is well connected and M. Hiland will seek advice from her. M. Hiland feels that the cost of contracting this person to conduct the search would be prohibitive as her firm would require one third of the hiring salary as a finder's fee.

G. McAnulty pointed out that the financial demands on the Federation have increased.

M. Hiland sought permission from the Board to explore hiring an independent contractor/grant writer for a period of time on an hourly basis (\$75-100/hour). She will explore posting the position on the national website of grant writers. Responsibilities would include submitting grants to higher level foundations. The person should know up front what sorts of foundations would accept such grant proposals from NFI.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To delegate to M. Hiland the responsibility to explore grant writer availabilities and report her findings to the board.

With regard to hiring an Executive Director, M. Hiland recommended that a search committee consisting of board members be formed. She suggested the following process:

1. Accept resumes and statements of qualifications (M. Hiland will screen)
2. Phone interviews (M. Hiland will develop an interview protocol and share it with board members for review and suggestions); a second interview with selected board members would be scheduled for the top several candidates
3. The top three to five candidates would subsequently be asked to interview with the full search committee. The search process will continue until several strong candidates emerge.

M. Hiland agreed to draft a job description and the above search proposal plan to be reviewed by the search committee. J. Helm suggested that the officers comprise the search committee. After a discussion, it was decided that J. Helm as board member and the NFI officers comprise the committee.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, with 8 yeas and 1 abstention, it was VOTED: To create an Executive Director job search committee made up of the NFI officers (H. Als, g. Lawhon, G. McAnulty, D. Buehler) and J. Helm.

The Board agreed on the following requirements for the NFI Executive Director: Master degree preferred in a field appropriate to the position, and/or equivalent experience; five years leadership/management experience, including non-profit leadership experience; located in the broader geographic area of New England and South to include the Washington, DC Area.

The following organizations were identified for the posting of the position: Craig's list; the NFI organization membership (perhaps through our listserve email communications) and the Fielding Institute.

M. Hiland agreed to post the position by June 1, 2005. The plan set forth was to hire someone by October 1, 2005 and to use the Annual Trainers Meeting as a training session for the new hire.

Financial Reports and Fundraising

Expenses and revenues compared to the budget to date

A calculation error on the budget distributed at the October 2004 meeting was discovered and corrected by M. Hiland. A corrected version was distributed to the Board. M. Hiland briefly reviewed the budget. She reported at the beginning of the fiscal year (October 2004) the NFI had a cash balance of \$82,530. Subsequent revenue brought the total cash balance to \$99,680. The projected expenses for the 2004-2005 fiscal year were \$79,600, of which \$39,152 had been expended, leaving a cash balance to date of \$60,529. She reported that the Trademark cost of \$600.00 had not been anticipated. Including the Pritzker Grant award, date of 1 June 2005 of \$50,000, there was a total cash balance of \$110,529.

Recommendation for budget revisions

M. Hiland listed expected increases and expected costs to the budget as follows:

- Budget increase due to additional training center dues given the increasing number of new training centers;
- Budget increase due to the increase in the grant amount awarded;
- Budget costs due to the increase in the number of work hours expected of the Executive Director; the April Board meeting hours for instance were not included in the original projections;
- Budget costs due to the monthly maintenance fee for database and website; and
- Budget costs due to the cost of \$5,000.00 for the preparation of a NIDCAP center agreement document.

M. Hiland estimated that these proposed budget changes yielded estimated cost increases of approximately \$20,000, yielding a total estimated balance of \$ 90,529.00. B. Westrup addressed the issue of the costs associated with becoming a Training Center, stating that it is a hardship for newly opened Training Centers to pay membership dues, especially during the first year of operations. H. Als reminded the Board about the formal process in place for approaching the Board with such issues. H. Als recommended that new centers may submit a formal notice of hardship to the Board with application for an amended payment plan. The Board decided to continue the discussion of this point at a later time during the meeting.

R. Sheldon addressed the need for discussion of the cost of the search for a new Executive Director.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To accept the proposed revised budget as presented.

Fundraising Report

K. VandenBerg reported a 5% return rate for monies raised from the Annual Letter Appeal. K. VandenBerg listed other options for funding that could be explored, including: the March of Dimes, the Mattel Foundation, and the Irving Harris Foundation (suggested L. Gilkerson, committee member).

Report on Pritzker grantee meeting in Chicago

M. Hiland distributed a survey that was a product of the Pritzker Foundation grantee meeting that she attended. (see attachments).

Fundraising plan – review and adoption

M. Hiland discussed and described the Fundraising Plan as follows:

1. Grant writing: The overall fundraising goal to support an Executive Director should be \$75,000.
2. The overall fundraising policy was approved by the Board at the July 2004 Board meeting.
3. Annual Appeal: The goal was to raise \$10,000 in an annual letter appeal. M. Hiland acknowledged g. Lawhon's efforts and success in sending out her letters of appeal. M. Hiland sent letters to all of those who were in attendance at the October 2004 trainers meeting but received no responses. H. Als expressed that there was not enough communication about the format of the letter itself. M. Hiland stressed the importance of discussing the comfort level of the Board in pursuing such fundraising methods. M. Hiland stressed it is the responsibility of the NFI to seek out people, who are committed to the mission and ask for donations. M. Hiland recommended reducing the annual goal of the letter appeal from \$10,000 to \$2,000.

4. Expand membership: establish a committee to design a two-tiered membership and to raise dues.
5. Website Capability: The goal was to set up a method to allow for donations via the website. This has been met with the establishment of a PayPal donation method.

K. Vandenberg asked if the board has any long-term goal for fundraising. G. McNulty stated that she reviewed what D. Buehler's contact, P. Ter Huen, developed as a plan for fundraising last year. D. Buehler distributed the overview of P. Ter Huen's systematic marketing approach. M. Hiland and K. Vandenberg expressed interest in further exploring this fundraising direction.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To adopt the Fundraising Plan's letter appeal (updated 4/15/05) with its modification of changing the Annual Appeal goal to \$2,000 instead of \$10,000.

M. Hiland distributed to the Board the Executive Director Report, January-March 31, 2005.

J. Helm suggested that the Fundraising Committee develop an operating budget.

Communications Committee Report

Website development and management

G. McNulty reported on the status of the NFI website. The website went live in January 2005. The host of the site is now Locust Creek, Randolph, Vermont. The domain names for the website, *nidcap.com*, *nidcap.net* and *nidcap.org*, were transferred to the new registrar. NFI has a contractual agreement with Onyons to build the site and has expended \$3,550.00 to date. The ongoing costs will include a \$35 per month maintenance fee and a \$135 per year fee for production of a traffic page report, which summarizes how many "hits" the site has received, who is visiting the site, length of stay, etc. To view the traffic report one must type **www.nidcap.org/reports**. G. McNulty listed some of the items now working on the site, including a film clip of an APIB demonstration. Donations may now be made through Paypal, with a 3.2% service fee for each payment. A search engine will be installed within one week of this meeting. G. McNulty asked the board to review the website and submit any edits or suggestions to the Communications Committee by June 1, 2005. H. Als suggested the creation of a reading committee and asked for volunteers. K. Vandenberg, M. Hiland, J. Helm, G. McNulty, and H. Als volunteered to be readers on the committee. J. Helm reminded the readers that the text should be brief.

G. McNulty explained that the contract does not include work involved in making updates to the website once the design and content are deemed final. G. McNulty told the Board that A. Brandon offered to donate her time to make ongoing updates unless the time becomes unmanageable. G. McNulty expressed the importance of designating a specific number of hours per month for maintenance. M. Hiland suggests that an hourly wage be agreed upon with A. Brandon and then paid on an as needed basis. After a discussion it was decided that the communications committee be given the power to determine how much money would be needed to maintain and update the website.

The Board was advised to send any requests including additions of individual NIDCAP center links to the Communications Committee (J. Helm, G. McNulty, and S. Kosta).

K. Vandenberg volunteered to create the reference list for posting on the website. S. Kosta will provide K. Vandenberg with the lists of references created for the past trainer's meetings. Further,

K. VandenBerg will work on areas of the website that are still under development, including a review of the documentation on the website.

Process for responding to website inquiries and the generic letter of response

A discussion was held regarding how to handle the great number of NIDCAP training requests that are made via email every day. G. McNulty drafted a generic letter that was distributed to the Board prior to the meeting. Several Board members made edits and H. Als asked if the edited version could be added to the website. Some board members prefer a more personalized response. It was determined that general inquiries for NIDCAP training may be addressed with this informational letter and/or by being forwarded through the NIDCAP website. As of May 1, 2005, g. Lawhon will receive forwarded training requests for review and guidance. The addition of a link entitled "Where do I get training" was discussed. the link would bring the reader to the generic letter and then refer them to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) and Program Guide sections of the website. The deadline for edits to be sent to the Communications Committee for the generic letter was set for June 1, 2005.

FAQ document

J. Helm created a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document that was distributed prior to the meeting. The Board discussed editing the document with revisions due by June 1, 2005. g. Lawhon raised the concern about the description of fee schedules being similar across centers. It was decided this will be discussed at the October 2005 meeting. Suggestions were made that a page could be created with all the various NFI-related questions divided into different areas (i.e. NIDCAP, APIB, and related training).

APIB FAQ

D. Buehler will edit the APIB Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document by June 1, 2005, and then send the final version for review to the Communications Committee.

A Reference Committee for the NIDCAP website was formed with K. VandenBerg, D. Buehler and S. Kosta as members. Basic articles, grouped by subject matter, will be included on the website.

H. Als raised the point that written materials, such as Board materials and website descriptions, should avoid abbreviations, given that the NFI is an international organization and will be read by individuals with a wide range of backgrounds.

Report on database development

J. Helm reported progress as slow and difficult. He reported being told by O. Leitch that a draft of the database would be accessible on the website by the end of the month and include the registration form and a method for query. Once data has been entered and saved by trainers, any mistakes will have to be corrected by the Communications Committee. The database will be available through the 'Members Only' page. It will eventually exist as a second level secure page with its own password. *Cold Fusion* is the software used to create the database. M. Hiland stated that several policies will have to be developed to determine, who will have access to it and how it can be used. K. VandenBerg addressed the issue of confidentiality. H. Als suggested that a clause be attached to the registration form that explains that the information will be entered into a database and used for training purposes only. J. Helm agreed to formulate the sentence to be added to the bottom of the registration page. J. Helm stated that a database policy draft will be ready for discussion at the October 2005 board meeting.

The Board discussed the issue of entering all the data from years past. J. Helm reported that he expects NIDCAP trainers to supply the Communications Committee with their last ten years of training data. O. Leitch will supply the data entry personnel. J. Helm explained that the money needed for data entry has already been allotted. A. Brandon has agreed to oversee the data entry quality control. J. Helm projected June 15, 2005 as a start date for new data entry. J. Helm stated that by June 15, 2005 he would send all directors a request for their training data (i.e. registration forms) from the last ten years.

Review and approval of the communications plan

M. Hiland distributed an outline of a format created by a communications professional. This document will be used as a marketing tool. M. Hiland created a preliminary version that pertains to the NFI. The Board reviewed the document together.

The main elements of the Communications Plan are as follows: Positioning statement; tagline; value proposition (how does the NFI add value in the world); key attributes of the NFI (list of 6 key aspects); fundamental messages around these benefits; and proof points (evidence supporting the NFI).

The main criticism of the document was that it described both NIDCAP and the NFI. It was suggested that the 'Key Attributes' section should be two tiered and include both NIDCAP and NFI descriptors. The Board decided on the following five descriptors for the NFI: international, assuring excellence, evidence-based, professional, and collaborative. H. Als recommended spelling out NIDCAP in the positioning statement. Further discussion of how to revise this document will be done via email with finalization and approval occurring at the trainers meeting in October 2005.

Membership Committee Report

J. Helm reported that currently there are 26 active NFI members, 5 retired or inactive members and two newly qualified members (H. Als distributed a revised list of members). J. Helm reported that he contacted a few NFI members to join the Membership Committee but as of yet no one has agreed to participate.

J. Helm stated the goal of the Membership Committee is to explore options for expanding NFI membership. He summarized the objectives of the Membership Committee as follows: To expand participation in the NFI; to increase public awareness; to develop new fundraising opportunities; and to continue to grow as an organization.

J. Helm described his proposal for a two-tiered membership. The two tiers would be Full Members and Associate Members. The Full Members category would be open up to those, who are NIDCAP certified and endorsed by a current NFI member. See attached Membership Committee report for detailed proposal. The board then discussed the pros and cons to opening up the membership to those, who are not NIDCAP certified. The board also discussed the benefits to be offered to those, who would be members, such as discount on training or the opportunity to receive a NIDCAP/NFI newsletter. A long discussion regarding CEUs (continuing education units) ensued and the advantages and disadvantages were discussed. There was disagreement among the Board members about whether this would be an incentive to become a member.

H. Als recommended that we develop a three-tier membership model. Individuals certified in NIDCAP would be eligible to be Associate Members. The proposed membership levels would be as follows: First Tier: full membership for NIDCAP Trainers, Center Directors, and Founding Members; Second Tier: associate membership for NIDCAP certified professionals; and Third Tier:

associate membership for key supporters at the training sites of the training process and the NIDCAP trainer(s).

The Board was reminded that changing membership eligibility will require a change in the by-laws. Some members agreed that membership should be extended to non-NIDCAP professionals. J. Helm suggested nomination as a qualification for membership; Master Trainers could nominate trainees for membership. H. Als agreed that trainers-in-training should have full membership with voting rights and correspondingly pay full membership dues.

An application and review process was also suggested as an option for membership. The Board discussed expanding full membership to those, who are key supporters at a training site, but who are not NIDCAP Trainers or Trainers in Training.

The meeting was adjourned 5:30 p.m., to be continued, Wednesday, April 25, 2005 at 8:30 a.m.

Wednesday, April 27, 2005

The Meeting of the Board of Directors of the NIDCAP International Federation was reconvened and called to order by H. Als at 8:30 a.m.

Membership Committee Report – Continued -:

J. Helm continued to direct the discussion about membership expansion beginning with the Associate Members category and opened the floor for discussion. This category would include NIDCAP certified professionals; they would not have voting rights but acknowledgment of required continued education. A long discussion ensued about how CEUs would be checked. It was suggested that a random check of certificates of attendance be done. The Board was in disagreement over the value of such a requirement; some felt it might be prohibitive. The fairness was also disputed, since the Full Members would not need to fulfill this requirement.

J. Helm suggested creating a third category of ‘registered’ members. Those in this category would be recognized as making efforts in the nursery and continuing their education. These individuals would be required to send their CEUs along with their membership dues. M. Hiland suggested there be a different fee for those who want to be part of the registry. All were in agreement. J. Helm will revise the categories and their requirements.

Distribution of minutes: H. Als advocated that the minutes go to all of the NFI members. Once the minutes are approved by the board, the members should receive them via email sent by either D. Buehler or M. Hiland. D. Buehler proposed that the minutes could be posted on the website in the ‘Members Only’ section. The Board agreed that when the Members-Only section is available on the NIDCAP website that will be the best forum for their distribution.

Legal Issues Regarding Training Center Status

Developing NFI agreements and contracts with training centers

M. Hiland reported that K. VandenBerg’s husband has done supportive work for the NFI around this topic. She reported that she and K. VandenBerg met with non-profit specialist attorneys and found that a licensing agreement between the NFI and individual NIDCAP training centers would cost from \$2,000 to \$5,000. This agreement would be a contract between the NFI and the organization entity that ‘owns’ the training center. M. Hiland will speak with the attorneys, who have already done work with the NFI on trademark development and the Board needs to get several bids before deciding, which attorney to hire. M. Hiland will inform the Board of the choices.

Concerns about such an agreement were raised by Board members, including the fact that some hospitals may not want a binding agreement, and it may be impossible to construct a document that would cover the varying types of hospital administrations in place at each training center. H. Als suggested the agreement be with the highest ranking person listed on the certificate, which may be the chair of pediatrics or the medical director of NICU. The Board agreed that the agreement should be with the authority sanctioning the existence of the center.

The Board decided on the following Training Center Agreement criteria:

- Membership in good standing – including payment of dues.
- Agreement is with the person the center director is accountable to – the level of authority that sanctions the existence of the center.
- Agree to send a representative to the annual trainers’ meeting.
- Uses the NIDCAP name/trademark only if there is a trainer in good standing on staff in an appropriate position.

- Honors the meaning and use of the NIDCAP name and trademark.
- Agrees to terms of “inactive status” when experiencing an NFI required and approved transition in training center status.
- Provides a written plan and shares updates regarding the establishment and management of training fees.
- Provides an organizational chart, which shows, who is employed and what the reporting relationships are for training center staff.
- Provides information regarding the employment status of the trainer, how the trainer is paid, and the plan for supporting continuing education.
- Provides and maintains an accurate record of trainees.
- Includes a statement to the effect that the NFI does not assume responsibility for liability; includes a ‘hold harmless’ clause.
- Agrees to use standardized certificates approved by the NFI.

Use of NIDCAP name

It has been discovered that certain hospitals are using the NIDCAP name without appropriate authorization. g. Lawhon will continue to monitor the Toledo website once it is back up and running. The Board discussed how to best monitor the use of NIDCAP in descriptions of hospital nurseries. It was decided that the focus should be on nursery recognition; only once that is in place will there be grounds for legal action.

Board Development

M. Hiland distributed a Board Manual that she created. She explained that the establishment of such a manual was an expectation of the Pritzker Foundation grant. The need for the development of a process for orientation of new Board members was discussed.

Review and vote on Board Development Plan

M. Hiland distributed a hard copy of the Board Development Plan for review and vote. It was recommended that the word ‘European’ be changed to ‘International’ on goal #3.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To adopt the Board Development Plan with ‘International’ replacing ‘European’ where it states ‘It is the goal of the Board to have at least one European member’, it should correctly state ‘It is the goal of the Board to have at least one International member’.

Conflict of interest policy

All Board members received a Conflict of Interest form in their Board Manual at this meeting. M. Hiland described the three types of conflicts of interest as: 1) potential (a Board member may have a conflict of interest); 2) actual (a Board member has a conflict of interest); and 3) self-dealing (a Board member advocates a decision that results in personal advantage to himself or herself). M Hiland explained the importance of acknowledging a conflict of interest. All Board members read and signed the conflict of interest forms and submitted them to M. Hiland.

J. Helm raised the issue of potential conflict of interest with trainers and their fees; for example, if training fees are brought up for discussion is it a conflict of interest for a trainer to be voting on trainer fees? M. Hiland reminded the Board that the conflicts policy is about being aware of and disclosing any conflicts of interest. As a public charity (501C3) that can accept tax deductible contributions, NFI has the responsibility to be accountable to its membership and the world at large.

The Board discussed which documents should exist on the password protected portion of the website. It was suggested that the following documents should be posted: The approved budget; Board policies (development plan; conflict of interest policy); and meeting minutes. H. Als expressed that any formal document that has been adopted by the Board should be available on the website. M. Hiland will work with the Communications Committee about the implications of adding several documents to the website. J. Helm suggested the creation of new page that includes these documents.

H. Als suggested that someone be delegated to read all the documents before they are posted. Several typographical errors were found on the mission statement. K. Vandenberg volunteered to proofread the documents that will be posted to the web. M. Hiland will proofread all of her own documents.

Nursery Recognition

K. Smith distributed the Nursery Recognition Committee Report to the Board and described the four focus areas indicated by the committee.

The primary focus of the committee has been to form the *criteria*, by expanding upon the Profile of the Nursery Environment and the Care Components (templates) with the addition of several new template items. K. Smith pointed out that Part 1 of the template manual is available on the NIDCAP website; Part 2 is not available at this time, however, it will be part of the nursery recognition process.

The second focus has been to develop *descriptors* of a developmental nursery including “catch phrases” to be used for general understandings. K. Smith explained that the next step would be to develop a working relationship with a marketing or public relations contact and begin by pursuing nurseries or hospital systems with which the NFI already has a connection.

The third focus is developing a format for the *application process*. The committee has considered the use of the topic areas of the Criteria. The applicant institution would be asked to provide evidence of meeting the standard of the criteria. It was suggested that after determining a nursery’s interest and qualifications for nursery recognition for its implementation of developmental care, designated individuals from the nursery site should complete and submit an application along with supporting materials, such as the Site Assessment form, to the review team. Topics such as direct caregiving, clinical management aspects, support to staff and training, family aspects, and transition systems to home would be evaluated. B. Westrup pointed out that the Site Assessment would need to be formulated to be applicable for international nurseries, to include, for example, more open-ended questions. As the nursery team gathers evidence, the team members may realize the need for additional coaching and/or training toward meeting the criteria, and may want to visit a Training site. The next step will include the review team’s screening of the application to determine the readiness of the nursery for the recognition process. If deemed ready, the application will be thoroughly reviewed and a site visit will be performed by an NFI review team. Establishment of site visiting teams with qualifications and criteria for the United States and outside of the United States need to be developed. Other topics explored include: The need for a recertification process, perhaps to be completed every three years and based on the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organization (JAHCO) standards; and the use of existing programs as a model for this process (E.g., the MAGNET-Recognition of Excellence in Nurseries accreditation model). The Board discussed a process whereby the Site Surveyor team would report its findings to the Board and the Board would decide on the certification of the nursery. The Board decided nurseries meeting the criteria for this level of developmental care will be recognized as “NFI-certified

Newborn Individualized Developmental Care and Assessment Program (NIDCAP) providing nurseries”.

The fourth focus, under development, is the *fee structure* for such nursery certification, including a site evaluation fee for charges covering application review, site reviewer time and travel expenses. The Executive Director could explore the fee structures for evaluators from comparable programs. The Nursery Recognition Committee will present its findings at the October board meeting.

R. Sheldon suggested that due to the potential for a conflict of interest, no reviewer should be an evaluator of his or her own site.

The timeline for a first visit to a site was discussed and it was determined that a pilot recognition process might be done in the next fiscal year. K. Smith said that the Nursery Recognition written materials, including a sample application, would be ready for review by October 2005, and then a trial certification process will occur during the next year. Potential trial sites were suggested, including Danderyd Hospital (Karolinska System, Stockholm, Sweden) and WakeMed (Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A). In summary, during this pilot phase, materials and a review process will be developed and a pilot site visit(s) will be performed. Since no charges will be made during this phase, funding will need to be sought. M. Hiland suggested that perhaps a grant writer working for the NFI might be successful in locating funding for this process.

K. VandenBerg and R. Sheldon volunteered to serve on the Nursery Recognition Committee. Others suggested to participate as Site Reviewers were: D. DeMare and R. Hedlund. M. Hiland offered her administrative assistance.

Training Program issues

Certificates of Training

M. Hiland distributed hard copies of certificate templates; the Board reviewed these and made suggestions.

The Board agreed on the use of the National NIDCAP Training Center’s certificate design in terms of the first few lines:

1. The NIDCAP logo should be to left of the text ‘NIDCAP Federation International’, which is centered, with the name of the individual center directly underneath;
2. Center logos will be placed below the center name;
3. Followed by the words “certifies that”;
4. Then there will be a line for the trainee’s name;
5. Followed by the words ‘has successfully completed training to reliability in the Newborn Individualized Developmental Care and Assessment Program (NIDCAP)’
6. ‘At’ (name of center) ‘On’ (date spelled out);
7. The bottom shall be reserved for signature blocks (number of signature blocks will vary’ every certificate must include spaces for the: trainer(s), NIDCAP center director, NIDCAP center medical director, NIDCAP center nursing director, and the overriding person to whom the NIDCAP center director reports.)

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously

VOTED: To create a certificate that includes the above mentioned text in that order.

The following suggestions were made regarding the NIDCAP Trainer certificate:

1. To remove the wording about the prerequisite of NIDCAP and APiB;

2. To change wording to: “Has successfully completed training to reliability as a trainer in the Newborn.....(NIDCAP)”;
3. To remove wording about being a member in good standing.

The Board discussed the other levels of certificates. In doing so a discussion ensued about whether to change the names of the Master Training centers to reflect that status. It was decided that the centers maintain their names, but that the Program Guide be revised to include a page that lists all those centers that are designated as Master Training Centers. M. Hiland agreed to modify the certificates and send them out to the Board for review.

Review of the document ‘Cost Projections for Seven Levels of NIDCAP-Related Training’

H. Als explained that the document was based on current Boston training fees. The Board reviewed the document. g. Lawhon raised concern about there being a separate day allotted for consultation during NIDCAP training. Several trainers explained that they usually incorporate the consultation into the other two days of training during each of the introduction, work and reliability days. H. Als reviewed the training as follows: Day one NIDCAP introduction with workshop, Day 2 bedside, Day 3 consultation with feedback on site assessment, guiding the trainee through their homework, develop timeline and meet with nursery team that wants the trainees trained. She reminded all that NIDCAP training is no longer a training of individuals but rather a change in nursery approach. H. Als stated the importance of discussing this at the October 2005 trainers meeting, especially with regard to who should be trained. H. Als stressed the need to define a core group of people to be trained. She reported that she often meets with people on a one-on-one basis, on the consultation day, whereas other trainers reported that they meet with groups of hospital staff.

D. Buehler suggested creating a trainer’s manual for guidance and consistency purposes. D. Buehler has agreed to draft such a manual using the seven levels as an outline. It was decided that the Board needs to agree on the guidelines for trainers.

H. Als suggested the Board adopt this document without the dollar figures. The board agreed that they will review the issue further and show it to their individual trainers for their review. The deadline for comments/edits is July 1, 2005. All comments should be directed to H. Als.

H. Als’ letter ‘NFI Board Decision pertaining to NIDCAP Training Center Development’

It was proposed that this letter, describing the recent NFI Board decisions regarding the process of the development of NIDCAP Training Centers and Master Trainers, become a board policy statement. J. Helm asked for clarification of point #3 about the application process. H. Als explained that a trainer would approach the Master Trainer (MT) Committee and the committee would then take it to the Board. It was suggested that point #3 be reworded to say: “After review of the site’s application, the Board will consider the Committee’s recommendation, make a decision, and suggest next steps. The committee will then inform the site as well as the trainer of this determination and recommendation.”

A question arose about whether the MT is authorized to make a decision or rather make a recommendation to the Board for its decision (via email if necessary). It was decided that once an application is received, the MT committee should make a recommendation to the Board. J. Helm agreed to edit the letter.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To adopt as Board policy the document entitled ‘NFI Board Decision pertaining to NIDCAP Training Center Development’ with corrections.

The triage of training center development requests

The Board reviewed the current centers that may need to be assigned a different trainer. Specifically, centers receiving training from J. Browne were reviewed based on her report to H. Als in a letter describing the training status of centers she was currently training. The following section describes the discussions held for each of the four training groups.

Brussels (St. Pierre): J. Browne had been working with this team and there is a physical therapist on the team, who is close to receiving trainer reliability. It was suggested that the completion of the physical therapist's training and reliability should be transferred to Agneta Kleberg.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: To transfer training of the Physical Therapist on the Brussels St Pierre team to Agneta Kleberg.

Brussels (Erasmie Hospital): The team there has expressed that they would prefer training in French. The Board discussed whether to approach J. Sizun and N. Ratynski and offer that they train the Brussels team. It was decided that those who have begun training should remain with the same trainer (J. Browne) through certification.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously VOTED: That J. Browne continue training the three Brussels (Erasmie Hospital) trainees she has already begun to train and to speak to the others who want to be trained about the possibility of French speaking trainers.

Montpellier, France: J. Browne had been conducting training with ten trainees at this site. She reported that training efforts appeared to be stalled. After a discussion of how to proceed, the Board suggested that H. Als acquire more information from J. Browne before developing a plan for continued training.

Sydney: J. Browne reported in her letter to H. Als that there are currently no trainees in the process of reliability. The Board made a suggestion to H. Als that she explore in more detail next steps that may need to be developed.

Canada: J. Browne reported in her letter to H. Als that there are 16 trainees from four different hospitals. J. Browne reported she was aware that they will need a different Master Trainer. g. Lawhon suggested that H. Als share the Board policy document with J. Browne and have her distribute it to the Canadian teams in order that they are informed of the application process for becoming a NIDCAP training center. H. Als will recommend to J. Browne that she speak with J. Tyebkhan. Further, she will ask J. Browne if she is at a point where she may reconsider her Master Trainer in Training status. If J. Browne continues to be unavailable to pursue her Master Trainership, then the Master Trainer Committee will make a decision as to who will be the Canadian group's Master Trainer.

Training center copyright registration

H. Als stated she would like to delegate this responsibility to someone. It was decided that M. Hiland will explore the steps for copyright registration.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously

VOTED: To give M. Hiland the responsibility of exploring, facilitating, and accomplishing the process of copyright registration of all English language documents and approved foreign language translations of documents. If additional time is required for this process, additional funding for this task is hereby allocated for Ms. Hiland's use to accomplish the task.

Training documents in languages other than English

H. Als stated that she would prefer to have one set of documents in each language; e.g., once the documents are translated into Spanish, Spanish speaking centers should use those documents only rather than translating another set.

B. Westrup agreed to follow-up with J. Sizun on the progress his center has made on translating the documents into French. K. Smith reported that the team in Italy has translated the manual.

It was decided that the trainer of a particular site would need to inform the Communications Committee that a particular site will be designated as the site to translate the documents into the respective language. Each and every document must also include the wording: "translated by (name of translator) with permission of the NFI as conferred to (Master Trainer or Trainer working with the site and in touch with the NFI Communications Committee regarding the permissions and registration) on (the date)"

Document defining Training Center development steps and process

H. Als was still working on the document defining training center development steps and process.

Integration of European NIDCAP trainers and centers

H. Als raised the concern of Europeans not wanting to use the term NIDCAP. B. Westrup reported that if a research project begins NIDCAP will be used. He assured her that there was support of NIDCAP in Europe.

B. Westrup motioned that the first year's Training Center fees be waived. With the French NIDCAP Training Center as an example, he described the difficulty new centers have when paying dues after the expense of the trainer's own training is taken into account and with little to no revenue coming into the center to start. The discussion was tabled. After a brief recess, G. McNulty re-visited this topic and restated the request for suspended dues during the first year of a Training Center's opening. Further, she reported having already received dues from two newly established training centers this year. Options for the French training center were discussed, including submission of a letter claiming hardship or acknowledgement that the center not be billed until the next fiscal year after the center's opening. A discussion ensued about when it was appropriate to bill a new center. H. Als reminded the Board that each center during its development was aware of the money necessary to participate in the NFI when embarking on becoming a training center. M. Hiland suggested a prorated fee for the new center based on the number of months open during the new fiscal year. M. Hiland will locate in the past minutes the hardship discussion around the topic of yearly training dues and will forward the information to B. Westrup to be passed on to the French team.

Upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, it was unanimously

VOTED: To not bill newly established NIDCAP training centers until the following fiscal year.

16th Annual NIDCAP Trainers' Meeting & NFI Board Meetings, October 2005

g. Lawhon reviewed the agenda she drafted for the 16th Annual NIDCAP Trainers' Meeting. The topic chosen for the 2005 meeting was the digestive system (gut), a continuation of last year's feeding topic.

Moderators/Facilitators were decided upon as follows:

- G. McAnulty will organize and moderate the 'Greeting and Mutual Introductions'.
- J. Helm will organize and moderate all of the 'Accomplishments' sessions.
- D. Buehler and M. Johnson will facilitate a Reflective Session for Center Directors, Trainers, Trainers in Training and Master Trainers in Training around the topic of guidance issues for families, staff, NICUs, and communities.
- B. Westrup will organize and moderate the 'Research Presentations' session. g. Lawhon will email him the Call for Abstracts document.
- R. Sheldon and K. VandenBerg will each facilitate a workshop during the General Session.

After a discussion about length of time necessary for the NFI membership meeting it was decided that two hours would be allotted. B. Westrup mentioned that last year members did not have enough time for questions/open discussion. H. Als addressed the issue of whether this meeting would include an expanded membership with more people having voting rights or would the expansion not occur until the following year. J. Helm expressed that it was his understanding that he would write a membership committee report and outline the next steps. He reported that he is not ready to make a recommendation on whom to include in the NIDCAP professionals category.

Once a decision is made to broaden the membership, the members will have to approve a by-law change. Upon receipt of the meeting notice, members would be informed about the substance of the proposed membership change. A policy vote via email could occur prior to the October 2005 membership meeting.

g. Lawhon summarized the speaker line-up for the General Session. The first speaker will present on the evolution of the mammalian digestive tract; and the second guest speaker will present on the physiological and neurobiological aspects of digestion. g. Lawhon offered a suggestion for a speaker--Carol Lynn Berseth. g. Lawhon asked the Board to think of alternatives in the event that C. Berseth declines. The last speaker of the day will be H. Als, who will discuss the topic as it relates to NIDCAP.

g. Lawhon asked the Board for title suggestions and asked the Board to review the agenda by the end of May.

With regard to the 2006 trainers' meeting, g. Lawhon suggested that this meeting be used to present trainers' own training work.

g. Lawhon stated that she will need the October 2005 board meeting agenda to incorporate it in the program for the NIDCAP Trainers' Meeting. D. Buehler agreed to distribute the April Board Meeting minutes to the Board by June 1, 2005, with a deadline for review/edits of June 15, 2005. M. Hiland will then build the agenda from the finalized minutes.

Clarification was made that the budget included a \$500 honorarium for each of two guest speakers and also included the speakers' travel and hotel expenses.

There being no further business, upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Secretary