



**Minutes of the Mid-Year Board Meeting of FY 2009 - 2010  
Rockport, Massachusetts, USA - Emerson Inn by the Sea  
13 - 14 April 2010**

*Present: H. Als, D. Buehler, J. Helm, S. Kosta, g. Lawhon, G. McAnulty, T. Price-Johnson, R. Sheldon, K. Smith, K. VandenBerg, J. Sizun, V. Youcha*

*Staff: D. Wahl*

The regular meeting of the NFI Board of Directors was held at the Emerson Inn by the Sea in Rockport, MA, USA, on Tuesday, April 13, 2010 and Wednesday, April 14, 2010.

**Tuesday, 13 April 2010**

Dr. Als called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. (EST).

**Review and Adoption of the Special Phone Conference Meeting Minutes, March 16, 2010**

Dr. Helm pointed out that his title was not reflected appropriately on the second page where his name appears. Ms. Kosta will revise the minutes prior to posting on the web.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and VOTED BY MAJORITY: To adopt the Minutes from the Special Phone Conference Board Meeting, March 16, 2010.**

**Review of Chicago Meeting, 2 & 6 October 2009, 'To Do List'**

Each Board member reported on the status of their respective "To Do" items generated from the Board meetings in Chicago, Illinois, October 2009. Ms. Kosta will formulate a new list that reflects the work identified from this meeting as well as those tasks that remain from the Chicago 2009 list.

**President's Report to the Board**

Dr. Als summarized the events of the Board that occurred since the first formal half-day Board Meeting, Chicago, Illinois of Board Year 2009-2010, held on 6 October 2009. She reported that all minutes with exception of those being voted on at this meeting have been posted to the web. She reported the following activities: (1) She and Ms. Kosta met with Mr. Wahl on December 1, 2009 to follow up on the Board's discussion on how to further improve communication between him and members of the Board. Dr. McAnulty joined the meeting with Mr. Wahl's consent. Dr. Als reported in update of greater communication effectiveness, the following: 1. Mr. Wahl and Dr. VandenBerg, Chair of the Fundraising Committee, have regular meetings with follow-up correspondence cc'd to either the President or the Treasurer; the communication; 2. The communications between Mr. Wahl and Dr. Helm re membership applications etc. have improved significantly; the process itself has been improved and is running smoothly. (2) The NFI hired Rodd Hedlund, M.Ed. as the Director of the NIDCAP Nursery Certification Program (NNCP) and his one year contract began as of December 1, 2009. The memorandum of agreement, as well as the job description, is attached to the President's report. Dr. Als explained that Mr.

Hedlund is responsible to the Chair of the NNCP Committee, who is in turn responsible to the NFI Board of Directors; (3) A semi-annual review of the Board's directorship positions (Executive Director and Director of the NIDCAP Nursery Certification Program) has been instituted and will be preceded by meetings with each person. Dr. Als reported that prior to this Board meeting she had a meeting with Mr. Hedlund via telephone and with Mr. Wahl in person; (4) All committee descriptions have been submitted to Ms. Kosta for web posting; and (5) The Elk, the symbol of the NIDCAP Trainers Meeting has been sent for an estimate of its needed repairs. Dr. McAnulty reported that *Shreve, Crump and Low* have evaluated the Elk repair and estimated repair costs as follows: To provide a new mahogany base – approximately \$340 and to engrave and apply new plaques – approximately \$800. The company will extend a 15% discount to the NFI. Dr. McAnulty stated that the repair costs would be covered by the Program Committee's line item in the NFI budget. Dr. Lawhon reported that she has heard from a number of people who are invested in maintaining the Elk tradition; she stated that as the Program Committee Chair she is willing to bear the financial costs within the confines of the Program Committee. The Board addressed the issue of future damage caused by shipping and made several suggestions for protection during shipping (e.g. sturdier packaging, purchase of a special carrying case). Dr. McAnulty will explore with *Shreve, Crump and Low* options for shipping protection. The Board discussed whether such expense was justified within the NFI's budget. Dr. Sheldon reminded the Board of the phone call at which there was little support behind taking on such an expense. Dr. Als pointed out that the repairs should be considered a long-term investment and reminded the Board that in its first 20 years the statue carried no financial burden and that the repaired model is expected to last at least another 20 years. From a financial perspective, Dr. McAnulty stated that if the Elk is considered to be a programmatic item and the Chair of the Program Committee feels that it is feasible financially then it is within her purview to approve the expense. She also pointed out that Dr. Lawhon did not spend down her line item with last year's meeting expenses. Dr. VandenBerg voiced her opinion that the value of the Elk is in its symbolism and if the Elk were retired a replacement would be necessary. Dr. Sheldon stated that no action by the Board is necessary and also acceptable, however, he stressed the need to be fiscally responsible. Dr. Lawhon suggested that perhaps a private donation be sought. Dr. Als gave the responsibility to Dr. McAnulty to proceed with repairs.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To accept the President's Report as presented.**

### **Report by the Executive Director**

Mr. Wahl reported that his primary focus over the last six months has been to maintain funding from both the Pritzker and Mailman Foundations. He expressed how difficult it is to report only the maintenance of "the status quo"; however, he stressed the importance of securing continued funding from current funders. He also stated that he foresees the fiscal year ending with more revenue than has been budgeted. He reported that many foundations are not considering new funding prospects, making it difficult to seek funding from new sources. He emphasized that the Fundraising Committee nevertheless is continuing to seek new funding sources and that several LOIs have been submitted, including to the: Ronald McDonald House Charities; Fuller Family Foundation; and Fletcher Family Trusts. Liberty Mutual is another potential source and represents a strategy that moves away from philanthropic foundations to corporate foundations. He explained that the philanthropic foundations have challenges in this economy whereas the corporate foundations may have been less affected and recover more quickly. He reported that he and Dr. McAnulty continue to work together to manage the budget effectively. He also reported that he has been in contact with Mr. Les Fallick about the NFI's financial situation and that Mr. Fallick has expressed that he is unsure of how he can help at this time. Dr. Buehler stated that her understanding was that Mr. Fallick was offering to help develop funding strategies and she asked Mr. Wahl if Mr. Fallick has been a resource in this way. Mr. Wahl stated he and Mr. Fallick have a phone conference call arranged for April

27, 2010. Dr. Buehler reported that she recently sent Mr. Fallick some materials including the NIDCAP film and the latest Developmental Observer. Mr. Wahl will report back to the Board after his conversation with Mr. Fallick.

Dr. Helm asked for examples of what funding agencies might look for in an organization. Mr. Wahl stated that agencies often ask about the organization's strategic plan and look for evidence that the organization is growing. Mr. Wahl indicated that the growth in the NFI membership reflects well on our organization. He stressed that although the strength of the cultural core is important the growth in membership is even more important. Mr. Wahl also stated that foundations may have difficulty identifying what the NFI organization stands for and he believes that we need to convey the amount of dissemination that is being accomplished. Dr. VandenBerg added that many foundations are interested in the multi-disciplinary aspect to the training. Dr. Als asked how this information might best be captured and organized into a presentation to be shown to funders. Dr. Helm offered that he could make it part of the annual Trainers Meeting update; he would request that Trainers keep track of lectures given and the number of audience members, by discipline, in attendance. Mr. Wahl reported that he would gather some concrete data within the next 60-90 days in order to include these figures in LOIs. Dr. Als suggested he ask all of the trainers for their lecture attendance breakdown. Dr. Helm agreed to consider modifying his annual report of training to include such information.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To adopt the Executive Director's report as presented.**

### **Treasurer's Report - Mid-Year Budget 2009-2010**

Dr. McAnulty distributed the budget to the Board and explained why there are two different budgets shown: The "FY09-10 as Approved" reflects the budget that was approved in Chicago (after the calculation error was fixed); "FY09-10 Revised 11/2009" represents the current operating budget and includes the revisions made following the November conference call. She reported that spending is proceeding as planned. She reported that of the \$110,000 in projected revenue, \$20,000 has been received. She also reported that the revenues might increase to \$126,000. Changes in the revenue category include: an increase in one foundation's grant by \$16,000; an increase in another foundation's grant by \$10,000; and one foundation's funding that may not come through. Adjusting for those changes, the estimate of revenues becomes \$126,000 rather than the \$110,000 projected. She explained that Mr. Wahl and Dr. VandenBerg will report on the specifics of these revenues under the Fundraising Report. Dr. McAnulty reported that under the *Expenses* category, the *Professional Services* line item is as projected. She pointed out that a good percentage of the budgeted legal expenses have been expended due to the issue with the Swedish trademark and also with the copyright of materials in the NIDCAP Training Binder. Dr. McAnulty explained that the NNCP has a stand-alone budget, under the control of the Chair of the committee and the Director of the program, and that the NNCP is on target with expenses. She summarized the *Operations* budget and the current financial status as "spending as expected" and "achieving more revenue than expected." The budget will be posted on the web.

### *Discussion*

Ms. Price Johnson asked if the \$8000 budgeted in the *Professional Fees-Legal* line item was a retainer. Dr. McAnulty replied that the attorneys bill for service. The Board asked for clarification on what has been billed thus far and Dr. McAnulty listed the following: Maintenance of copyright, trademark rights, activities around the Swedish copyright, questions about international fundraising. Dr. McAnulty pointed out that there is no committee to oversee the legal dealings of the NFI and she understands the Board's concern that more than half of the Legal budget has been expended at the mid-year point of the fiscal year. She added that the spending of that line item is not frivolous and that she is very conscious of

limiting phone and email time with the attorneys in order to keep costs to a minimum. She also assured the Board that the attorneys are very responsive and offer very good advice. Ms. Price Johnson and Mr. Wahl both indicated that they would be interested in knowing if anyone knew of attorneys who would consider doing pro bono work for the NFI.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To adopt the FY08-09 year Treasurer's report as presented.**

### **Fundraising Committee Report**

*Continuing Support:* Dr. Vandenberg reiterated that Mr. Wahl has worked diligently to maintain current funding from the Mailman and Pritzker Foundations. She reported that it is unlikely further funding will be received from the Bella Vista Foundation. She believes that they view the funding of the NFI as finished. Dr. Vandenberg is, however, pursuing contact with Ms. Mary Gregory to discuss this further.

*New Support Efforts:* In terms of new support efforts, Dr. Vandenberg reported that the Letter of Intent to the Ronald McDonald House Charities will be submitted soon. Dr. Vandenberg then reported on the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and their Grand Challenges in Global Health initiative that now addresses maternal, newborn and child health. In reviewing the Gates website, she learned that some of the activities being funded include the education of people who work with premature infants in underdeveloped countries, therefore, she feels it is timely for the NFI to submit an LOI. The foundation is seeking applications that describe strategies to educate frontline workers in communities in underdeveloped nations, including Northern India and Northern Nigeria. The Living Proof Project organizes one of the projects supported by the Gates Foundation. This project involves the teaching of Kangaroo Mother Care to mothers of premature infants in Malawi, Africa. Dr. Vandenberg reported that the Gates Foundation expects LOIs to describe very specific goals, objectives, strategic plans, and plans for project evaluation. She opened up discussion to the Board and asked where the NFI may want to focus such an effort. She suggested that perhaps the NFI could build on a kangaroo care effort already occurring somewhere; or perhaps work with Dr. Graciela Basso in South America. Dr. Als raised the issue that the NFI's work and the NIDCAP model is based in hospitals and that experience in the field is lacking. She stated that such a project would require a connection to a region which if not already existent may take years to establish and would also require people who speak the language of the particular nation and would require the building of an infrastructure on the ground. She questioned the NFI's means to do this effectively at this time. Dr. Vandenberg emphasized the need to start small and demonstrate success with one project in one place. Dr. Vandenberg suggested targeting an area outside of the US where hospitals are in need, where services and equipment are minimal. Dr. Als pointed out that there are hospitals with the technology, however little in place to foster mother/infant relationships. Dr. Vandenberg stressed that the only avenue into the foundation is through submission of an LOI. The LOI could be framed around the impact of prematurity worldwide with the mission of the LOI being to begin a dialog about the topic. Several Board members explored whom they might know who may have some connections to an area of interest. Dr. Youcha suggested that there might be teams of people already working in these areas with which the NFI could develop a partnership. She also added that the Board must keep in mind how the proposed work would benefit the NFI. She added that raising awareness could have a huge impact and she supported the idea of the LOI's goal to serve as the beginning of a dialog. Mr. Wahl guarded against being in a position of convincing the foundation of the NFI's capability and instead to raise awareness of a need that is present somewhere that we could fill. Dr. Als suggested writing the LOI with the hope that it may lead to something in the future. Dr. Sheldon suggested finding out who is involved in providing the Kangaroo Mother Care in Malawi. Dr. Vandenberg suggested framing the LOI around who the NFI is and defining needs and what the NFI can provide in terms of fulfilling those needs. Dr. Vandenberg will draft an LOI and send to Dr. Als for review prior to submission. Dr. Youcha pointed out that Gates

requests that the LOI include a modified logic model and she offered her assistance with this aspect of the application.

*Corporate Foundations:* Mr. Wahl reported that there are some opportunities within the corporate world that the NFI might pursue. He stated that he would use his personal contacts to pursue such opportunities. He feels the NFI should expand the fundraising strategy. He indicated that he is moving in the direction of submitting LOIs to corporate foundations.

*Pharmaceutical Firms:* Mr. Wahl reported that in terms of approaching pharmaceutical companies for grants, he is aware that the likelihood of there being a conflict of interest is high. He reported that the Fundraising Committee considered a long list of companies and narrowed it down to a list of ten to propose to the Board as potential funding sources. He stated that these ten currently have transparent gift giving records and the values of the companies seem to be consistent with the values of the NFI. He opened the topic up for discussion and asked the Board for their input on these firms. Dr. Sheldon addressed the concern over the appearance of transparency versus actual transparency. He is aware of several companies on the list having questionable business practices leading to fines and pointed out that many have a short record of transparency. The Board discussed the need for disclosure if such a company grants money to the NFI. The Board also discussed whether they felt the NFI was at such a critical point financially where they needed to consider accepting grants that require such disclosure and explanation. Although the companies have separate charitable arms from which they grant monies, the Board decided it was best to avoid such companies at this time, though did express concern over whether there are enough other avenues to explore.

Mr. Wahl stated that there may be more opportunity within the corporate world to obtain funds. He stated that insurance companies have long-standing charitable divisions and that the NFI might explore these before moving to pharmaceutical companies. Dr. Buehler asked about the possibility of seeking funds from health and safety groups. Dr. Vandenberg indicated that each foundation has to be evaluated on an individual basis. Dr. Buehler suggested enlisting legal counsel to explore the background and reputation of certain companies. Dr. Youcha added that it might be worthwhile to get advice on how to proceed. Mr. Wahl stated that he would explore the corporate funding opportunities. He will approach the Board with companies that look promising and a determination will be made as to whether the Board is comfortable accepting funds from particular companies.

*International Donations:* Dr. Sizun reported that he has begun to explore ways to organize fundraising in Europe. The difficulty remains in how to explain to European companies and foundations that the NFI, an American organization, benefits Europeans. Also, there are no tax benefits for Europeans donating to a U.S.-based organization. Dr. Sizun reported that he met with an attorney who gave him some direction in terms of the options available for international fundraising. The attorney's suggestion was to create a "sister federation" in Europe with the same goals as the NFI. Dr. Sizun outlined four possible strategies. (1) To designate a national European foundation as a "beneficiary" or "host foundation" that receives donations and then grants funds to the NFI. The biggest plus to this option is that a new foundation need not be formed. The cons to this option include having to find a host foundation in each country and visibility of the NFI is not strong in this scenario. (2) To create regional NFI chapters. Dr. Sizun gave an example of such an organization ([www.iahss.org](http://www.iahss.org)). The pros to this strategy include separate chapter governing bodies created in accordance with local law, new organization can be created within three weeks, and donations by Europeans to the chapters will be easy. The cons include in order to accept charitable donations as a non-profit the chapter must be designated as a *Public Utility* which could take up to three years to accomplish and there may be conflict between the chapters and the NFI at large; (3) To create a small foundation within a larger "host" foundation. The pros include autonomy from the host

foundation and administrative needs would be handled by the host organization. The Board felt this option would be similar to how the United Way is structured. Most likely the host foundation would expect a percentage of the donations received by the smaller “hosted” foundation. Further information needs to be obtained on how this option truly functions. (4) To create a hospital foundation that would then seek funds/grants. The pros include the creation of a system to support private funding for research; however, a con is that this option would benefit only the Brest hospital and not the NFI at large.

After weighing all the options, the Board determined that the second option, the creation of NFI chapters, seems the most viable. Yet several questions arose (e.g., Would the chapters be based on language or country? Would the chapter would be a European Chapter or a France Chapter?). Dr. Sizun indicated that a chapter would have the same goals as the NFI and one goal would be to encourage membership to the NFI. He reiterated that the legal aspects to organizing a chapter model is challenging. He stated that he would need to investigate the laws around the establishment of a non-profit, “Public Utility”, organization.

Dr. Youcha suggested that the Board authorize Dr. Sizun to seek legal advice on the establishment of such chapters. Dr. Als suggested that Dr. McNulty conduct a parallel investigation with the NFI attorneys on the ramifications and benefits to establishing chapters. Dr. Sizun indicated that in order to acquire more in depth legal advice he requires funds. He stated that he would compose a letter to the attorney asking for a proposal of what steps need to be taken to establish NFI chapters and what the costs would be to take such steps. Mr. Wahl offered to pursue the investigative work in the U.S.

*Website Usage and Fundraising:* Dr. Youcha recommended that some statistics on the usage of the NFI website be included in fundraising strategies. She reported that she has preliminarily explored the usage statistics available from Google Analytics. Information such as how many visits from individual countries is available (e.g. since January, there have been 414 visits from France, 327 from Spain, 193 from Italy). She added that the program also produces maps showing visit trends. She stated that the Google Analytics site contains much more information that can be accessed and added to fundraising proposals. She explained that another way of utilizing the data is to determine which search words bring visitors to the webpage. She is exploring the parameters for applying for a Google Ad words grant and may pursue this direction when there is more content to offer visitors (i.e. sign up for workshops, educational videos, DO downloads). She stated that more needs to be done on why we want to attract visitors and what do we want to promote. Dr. Als stated that the increase in training effort is a reason to attract people and suggested offering a reference list on the resources page. Dr. Youcha then stated that an ad word campaign can be launched on references. She suggested that the “news” tab on the home page be linked to an RSS feed which would allow for instant news bulletins to be sent to Twitter and LinkedIn in as they are placed on the NFI website. The Communications Committee will explore this suggestion with *Planeteria*.

In concluding the discussion on fundraising, the Board suggested that the list of company names be removed from the Fundraising report. Dr. VandenBerg will revise the Fundraising report and email it to the Board.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To accept the Fundraising Committee Report**

### **Membership Committee Report**

Dr. Helm reported that membership has increased by 29 members since last report and that most of the growth has occurred within the Student Membership. There are 21 student memberships pending and in

most of these cases; he is waiting to receive their applications. Dr. Helm informed the Board that when he receives an application for Membership, he sends the prospective member a letter, via email, that serves a dual purpose; it is both a welcome letter and an invoice for dues. Mr. Wahl receives a copy of every letter so that he knows from whom he may expect payments. Dr. Helm stated that the application process is being tracked more efficiently than it had been in the past. As soon as payment is received, Dr. McAnulty is notified to add the new member to the Google listserv, Dr. Lawhon is notified to add the new member to the *Developmental Observer* mailing list, and Mr. Wahl sends a membership packet with the pin and password. Dr. Helm explained that some applications were being held up due to the Trainer's signature requirement, however, the signature requirement has been lifted recently in order that the application process be streamlined. He also reported that those who have not paid this year's dues are being sent reminders. He reported that he and Mr. Wahl are working out a process for sending second and third invoices.

Dr. Als reported that those individuals whose dues are paid by their institution have no way of tracking whether their dues have been paid. Dr. Helm stated that on occasion, money is received without identifiers. Dr. Als suggested that the Trainer notify Dr. Helm when a student becomes certified. Dr. Helm indicated that once a student becomes certified he will send an email to them indicating that their next invoice will reflect their Professional Member status and that they would be invoiced at the higher rate.

Dr. Lawhon sent a list of all of her trainees to Dr. Helm in order to facilitate that process. Dr. Helm is not prepared at this time to make that request of all Trainers. He is keeping track with his own charting system. Dr. Helm stated that once the new database is complete, he hopes to be "alerted" to new entries allowing him to initiate the membership process.

Dr. Helm stated that the Membership Committee's Goals are as follows: (1) Continued development of membership; (2) Coordination with other committees to provide member services; and (3) Coordination with trainers to help the transitional process from Student to Professional Member.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To accept the Membership Committee report.**

#### *Discussion*

Dr. Sizun raised the concern around the student membership requirement for Europeans. He explained that requiring membership is difficult for Europeans to accept because they are not accustomed to being required to belong to an organization. He would rather see the NFI create the opportunity for individuals to become NFI members rather than "pushing" them into membership. He stated that although the website content is now translated, there is little else to offer members. He suggested organizing international meetings for NFI members, and/or translating the *Developmental Observer* into multiple languages. Dr. Sizun explained that it is difficult for them to understand why, when the hospital is paying their training, there is another fee necessary to access the training documents.

The Board considered the concerns valid and important to address and had a discussion about the reasons for such a policy and considered what might be done to alleviate the conflict.

The considerations for modifying the policy included: (1) Hospital systems/training centers are already paying for students to be trained so why should there be an additional charge to access training materials; (2) The training documents may not be available in one's language; (3) Some trainees entered the process before the policy was set in place; (4) The NFI should be sensitive to cultural differences in how

individuals become affiliated with organizations; and (5) The NFI should recognize the cultural differences in what it means to belong to an organization, where it is a privilege in some countries (e.g., U.S.) it may be viewed as forced in other countries.

The considerations for maintaining the policy included: (1) The risk to the intellectual property protection when Trainees are given the password without first paying Membership dues; (2) The difficulty requiring adherence to the NFI's authority and the laws, as the NFI holds the structure and the guidelines to training; (3) The necessity for Trainers to state the importance to being involved and staying current with the NFI's policies and training documents most readily achieved through membership; and (4) The importance to creating growth in the organization.

Some possible solutions discussed included the following: Reduction of the student membership fee until the website reflects the international nature of the organization, and training materials are available in trainees' languages; Offer of additional benefits such as meetings for trainees to attend; Translation of the DO articles; Incorporation of the individual dues into the training fees; Purchase of the password by the training center to be used by all trainees; Opening up the discussion at the Trainers Meeting; and Creation of a survey asking trainers for their input and table the discussion until concerns are heard.

Dr. Sizun explained that when NIDCAP first began in Brest, France, it was "an adventure" as it was something new and exciting. Today, for Trainees who have no contact with the NFI, he described the NFI as not as appealing. Dr. Als pointed out that the Trainees not feeling a part of the NFI could be due to the method of delivery of the message by Trainers. Dr. Sizun stated that it seems to be a difference of opinion on the strategy. The priority for all is that NIDCAP is increasingly used in NICUs. He stated that the French agree with the goal but disagree with the strategy. When asked if the issue was financial or membership he replied that it was a combination. He stated that if given another year to develop interest by offering NFI-related meetings and translation of some other materials, membership would increase in his country.

Dr. Helm asked if the Board would consider an ongoing discussion of the concerns raised. He stated that as Chair of the Membership Committee he would be willing to draft a response to send to the Trainers Google listserv where a discussion has begun this week. He would explain that the Board has heard the concerns and given serious consideration to the options suggested. It would convey to the Trainers that developing the organization is a growing process. He will send the draft to the Board for review prior to sending out a statement to the Trainers group.

The Board decided that it would take a stepwise approach to the issue, beginning with a response from the Membership Committee to the trainers, and then proceed with more discussion.

### **Program Committee Report**

Dr. Lawhon explained that her written report included a summary of the evaluations from the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual NIDCAP Trainers Meeting in Chicago, October 2009.

#### *21<sup>st</sup> Annual NIDCAP Trainers Meeting*

Dr. Lawhon reported that the theme of the upcoming meeting is "sleep". She has invited James McKenna, PhD, Director of the Mother Baby Sleep Lab at the University of Notre Dame to speak on the development of sleep in the newborn. He is an anthropologist who runs the mother/baby behavioral sleep laboratory at the University of Notre Dame. He has done extensive work on co-sleeping issues. She stated that if Dr. McKenna is unavailable, she has a list of other prospective speakers. She also reported there will be a session on the Infant Behavioral Assessment and Intervention Program (IBAIP) because several

individuals in the Netherlands have done dissertation work with this instrument. Other ideas for the meeting include: A workshop addressing *concrete NIDCAP training* needs such as feedback within the NIDCAP training process and the selection of trainees; *NIDCAP Nursery Certification Program* session on site review team training; the *greeting and mutual introductions* session (the traditional format with the growing numbers of participants is becoming more time consuming and difficult to manage but perhaps it can be approached in a different way; the majority of feedback is supportive of this session's continuation, although other ideas have been offered, such as the production of a small book containing a photo and mini biographical paragraph on each participant); the *accomplishments and overview of training sessions* will occur as usual; the *poster session* will likely be held if there are enough submissions; *committee sessions* being held were undecided; and the *reflective session* was too large last year so a decision will have to be made as to how to split the session (perhaps running parallel sessions, one with trainers and one with trainers in training); and the *Membership Meeting* will remain in the Tuesday morning position.

The rough schedule will be as follows:

Saturday	Morning:	Introductions and Training Accomplishments
	Afternoon:	Research abstracts
Sunday	Morning:	Scientific session
	Afternoon:	Free time
Monday	Morning:	NNCP session (criterion scales) IBAIP presentation Work session on training feedback
	Afternoon:	NNCP (review team training) Reflective session(s) NFI committee sessions
Tuesday:	Morning:	Family panel NFI membership meeting Summary and evaluation Preview of next meeting

Dr. Lawhon reported that if there are more than 80 participants the seating will be cabaret style, otherwise it will be the traditional U-shaped set-up.

*22<sup>nd</sup> Annual NIDCAP Trainers Meeting:* Dr. Lawhon reported that the 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual NIDCAP Trainers Meeting will be hosted by the NIDCAP Training and Research Center at Cincinnati Children's.

*Future Meetings and Themes:* Dr. Lawhon raised for discussion the recurring topic of the evolution of the Trainers Meeting and its purpose. As the meeting moves to include NFI work, she posed the question of what an NFI meeting might look like. She stated that the original purpose of the meeting was to have Trainers, Directors, and those interested in the work to come together to develop the NIDCAP model and practice, reflect and network. She suggested that perhaps every other meeting should be designated as a "practical training" meeting. She presented the other thematic ideas for future meetings as follows: the needs of underdeveloped countries; mental health issues; and end of life and palliative care issues.

The discussion returned to the structure of this year's Trainers Meeting. The Board asked about this year's meeting and about possible connections with the European Foundation for the Care of Newborn Infants (EFCNI). Dr. Lawhon explained that to try to cover the theme of sleep as well as the concrete training issues, the family network idea could not be featured prominently. Dr. Als stated that it was perhaps too much to try to cover sleep, training and IBAIP at one meeting. Dr. Lawhon suggested that the two training

issues be combined yet recognized that it may be too ambitious. The Board discussed the importance of making the EFCNI connection while having a meeting in Europe. After some discussion it was decided that if Dr. McKenna does not accept the invitation to speak, the program can be changed to include the family network connection. Dr. Sizun stressed the importance of making this connection with the EFCNI. Suggestions were made to either replace the IBAIP with the family network topic, or rearrange the program to place the IBAIP session in the one-hour slot preceding the abstract presentations. Dr. Sizun asked what could be done specifically for the Trainer and Dr. Lawhon explained that two topics of interest were the selection of Trainees and all aspects of training feedback. Dr. Als asked Dr. Lawhon if she had a breakdown of the meeting participants in terms of numbers of Trainers, Trainers in Training, Center Directors, Center Medical Directors and others. Dr. Lawhon did not have the breakdown offhand though she agreed to determine this information.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED:** To accept the Program Committee Report as presented.

### **Quality Assurance Committee Report**

Dr. Als reported that she was charged with creating a policy governing the oversight of the production and dissemination of audiovisual NIDCAP education and implementation materials. The Board read the policy that is detailed in the written QAC report. Dr. Als mentioned that the Design and Aesthetics committee should approve the look of the material before it becomes an official product. Dr. Helm stated that the policy should not give the impression that once an individual becomes a trainee the NFI owns everything they do. Dr. Als explained that the policy's purpose is to indicate that if material is produced and being used generally, it is in the best interests of the creator of the product to assure it is in keeping with the organization's goals and visions. Ms. Smith asked if the policy applies to slides that are used in NIDCAP training and if so, would they then need the approval of the QAC. Dr. Als explained that if the slides are being used for training beyond one's individual training use then yes. Dr. Youcha asked if the NFI's attorneys had reviewed this policy. Dr. Als explained that the policy presented at this meeting is a draft for the Board's review and she explained the history behind the creation of such a policy. Dr. Youcha stated that if an individual produces a product and wishes to obtain NFI endorsement, it would, of course, have to be approved. She stated that she would like the attorneys to look at the policy to determine if the policy states enough while at the same time does not cross any legal boundaries.

*Update on Training Materials:* Dr. Als stated that the binders distributed at the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual NIDCAP Trainers Meeting remain the standard training binders and must be used by Trainers. She reported the binder costs have increased and that Ms. Kosta has been in touch with Mr. Hisashi Tatsumi of OfficeMax to determine the current costs. Ms. Kosta will post the updated costs to the web as soon as they are determined. Dr. Als stated that the Training Center Development Binder is in need of revision and it is her intent to accomplish this by the 2010 Trainers Meeting. With regard to the Required Readings List, Dr. Als stated that it is the responsibility of the Trainer to assure that Trainees acquire the required readings. PDF versions of all the required readings will be available soon on the Member Services page of the NFI website. Dr. Als stated that APIB trainees have voiced their desire to be able to purchase complete APIB kits rather than to buy the individual parts themselves. She announced that there is now a source for production of the APIB bag and asked if anyone was interested in taking on the distribution of the kits. Dr. VandenBerg offered to take on the responsibility of assembling and distributing the APIB kit. Once she has worked out a system, she will inform Ms. Kosta of the ordering information and Ms. Kosta will post it to the web.

*Training Updates:* Trainer updates: Dr. Als informed the Board that Dr. Graciela Basso has applied for NIDCAP Master Trainer-in-Training status and that her application is attached to the QAC report. The

two sites that Dr. Basso has proposed to develop as Training Centers are Vall d'Hebron Hospital in Barcelona with Josep Perapoch, MD as NIDCAP Trainer in Training, and 12th October University Hospital in Madrid with Maria Maestro Lopez, MD as NIDCAP Trainer-in-Training. Dr. Als reported that the QAC has reviewed the materials and recommends to the Board the approval of Graciela Basso, MD, PhD as NIDCAP Master Trainer-in-Training. Dr. Als will inform Dr. Basso as well as the hospitals and respective Trainers-in-Training of the Board's approval.

*APIB Training Updates:* Dr. Als reported that Dr. Basso's APIB trainees are nearing certification level which will elevate her to APIB Trainer status. Ms. Dorothy Vittner has passed her APIB re-reliability. Dr. Buehler has begun her APIB training of NIDCAP Trainers-in-Training Sylvie Minguy (Brest) and Natascia Bertonecelli (Modena). Dr. Browne continues to be in training with Dr. Buehler however one APIB trainee has suspended her training so Dr. Browne is in search of another trainee. Dr. Als has workdays scheduled with Gillian Kennedy, Trainer in Training, as well as with Beverley Hicks, NIDCAP Professional, both at the UK NIDCAP Training Center, St. Mary's Hospital London, and the UK.

*Training Centers in Development:* Training Center and Trainer Development continues in Norway (Alesund), Arizona, US (Phoenix), Italy (Modena) and the UK (London). Prospective Training Center development is occurring in Japan where two hospitals have begun NIDCAP training (total of six trainees); Israel at the Meir Medical Center; Heidelberg and Tübingen, Germany.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the Quality Assurance Committee Report.

*Sub-Committee on Production and Web Posting of Training Materials in Different Languages*

Dr. Als reported that the French and Spanish websites are live. She reported that Dr. Sizun has translated the NNCP Criterion Scales. She reported that the binders are not yet available in European sized paper, however, this is being accomplished. She stated that there are varying numbers of documents in various stages of translation. It has been decided that a certain body of materials must be produced before they are to be posted on the web. The committee has stored all of the translated documents submitted to date and when Trainees need a document in a certain language they may seek Ms. Kosta's assistance.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the report of the Sub-Committee on Production and Web Posting of Training Materials in Different Languages

*Sub-Committee on Specific Training Resources*

Dr. Lawhon reported that the required readings list has been updated. A CD containing PDF versions of all the required readings was distributed at this meeting. She reported that the electronic production of the reference library is still ongoing. She has begun to gather some sites' contractual agreements and she stated that she intends to have that completed prior to the next Board meeting.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the QAC's Sub-Committee on Specific Training Resources Report.

*Intellectual Property Sub-Committee*

Dr. McNulty reported that we are up to date with the protection of the wordmark, the NFI trademark, and the certification mark as indicated on the written report. She reported that the NFI attorneys will notify her when fees are due for registration renewals. Dr. McNulty suggested that the Board consider adding Japan and Israel to the list of countries in which we have protection of the name NIDCAP. She

also reported that the NIDCAP Training Binder is about to be revised and submitted for copyright protection. She stated that she and Ms. Kosta are in the process of updating it and determining which documents need transfer of copyright signatures.

The Board discussed whether to move forward with protection of the name in Israel and Japan and the consensus was that both protections should be pursued. Dr. McNulty stated that she is unsure of the costs. The Board gave her the authorization to move ahead as long as the cost is reasonable and within the budget. If it is more than \$2500 she will bring authorization to the Board for a vote. Dr. McNulty asked whether to prioritize the international fundraising questions ahead of the trademark protection in Israel and Japan. It was suggested that she obtain the costs for both and then make a determination.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the QAC's sub-committee on Intellectual Property Report.

#### *NFI Certificates Sub-Committee*

Ms. Kosta reported that all but two centers, the University of Illinois Medical Center at Chicago (UIMCC) NIDCAP Training Center, and the UK NIDCAP Training Centre at St. Mary's have approved certificates. She reported that both centers have received approval for the electronic version of their certificates. The committee is awaiting the hard copy versions for final approval. She also reported that the European centers continue to have trouble locating a source for the correct parchment paper so the National NIDCAP Training Center has supplied these centers with the correct paper.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the QAC's Sub-Committee on NFI Certificates Report.

#### **Design and Aesthetics Committee Report**

Dr. Buehler reported that the committee completed the NFI Brochure in French and she passed around a sample of one for the Board to review. She reported that the committee is waiting for the completion of the NNCP's third pilot site visit to finalize the program's materials. The NNCP brochure will be forthcoming after the third pilot site also. She announced that the fundraising booklet would be developed prior to the next Board meeting. She distributed several copies of the NIDCAP film to each Board member and stated that there needs to be a plan for distribution to trainers and centers. She stated that she will get copyright forms signed by the creators of the film and the film will be submitted for copyright. As soon as the copyright forms are submitted the film will be posted on the web.

#### *Discussion*

Dr. Lawhon asked Dr. Buehler to summarize the revisions made to the film. Dr. Buehler explained that a few additional photographs of children added to depict the early days of NICU care prior to NIDCAP and images were adjusted to reflect the messages being described. Some of the suggested revisions were not done due the amount of re-working and additional filming that would have been required. She stated that she envisions a companion piece to the film that addresses the international and interdisciplinary nature of NIDCAP. The idea of translating into other languages was raised and some suggestions made for where to seek information on dubbing and subtitling, one of which was [www.dotsub.com](http://www.dotsub.com).

Dr. Lawhon expressed her desire to add the Mid-Atlantic NIDCAP Center logo to the stationary. Dr. Buehler will assist with the design.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the Design and Aesthetics Committee Report.

## Communications Committee Report

### *Developmental Observer Sub-Committee*

Dr. Lawhon reported that the next issue of the *Developmental Observer*, Volume 4, Number 1 is in the process of being printed. She stated that she continues to work with Mr. Wahl and Dr. McNulty in maintaining cost efficiency. Production of Volume 4, Number 2 has already begun with a deadline for content collection of May 28, 2010. This issue is expected to have: a Message from the President, a research piece written by Dr. Sizun and Ms. Inga Warren; the Centers Around the World article featuring The Karolinska NIDCAP Training Center; the NIDCAP Profile written on Josep Perapoch; Family voices featuring a mother from the UK; a poem written by a NICU nurse; a piece on scrapbooking and its use in supporting families; and the Developmental Resources section reviewing the NIDCAP film.

### *Website/Database*

Ms. Kosta reported that the Communications Committee has maintained and updated the website as needed over the last six months. All revised policy and training documents have been uploaded to the Member Services page and the NFI Committees page has been updated to reflect the new committee structure. She reported that the hosting and email management, previously performed by *Planeteria* has been shifted to *Planeteria's* business partner, *Project A*. She stated that the committee is working with *Project A* to transfer the domain name management to them. Ms. Kosta reported that the committee was pleased to announce that the website now has multi-language functionality and that the site was recently launched in French and Spanish. The committee worked with Jacques Sizun, MD Nathalie Ratynski, MD and Christine Rémont, physiotherapist, who translated the site's content into French and the French pages were launched on February 16, 2010. The committee worked with Graciela Basso and a team at the Alumbrar Foundation in Buenos Aires to complete the translation of the site into Spanish and the Spanish pages launched on April 8, 2010. She reported that Dr. Basso and her team also translated all of the training documents which have been uploaded by the Committee to the Member Services pages.

Ms. Kosta reported that another major accomplishment of the Communications Committee was the "kickoff" of the database project. She stated that Phase II of the web design, which is the building of a centralized and secure web-based database to track and report NIDCAP and APIB training for the web site began April 7, 2010. She reported that the existing training data, currently housed in an Access database, will be exported to the new web-based database and the most current data from the last two years will be entered by hand. The design plan includes the option for users to download data to their computers for customized analysis through Excel. She announced that completion of Phase II is expected by the end of May 2010.

Ms. Kosta also reported that the Communications Committee continues to maintain the three listservs of the NFI: the Members' listserv, the Trainers' listserv and the Board's listserv.

She reported the Committee's goals for the next six months as follows: To expand upon and maintain the site as needed; to complete the web-based training database; to work with the Family Committee to enhance the Resources Page; to explore volunteers to translate the site into more languages; to work with the Director of the NNCP to update the NNCP pages; to work pursue with *Planeteria* the RSS feed to link the news items to those registered with Twitter, LinkedIn, and other social networking sites; and to upload the NIDCAP film once copyright registration has been completed.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To accept the Communications Committee Report as presented.**

### **Nominations, Elections, and Appointments Committee Report**

Dr. Helm reported no activity since the October 2009 meeting. The committee anticipates the following activities in the months preceding and during the October 2010 meetings: The election of the Board officers; notification to the Membership of the two open seats on the Board of Directors, one of which is a designated Family Representative seat; and the election to fill the two open seats on the Board.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the Nominations, Elections, and Appointments Committee Report as presented.

### **Family Committee Report**

Ms. Price-Johnson reported that there would be an article in the *Developmental Observer* each month that addresses NIDCAP from the family perspective. She reported that she and Dr. Youcha are working on a list of family-friendly links for the *Resources* page of the NFI website. Ms. Price-Johnson explained that she is in the process of creating a notebook/guide for family representatives elected to the Board of Directors. She and Dr. Youcha feel it would be helpful for any new Board member to have access to such information. She also reported that she is developing a family focus group at her hospital and thought perhaps the NFI could utilize the same model once prepared. Ms. Price Johnson reported that she gathered at least eleven different sources from attendees at the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual NIDCAP Trainers meeting and she stated that she would send the information to Ms. Kosta in order for her to add to the Resources page of the website. She also suggested that a list of books and articles geared for families would be beneficial to have on the website as well. Ms. Price Johnson will coordinate the linking of the EFCNI to the NFI web and also the NFI's link from the EFCNI site. She asked the Board members to send her any information they may have regarding family resources or names of individuals who may want to become NFI Family Members or NFI Family Committee members. She mentioned having spoken with six potential NFI Family Members.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the Family Committee Report as presented.

### **Outreach Committee Report**

Dr. Sheldon reported that he completed the final draft of the American Academy of Pediatrics Letter of Intent, to prepare a Technical Report on the NIDCAP approach. He stated that Drs. Sizun and Westrup have agreed to review the letter. He reported that the technical report is in the works, however, he will need assistance with its completion. He reported that the committee has not met officially though has had some conversations and looks to the Board for guidance on their duties and responsibilities. He stated that the committee has not yet followed through on utilizing Mr. Michael Moir's, Dr. Buehler's brother, expertise on social media and web strategy but they intend to do so. He mentioned that the minutes from the last meeting indicated there was a question to the committee about what to do with non-English public relations material and Dr. Sheldon stated that he presumed that a Senior NIDCAP Professional would review the material prior to its use in the media.

Dr. Sheldon reported that he revised the committee description since the last meeting and submitted it to the Board for review. The Board reviewed the description during the meeting and discussed changes. He stated that he added the ED to the membership of the Outreach committee. Dr. Sheldon agreed to make the suggested revisions and will re-send to the Board for review. The Board expressed desire to read the description overnight and discuss at the end of tomorrow's meeting.

Dr. Sheldon mentioned that Dr. Sizun is planning to translate the description for the website, however, Dr. Sizun has indicated that the translation of the word “outreach” is considered jargon in French. He asked for suggestions on how to best translate the word. The Board suggested “Public Relations.”

Dr. Als asked Dr. Sheldon if the AAP Technical Report would represent the NFI. Dr. Sheldon stated that it is a scholarly review to interpret the NIDCAP literature and attempt to resolve conflicting publications and classify the results as “good, bad, or indifferent” evidence.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried it was unanimously VOTED: To accept the Outreach Committee Report.**

### **New Business**

Dr. Lawhon took this opportunity to inform the Board of NIDCAP related activities she is involved in.

- She continues to be the NFI representative for the Preemie Health Coalition and informed the Board that the Preemie Health Coalition is coming out with three products: (1) a pamphlet on milestones for preemies; (2) a NICU journal; and (3) a discharge planning toolkit.
- NIDCAP has been chosen to be part of a 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Neonatology Symposium in Rio de Janeiro.
- She is completing a two-year involvement with the March of Dimes to create an interactive video on “understanding your premature infant” for the web.
- Next April will be the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Neonatal and Perinatal Nursing and they have requested a practice article on the evolution of nursing to NIDCAP Nursery Certification (NNCP).
- The Encyclopedia of Family Health, a sage publication, has requested a 3000-word article on NIDCAP.
- A doctoral student in Nebraska, a rare exception of an individual undergoing NIDCAP training, will integrate NIDCAP into the nursing curriculum in Jordan.

Dr. VandenBerg added that the state of California would fund separate classes for NICU staff based on NIDCAP training to enhance parent education, especially to support parents at high risk for child abuse.

Dr. Als adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m. (EST).

### **Wednesday, 14 April 2010**

Dr. Als called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. (EST).

### **Closed Semi-Annual Review Meeting of NFI & NNCP Directors**

The Board held a closed discussion to review the performance of the two NFI directors, the Executive Director, Mr. Wahl and the NNCP Director, Mr. Hedlund. Mr. Wahl was not present during this portion of the meeting.

At the conclusion of this session, Mr. Wahl returned to the meeting and was briefed on the Board’s discussion.

### **NIDCAP Nursery Certification Program (NNCP) Report**

*NNCP Director:* Ms. Smith reported that since the last meeting in October 2009, the committee posted the job description, screened applicants, and interviewed for the position of NNCP Director. Mr. Rodd Hedlund was hired and began working in that capacity on December 1, 2009. She informed the Board that

his training began with a one and a half day work session in Boise, Idaho. During this training, Ms. Smith introduced him to the NNCP process and materials. Since that time the NNCP Steering Committee has held several phone conference calls with Mr. Hedlund.

*NNCP Materials:* Ms. Smith reported that the NNCP's guides and application materials are undergoing edits. She stated that a description of the NNCP has been written for inclusion in the NIDCAP Program Guide. She explained that the committee is working on a document entitled *A Guide to Preparation, Application and Implementation of NIDCAP Nursery Certification* as well as a procedural manual that will include goals and objectives of the program, roles and responsibilities of site reviewers, fees, and an evaluation of the NNC process. All of the pilot site reviewers were asked for their input for the creation of this manual. Ms. Smith anticipates that the pilot sites will be called upon for their feedback as well. Dr. Lawhon stated that feedback requests should be made in a timely fashion for a high quality of feedback. Dr. Youcha asked if it is written into the policy that Trainers cannot review their own site. Ms. Smith explained that it is not a written policy and Dr. Lawhon stated that the Trainer might be involved in the site's self-evaluation.

*New Site Reviewer:* Ms. Smith reported that since Dr. Sheldon is unable to participate in the third pilot site review, Dr. Sonia Imaizumi was approached and has agreed to be a reviewer at WakeMed's site visit. Mr. Hedlund is gathering information from Dr. Sheldon to support Dr. Imaizumi's preparations for the process.

*Third Pilot Site Visit:* Ms. Smith reported that the third pilot site visit is scheduled for WakeMed, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA. The site review team will be on site June 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, and will use June 30<sup>th</sup> for review and integration. June 28<sup>th</sup> and July 1<sup>st</sup> will be the reviewers' travel days. The team will include Dr. gretchen Lawhon, Dr. Deborah Buehler, Ms. Karen Smith, and Dr. Sonia Imaizumi. Mr. Hedlund will attend the visit as an observer. Dr. Helm has provided a preliminary agenda for the review days.

*Revision of Fees:* Ms. Smith reported that over the last couple of months the steering committee has reviewed and revised the NNCP budget. The cost analysis is attached to the report. Taking into consideration the current economic climate, the committee decided to reduce the costs associated with the NNCP applications. The committee decided to reduce the number of days on site as well as reduce the per diem costs to the site reviewers. She reported that the site reviewers were polled about a reduced per diem rate and all of the reviewers agreed to the reduction. This has resulted in a considerably lower rate. In order to secure funds to cover the administrative costs, the committee also reevaluated the application fee amount that goes directly to the NFI.

Dr. McAnulty reviewed the cost analysis grid that was included with the NNCP committee report. She stated that the steering committee discussed three scenarios and added that the ultimate goal is to increase the NNCP director's time commitment. Dr. Youcha asked if the fees included a second site visit to a unit, if deemed necessary. Ms. Smith explained that since the screening process prior to the visit is so stringent, the expectation is that certification is likely. Dr. Youcha then suggested that the NNCP web page indicate that during the screening process, a nursery will only move to the next step when they have met certain criteria and the cost analysis should indicate that the costs include only one site review. Dr. Helm suggested that there be a separate heading in the cost analysis for the review process.

*International Nursery Applicants:* Ms. Smith reported that there are currently two international applicants: (1) University Hospital in Brest France (the University Hospital application was included with the written NNCP report with a possible site review date of December 2010); and (2) Meir Hospital in Kfar Saba,

Israel (Hospital applicants have submitted Application Part I and are in the process of completing Part II. Ms. Smith expects to hear from them soon.).

*NFI Website:* Ms. Smith reported that the steering committee will use some funds to enhance the NNCP pages on the website. There is a currently a description of the NNCP and once all of the application materials are completed they will be uploaded to the site. The site will include a sample of the Criterion Scales as well.

*Magnet Program:* Ms. Smith reported that the American Nurses Credentialing Center Magnet Recognition Program does not recognize NIDCAP or APIB certification in their credentialing. The steering committee is exploring the possibility of the inclusion of NIDCAP, APIB and NNCP as part of the Magnet credentialing criterion.

#### *Discussion*

Dr. Helm asked if the steering committee considered other reductions in fees (e.g. reducing the reviewer fee even further). She indicated that the committee did take into consideration lowering the fees further, however, decided to propose the \$1000.00/day fee.

As the Board reviewed the cost analysis and budget justification, there was some confusion about the additional \$1000 fee per reviewer for application review. It was clarified that the fee covers the time needed for review prior to the visit as well as following the visit. Dr. Lawhon suggested itemizing the fee into two separate half days and listing them in sequence of how they occur in the application and review process. There was also some confusion over the wording of the number of visit days. (i.e., a two-day on-site visit translates to a three day NNC site review). Ms. Smith will make modifications to the cost analysis to improve clarity.

Dr. Helm stated that he anticipates the site visit process will eventually be streamlined into a two-day visit. He indicated that part of the report could be written prior to arriving on site so that the team “hits the ground running.” He stated that tightening the process would prove more economical for the sites and more profitable for the NFI.

Dr. Youcha stressed the importance of uploading as much as possible to the web and also suggested developing some Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) specific to the NNC process. Dr. Lawhon stated that information regarding the NNCP would appear regularly in the Developmental Observer. Dr. Youcha suggested creating some two to three minute videos containing footage from NNCP nurseries.

Dr. Lawhon stated that she would like to see the fees reduced further. Dr. Als indicated that the other reviewers polled agreed to the \$1000.00 fee. Dr. Helm stated that he agreed to a lesser fee and added that he views the site reviewer role as less of a time investment than his training therefore it warrants a different fee. Dr. Youcha stated her opinion that she feels the \$1,000/day is a modest fee.

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

**VOTED:** To accept the NNCP Committee Report with modifications as discussed to the cost analysis contained in the report’s appendix.

#### **Materials Production including Workshops, and Outreach**

Ms. Smith reported that the committee will modify the website to include all new and updated materials. The goal is to provide increased information on the website including downloadable materials and FAQs. She stated that the committee is looking for opportunities to get the information out to the members and

wants to provide it in an informative and attractive way. She reported that the committee felt the importance of allotting funds to this process at this time rather than to the development of workshops. Dr. Helm asked if the materials would be posted in a rolling fashion as they are completed or if the materials would be posted at once when everything is completed. Ms. Smith replied that once all materials are complete they would be posted. Dr. Helm asked where the products are in terms of their development. He expressed the need for their completion to be done in an accelerated manner, if possible. Ms. Smith indicated the pre-application materials are nearly complete. Dr. Helm suggested that the completion of the Guide be a priority as that is the document containing the most comprehensive information regarding the program. She stated that the goal is to have it done before the site visit in Brest, France.

Dr. Youcha suggested the creation of a webinar where individuals call in live and “attend” an informational meeting. She estimated the cost to be approximately \$200-\$400 per session. She suggested using [www.WebEx.com](http://www.WebEx.com) and suggested the webinar include video as well as PowerPoint presentations. Once the meeting occurs it can be posted on the NFI website for others to watch at their convenience. Dr. Als asked Dr. Youcha if she would be willing to explore this possibility. Dr. Youcha agreed.

### **Identification of Reviewers and Composition of Review Teams**

Ms. Smith explained that the committee had discussed reducing the number of site reviewers from three to two in order to save site costs. She requested the Board’s input on two member review teams versus three with neonatology, nursing, and behavioral disciplines represented. Dr. Lawhon asked for clarification on the pool of prospective site reviewers and if it consists of only Trainers. Dr. Als explained that so far the individuals that have been considered have been Trainers and Training Center Directors (although with Dr. Imaizumi the pool has widened to include a Training Center Medical Director). Those who are not associated with a Training Center have not been considered up to this point.

Dr. Lawhon pointed out that as a NIDCAP Trainer, and a Master Trainer, she works toward removing the disciplinary aspect. She feels individuals understand the perspectives of other disciplines and thus it is possible to evaluate the environment without the ideal disciplinary make-up. Dr. Als indicated that without all disciplines represented it is still important that questions from all perspectives be asked. Dr. Lawhon stated that she would not want to be held to only her discipline’s perspective. Ms. Smith indicated the importance of determining the key ingredients from the various disciplines that need to be shared with all reviewers. Dr. Buehler observed Dr. Sheldon’s interactions with other neonatologists at the Cooper site visit and appreciated his role and contributions as a neonatologist. Dr. Sheldon expressed his reservations about having a two-person team. He stated that although the questions can be asked by anyone, the answers might be different depending on who asks them. Dr. Helm agreed that a three-person team is necessary but that we need to develop more teams. Dr. Als stressed the point that the NNCP model should not be the same as the training model. Ms. Smith asked how future reviewers should be identified and suggested that the Trainers Meeting include a session to identify site reviewers. Dr. VandenBerg stated that she feels that the pool must be made up of Trainers as they have the experience of evaluating the NICU’s environment. Dr. Als suggested that a committee be formed to recruit site reviewers. Dr. Lawhon asked if the session would be open to all Trainers and Trainers-in-Training. The Board decided that it should be open to all and that it would not be an optional session. Dr. Buehler suggested that international teams be formed. Dr. Helm felt it would be helpful to know ahead of time who may be interested in being a site reviewer. Dr. Lawhon suggested creating a survey to send to Trainers and Trainers-in-Training prior to the meeting to get an idea of the interest. Dr. Buehler suggested creating a description of what the position entails and the advantages and motivation to assuming such a role. Dr. Sheldon suggested presenting the description as a matrix with two job descriptions: one that is specific to one’s discipline and one that describes the position’s duties regardless of discipline. Ms. Smith agreed to put together a job description and an invitation to participate.

### **Training and Training Process of Review Teams**

Ms. Smith stated that there are two opportunities available for training: (1) the Trainers Meeting; and (2) the site visits directly. Dr. Lawhon stated that in the latter, the team make-up would have to include two experienced reviewers and one novice. Dr. Helm suggested that perhaps there could be additional training to the Team Leader. Dr. Als reported that Mr. Hedlund suggested that he participate on-site as the facilitator. The possibility was raised that this may create a conflict of interest. Speaking from the financial perspective, Dr. McAnulty reminded that Board that in order for the program to support the NNCP director's salary, six visits/year need to be conducted.

After some discussion, Ms. Smith asked whether the entire Board needed to be involved in the process of reviewer training. Dr. Lawhon stated that up to this point the steering committee has handled training. Dr. Helm stated that he does not think the Board needs to be directly involved in the process of choosing and training individuals. He suggested that the NNCP strive for two day visits (including wrap-up) to cut costs to hospitals and increase operational funds to the NFI. Dr. Als stated that NNCP team has little experience in getting the wrap up done in a timely fashion before leaving a site and added that once reviewers have dispersed it will be difficult to get done. Dr. Helm reiterated that he understands the need for the third day in the pilot process, but once in operation the NNCP should strive for two-day visits. He also stated the importance of developing a formal process for providing feedback to the unit and obtaining feedback from the unit.

Ms. Smith summarized the NNCP's tasks as follows:

1. Considerations of further modifications to the application fees;
2. Development of a timeline for completion of all application materials and web posting (within two months);
3. Elaboration on the review and feedback process with input from the site and the site review team;
4. Formulation of site visit specific and site visit summary agenda;
5. Preparation of a presentation to educate potential site review team members;
6. Exploration of the creation of a webinar;
7. Creation and submission of a survey to prospective pool of site reviewers (i.e. Trainers and Training Center Directors, Training Center Medical Directors);
8. Creation of a site reviewer job description; and
9. Update of the list of prospective site reviewers.

Dr. Lawhon asked Ms. Smith how many Trainers Meeting sessions should be dedicated to the NNCP, one or two sessions. It was discussed that perhaps two would be necessary, one to introduce and discuss the Criterion Scales and the other for prospective site reviewers.

Dr. Helm restated that a description of the review process must be included in the materials that describe the program.

### **Unfinished Business**

#### *Nominations for Honorary Members*

Dr. Helm presented two individuals for nomination as Honorary Members. The Board discussed the specific nominations as well as the Honorary Member nomination procedure itself. It was Dr. Als' preference that the nominee be informed of the NFI's nomination desire. Dr. Helm agreed that it would be proper protocol not to presume or surprise an individual with a nomination. When approaching the nominee and/or appropriate members of their site, the Board discussed proper channels, which may begin

with the nominator and then with Dr. Helm. The Board also discussed the timing for making nominations. Dr. Helm proposed that the Board authorize him to pursue specific nominations and then proceed with a vote on the nomination after communications have been made and nominations are determined appropriate. The Board authorized Dr. Helm to pursue the specific nominations.

The Board discussed the second nomination. It was suggested that this individual be nominated to become a Professional Member of the NFI. Dr. Youcha suggested that an “award” category be added to the NFI (e.g. a life-time achievement award). Dr. Sizun pointed out that it might be advantageous to the NFI to have specific individuals as Honorary Members showing that the NFI respects their work. As the discussion continued, Dr. Buehler suggested that the Board might wish to choose nominees in a systematic fashion. Dr. Sizun suggested that perhaps the Board should submit names of whom they may like to be nominated. Dr. Youcha reiterated her idea of establishing another method of recognizing people who have supported NIDCAP.

The Board discussed the value of an honorary membership when individuals are not in agreement. The Board made an informal decision to delay the vote on this second nomination. The Membership Committee will consider the process and develop some criteria for nominees. Dr. Sheldon asked for names of others who the Board feels should be nominated as Honorary Members.

#### *Board Members Paid by the NFI*

The Board discussed whether an individual receiving income from the NFI could run for election for a seat on the Board. After some discussion, Dr. McAnulty offered to explore with the NFI’s attorneys whether there is Massachusetts state law that prohibits a non-profit from having a paid Board member. Dr. Helm stated that the issue could be addressed either through the NFI by-laws or through policy decisions. Dr. Sheldon raised the issue that a paid staff member would have a potential conflict of interest around any budgetary issue since it may affect their salary. Dr. Helm agreed and added that a further complication may exist if the individual reports to the Chair of a Committee, as he or she may be inclined to vote in a specific direction that either benefits or hinders their interests.

Dr. Lawhon stated that Dr. Als should inform respective individuals that it is inappropriate for individuals in paid NFI positions reporting to a Committee Chair to be voting members of the Board. The Board agreed.

#### *Open Board Meetings*

The Board revisited the idea of creating the opportunity for NFI members to observe the Board process. The Board discussed that opening the meeting up to observers may encourage more active participation of members at the committee level and may also reduce an air of secrecy that may be felt by some because of the current closed-door meeting format. The Board discussed in what capacity the observers would be invited. Dr. Youcha suggested that observers be invited for the committee-reporting portion of the meeting. The consensus was that it would be a great opportunity to bridge the gap between the Board and the Membership and that it would be feasible to do at the Board meeting that occurs just prior to the Trainers Meeting each Fall. The Board will decide which portion of the meeting they will be invited to attend.

#### *Outreach Committee Description*

Dr. Sheldon reviewed the Outreach Committee. Dr. Youcha stated that she was still not clear on the purpose of the committee. She stated that it seemed the description was written as though the committee’s main purpose is to refute negative claims on the NFI. Dr. Sheldon stated that the description does not

have to reflect that aspect of the committee's purpose. A few more suggestions were made to revise the description. Dr. Sheldon agreed to polish it further and then send to Ms. Kosta for posting on the website.

***Dr. Youcha excused herself from the meeting at 3:50 PM (EST).***

*Open Board Meetings Continued*

The Board resumed the discussion about opening the Board meetings to observers, and if so, whether to invite individuals for the entire meeting or just for the committee reporting time period. The Board felt it would offer transparency and also encourage people to join the Board or its committees. It was decided that if the meeting were to be open to observers, they could arrive only at the beginning or at break points of the meeting and also leave only during breaks. It was also discussed that an RSVP would be necessary in order to determine the meeting's space needs. The members will be informed with advance notice to make their travel plans accordingly.

*Misrepresentation of Qualifications*

There was a brief discussion about individuals misrepresenting themselves as NIDCAP Professionals. The Board decided that rather than determining a way to handle these particular cases, a proactive approach to the issue would be best. Further discussion is warranted.

**2011 Mid-year NFI Board Meeting**

The Board discussed possible locations for the 2011 mid-year Board meeting as being Rockport, Massachusetts, Duck, North Carolina or Napa Valley, California. It was determined that an East Coast meeting continues to make economically sense at this time and agreed to hold next year's mid-year Board Meeting on the East Coast on April 5 & 6, 2011. Mr. Wahl offered to organize the meeting in either Massachusetts or Rhode Island. He will take into consideration the ease of travel (i.e. minimal flight connections) when exploring the options. Ms. Kosta and Dr. McAnulty will assist in the planning of the meeting.

**There being no further business upon motion, duly made, seconded and carried, Dr. Als adjourned the meeting at 4:53 PM (EST) on Wednesday, April 14, 2010.**



---

**Deborah Buehler, PhD**  
**Secretary**  
**NIDCAP Federation International**



---

**Sandra Kosta, BA**  
**Assistant Secretary**  
**NIDCAP Federation International**