

[Print Page](#) | [Close Window](#)

## 14) Early/young researcher representation

**Printed from:** ISSLR Forums

**Topic URL:** [http://www.isslr.org/forums/topic.asp?TOPIC\\_ID=221](http://www.isslr.org/forums/topic.asp?TOPIC_ID=221)

**Printed on:** 04 Sep 2014

### Topic:

---

**Topic author:** rjellison

**Subject:** 14) Early/young researcher representation

**Posted on:** 08 Feb 2009 21:35:55

**Message:**

The desirability of having an early career researcher on the board has been noted (see election results). Although several of us would like to have seen Courtney Salm elected to the board, she was not in the recent election. To create a board position dedicated to an early career scientist would require amending our bylaws -- which can only be done by the general membership. If there is interest, I would suggest someone find a role for Courtney as chairperson of an appropriate committee. Various committees may be formed by the board at any time.

### Replies:

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 08 Feb 2009 21:40:56

**Message:**

Jasmine will probably be able to comment on this, as she knows Courtney best.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 08 Feb 2009 21:54:55

**Message:**

posted by Timms and moved here

I would like to see our constitution modified so that one of our members-at-large be designated for a younger person as defined as a postgraduate student/young scientist within 5 years of joining the work force. The item could be titled 'Young representation on board.'

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 08 Feb 2009 21:56:43

**Message:**

"posted by Oren elsewhere and moved here"

How to define "young" is of course not an easy question ; important is that we have someone who is enthusiastic and committed to the goals of the society, and who sees his/her future in the area of limnology.

[Go to Top of Page](#)

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 08 Feb 2009 21:57:02

**Message:**

Agreed. This should be on the agenda for the next members' assembly at the time of the 2011 meeting.

---

**Reply author:** clitchfield

**Replied on:** 10 Feb 2009 09:08:38

**Message:**

I like the concept. However, because we met only every three years, I should think that we would want someone who has attended the meetings and shown an interest in continuing in the field. Thus you might have to extend the 5 year period to 6 or 9 years. Many folks work only for a couple of years in the field in which they did their post-doc or PhD. It is certainly something to be discussed at the next meeting in 2011 with some advance notice to the membership.

---

**Reply author:** btimms

**Replied on:** 11 Feb 2009 04:00:55

**Message:**

Yes I thought it was a matter of amending our constitution and that it could only be done at a meeting of members. I move then that we give consideration at the next general assembly of members that we reserve a member-at-large position for a young scientist. We could discuss now or later the eligibility for such a position. Obviously such a person needs to show enthusiasm for our goals, as Aharon stated, and perhaps should have attended two meetings and be up to 9 years since graduation (I prefer not to define the level of degree). (I am happy to move my 5 years to 9 years as Carol suggests.)

---

**Reply author:** wurtsbaugh

**Replied on:** 14 Feb 2009 07:29:15

**Message:**

I agree that we need the young representation. The advantage of having good age representation is very apparent to me after having been active in SIL (which is dominated by leaders over 60+), and in ASLO (where there are two voting student board members plus considerable age diversity of the others).

I would suggest that we don't go over +6 years post-Ph.D. for the definition of a young scientist.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 14 Feb 2009 07:40:43

**Message:**

We all seem to agree that it will be good to have someone young on the board. Most voting members apparently thought otherwise based on the number of votes in favor of election of Courtney Salm. Therefore an amendment of the bylaws making special provisions for a young board member is probably the way to go.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 14 Feb 2009 08:43:38

**Message:**

Most appear to be in agreement with the desirability of having an early career scientist on the board. I prefer "early career" to "young" criteria. I don't think we should do something now as we just had an election. However, I think we should do something before the next general assembly. I propose the following to focus the discussion,

"RECOGNIZING the desirability of having representation of early career scientists on the board, RESOLVED that the following amendment to our Bylaws be put before the general membership in a special election to be held later this year.

## ARTICLE 2

## OFFICERS AND MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

## SECTION 1. NUMBER OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS AT LARGE

The officers of the corporation shall be a President, a Vice-President, an Editor, and a Chief Financial Officer who shall be designated the Secretary-Treasurer. There shall be seven member-at-large position of which one shall be held by an "early career" scientist. Only one office or member-at-large position may be held by the same person.

## SECTION 2. QUALIFICATION, TERM OF OFFICE, AND LIMIT ON CONSECUTIVE TERMS

Any member of ISSLR may serve as officer or member-at-large of this corporation except that the "early-career" member-at-large position will be reserved for those who have received their doctorate within 6 years of the date of the election. The term of office of officers and members-at-large shall be three (3) years and shall commence on January 1 following their election, or as soon thereafter as possible, and shall continue until their successors assume office. The President, Vice-president, and Members-at-Large shall not serve more than two terms consecutively.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 14 Feb 2009 08:50:56

**Message:**

The bulletin board doesn't allow italics to show the added text but you can see the few lines I've inserted by comparing to the bylaws currently posted at the website under the "Business" heading.

---

**Reply author:** clitchfield

**Replied on:** 14 Feb 2009 11:11:13

**Message:**

Bob:

Do you want a motion on that suggested change to the ByLaws so we can have a proper discussion of it or just discuss without a motion? If you want a motion, I move that the board accept the suggested change to the by laws as I think that what you have written captures everyone's thoughts on this matter.

Carol

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 14 Feb 2009 11:21:03

**Message:**

If it is a motion, I agree.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 15 Feb 2009 07:24:28

**Message:**

Posted by Mianping

I agree that the young researcher representation is needed on the board. I think that the young representative should meet the following three conditions: (1) his age should be below 45, (2) he should have attended two meetings, and (3) he should be up to 9 years since graduation.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 15 Feb 2009 07:27:33

**Message:**

Yes, I meant it to be a motion. I should have been clearer. I think it more effective to put a motion on the table to focus the discussion. This is the normal "Robert's Rules of Order". Now

that it has been seconded, we can discuss it, propose amendments (as Mianping has done), and finally call for a vote.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 15 Feb 2009 07:32:36

**Message:**

I think Mianping's suggested criteria are too strict, especially the requirement of having to have attended two meetings. The position is only one of 11 board positions and the intent is to get youthful, early career input.

---

**Reply author:** btimms

**Replied on:** 16 Feb 2009 16:43:22

**Message:**

On reflection maybe attendance at two meetings is a bit restrictive, especially in that we meet only every three years. Probably an age restriction (45 years) is good. But I still think 9 years post graduation (not necessarily Ph D ---just graduation from whatever) is applicable, but I wouldn't hold out voting in favour if others argue 6 years.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 16 Feb 2009 20:46:51

**Message:**

If determination of the criteria is so difficult, another option is not to change the bylaws, but indicate to all voters the next time a new Board will be elected that the Board finds it desirable to have at least one younger member, and that candidates xxx and yyy etc. are proposed. This does not oblige members to vote in favor of one of these candidates but it will give them some food for thought. On the other hand, this may be considered by some as an attempt of the outgoing Board to influence the outcome of the new elections, which of course cannot be done.

---

**Reply author:** mcoleman

**Replied on:** 17 Feb 2009 14:17:06

**Message:**

The restriction of two meetings and less than 6 years seems very restrictive to me. Even 9 years may be hard to fill. Do we have a person of such background on our books? Marianne Tiffany may be one such person but I am not sure if she was what we (or her - young - she would be flattered) had in mind. The age restriction of 45 would preclude her of course.

It seems to me that the board has a person in mind and wishes to re (de)construct the constitution to allow that person to be admitted to the board. While this is not a bad idea it seems to be getting submerged in non discrimination ideals and always will be if the 'new' person is to be a Board member.

Why can't the constitution be reformed to allow the Board to ask a younger member to advise the Board and take part in the meeting, and that person be appointed by the Board based loosely on the criteria of age, recent graduation (or not if the person has recently returned to post grad but has had been graduated before), performance at a recent meeting etc. I would assume that the advisor would not be able to vote but is voting needed?

---

**Reply author:** btimms

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 02:31:11

**Message:**

I would like to see our young representative being able to vote, i.e. being a full board member. Otherwise he/she will feel discriminated against. If we can't agree of criteria, lets make them very diffuse, ie. recent graduate in early stage of their career. Let us not define 'recent' or 'early.' I think it is important to have such a member on the board, for training for the future, for perception that we are not entirely a bunch of old fogies, and for liasing with younger members.

I move therefore to modify my motion that we, at the next general meeting give consideration to reserving a member-at-large position for a recent graduate in the early stage of their career.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 02:34:42

**Message:**

without strictly defining the terms "young", "recent graduate" and "early stage of career"?

---

**Reply author:** btimms

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 02:48:37

**Message:**

yes no defintions. Fewer people will be offended though I admit someone could flout the intentions in which case most voters would probably be aware of the contradictions and vote accordingly.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 02:55:31

**Message:**

If so, I am in favor of the motion.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 05:37:25

**Message:**

I think this and other topics illustrate why we need to at least roughly follow "Robert's Rules of Order" in order to have a more efficient and focused discussion.

Brian has made a motion and Aharon seconded it.

I move it be amended as follows:

"we, propose to the general membership, to modify the bylaws to specify that one member-at-large position be reserved for an early career scientist where "early career" means within 7 years of receiving their advanced degree."

I'd like to propose it to the general membership before the next general meeting in a ballot to be held before the next annual board meeting. Three years, followed by an election three years after that is just too long. I also would like to see some general criteria. I have found it usually ill-advised to leave these things undefined.

Always causes problems or ill-will down the road.

This proposed amendment to Brian's motion requires a second. Without a second I'll just drop it. This proposed amendment needs a second.

---

**Reply author:** clitchfield

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 09:09:08

**Message:**

I second the motion and agree with Bob that define these terms is necessary. Hoping everyone in ISSLR remembers in 10 years why something is done without a clear statement could lead to further confusion and ill will.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 09:15:13

**Message:**

Agreed

---

**Reply author:** mcoleman

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 13:37:34

**Message:**

I am sorry but are we at the stage of discussing or voting on the motion? What happens if we dont have a person to fill the position based on the criteria? Does our constitution allow for a position to be unfilled? I am being lazy and hoping Robert can answer this without me looking it up.

Finally do we have such a person(s) on the books for the next general meeting? I wish to get some comfort that this position is not being tailored for one person. I have no doubt that the person in mind will be a valuable addition but I doubt the wisdom of changing the constitution to achieve that end and thereafter it just becomes an Albatross for future boards. I have no doubt that it may work for other organisations but as we are being reminded we dont have a large membership.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 13:59:14

**Message:**

We are considering a motion to put it before the general membership. If it passed we would still need to have a vote on the change by the general membership(I suggest next fall), followed by solicitation of candidates, and then another election (perhaps before the following fall). I was just suggesting that we consider the possibility of having the position in time that it be filled by the next conference.

---

**Reply author:** mcoleman

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 14:19:13

**Message:**

Thanks Robert for the clarification.

I do not agree that the motion as I currently understand it should be proposed to the general meeting. I am happy to abstain as I am not against it in principle just its operation.

I agree some motion to include and encourage a young graduate in the organisation should be put forward to the next general meeting.

---

**Reply author:** wurtsbaugh

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 21:03:39

**Message:**

I agree with Bob's motion and that we should bring this before the membership as soon as possible. I call for the vote.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 24 Feb 2009 21:29:31

**Message:**

agreed

---

**Reply author:** btimms

**Replied on:** 25 Feb 2009 02:48:58

**Message:**

I will accept Bob's amendment and just hope people don't argue for ever over criteria.

---

**Reply author:** wurtsbaugh

**Replied on:** 25 Feb 2009 06:56:47

**Message:**

I agree with Bob (and the 7-year stipulation) and think we should get this to the membership as soon as possible. I call for the vote.

---

**Reply author:** sarosj

**Replied on:** 02 Mar 2009 13:00:42

**Message:**

I support Bob's statement.

I'll add, though, that I think this could all be simplified by simply calling this position a student member of the board, like many societies do, with the student being a PhD student who has attended a meeting. We had several PhD students at GSL. My sense is that what we're really seeking from this person is their perspective, in the hope that this may help us to recruit more early career people to the society. Since these are 3-year positions, I still think that's reasonable for a PhD student.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 02 Mar 2009 18:43:56

**Message:**

This is also a good idea. Do we want to specifically have a "student" member-at-large? Is there more support for this?

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 02 Mar 2009 20:36:35

**Message:**

With a meeting once every three years I am not so sure that will work. However, I will be happy with any solution that will ensure that the Board will get representation from the younger generation, and how the motion will be formulated in the end is for me of little importance.

---

**Reply author:** mcoleman

**Replied on:** 02 Mar 2009 21:46:14

**Message:**

I think that a 'student member at large' with at least one attendance has more chance of being filled and still satisfy the objective of a 'youthful' perspective than the more exhaustive criteria spoken about before. I have confidence that the general membership will select the best candidate, and I would prefer to allow the general membership make that decision than us preclude potential candidates. I think that it would be best to be inclusive rather than exclusive especially given our small membership.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 03 Mar 2009 06:09:37

**Message:**

I suggest we allow "young/early researcher" candidates to still be working on their PhD and thus we could change the wording to something like: "before or within 7 years of completing a PhD".

---

**Reply author:** wurtsbaugh  
**Replied on:** 03 Mar 2009 06:37:56  
**Message:**

Bob--great suggestion. I support it.

---

**Reply author:** aoren  
**Replied on:** 03 Mar 2009 07:34:49  
**Message:**

Sounds OK to me.

---

**Reply author:** sarosj  
**Replied on:** 03 Mar 2009 07:41:34  
**Message:**

I also approve.

---

**Reply author:** clitchfield  
**Replied on:** 03 Mar 2009 08:28:17  
**Message:**

It sounds as though we accept the amendment to the motion and we must vote as Wurtzbaugh has called the motion.

---

**Reply author:** btimms  
**Replied on:** 04 Mar 2009 21:14:02  
**Message:**

It is obvious to me, we are all in favour of the general concept. It is just a matter of someone to take over from my initial poorly worded motion and put forward something concrete. Bob you are good at doing this. So please?

---

**Reply author:** aoren  
**Replied on:** 21 Mar 2009 07:39:55  
**Message:**

Summarizing item 14 on the agenda: All Board members seem to agree that it is desirable to have a young (student or young researcher) representative in the Board - this in spite of the fact that most members of the society appear to have another opinion, as based on the outcome of the past elections!

After many discussions here still does not appear to be a consensus what criteria should be followed to define "young" etc.

Reserving a slot among the Board for a "young" member would require modification of the bylaws of the ISSLR. No well-defined motion has been proposed on which we could vote. Unless someone wishes to revive this topic now and formulates a motion to change the bylaws I propose continuing this discussion in next year's Board meeting.

---

**Reply author:** wurtsbaugh  
**Replied on:** 21 Mar 2009 18:50:17  
**Message:**

We had a motion, an amendment to the motion and a call for a vote, so I suggest that we do that vote and move forward with the following resolution which is a synthesis of the original motion and Bob's amendment:

"RECOGNIZING the desirability of having representation of early career scientists on the board, RESOLVED that the following amendment to our Bylaws be put before the general membership in a special election to be held later this year.

## ARTICLE 2

### OFFICERS AND MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

#### SECTION 1. NUMBER OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS AT LARGE

The officers of the corporation shall be a President, a Vice-President, an Editor, and a Chief Financial Officer who shall be designated the Secretary-Treasurer. There shall be seven member-at-large position of which one shall be held by an "early career" scientist who is a student or within 7 years of completing a PhD. Only one office or member-at-large position may be held by the same person.

#### SECTION 2. QUALIFICATION, TERM OF OFFICE, AND LIMIT ON CONSECUTIVE TERMS

Any member of ISSLR may serve as officer or member-at-large of this corporation except that the "early-career" member-at-large position will be reserved for a person who is a student or who has received their doctorate within 7 years of the date of the election. The term of office of officers and members-at-large shall be three (3) years and shall commence on January 1 following their election, or as soon thereafter as possible, and shall continue until their successors assume office. The President, Vice-president, and Members-at-Large shall not serve more than two terms consecutively.

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 21 Mar 2009 21:37:59

**Message:**

OK, let's vote. I am in favor of this motion.

---

**Reply author:** btimms

**Replied on:** 21 Mar 2009 23:49:04

**Message:**

Yes I vote in favour too (though we could argue till the cows come home on the exact definition of a student, the motion's definition is reasonable).

---

**Reply author:** sarosj

**Replied on:** 22 Mar 2009 15:48:32

**Message:**

I'm in favor

---

**Reply author:** mcoleman

**Replied on:** 22 Mar 2009 18:07:05

**Message:**

I am in favour

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 22 Mar 2009 22:24:14

**Message:**

We have five votes in favor. We need at least one more to have a majority and to approve the motion. I am looking forward to seeing the votes of the other board members as well.

---

**Reply author:** rjellison

**Replied on:** 23 Mar 2009 04:22:51

**Message:**

I'm in favor of the motion

---

**Reply author:** aoren

**Replied on:** 23 Mar 2009 04:25:08

**Message:**

Thanks, Bob. Now we have a majority for this motion as well. Let's wait until my return from Mexio on April 1st and if there will be no more issues to take care of, I will then adjourn this year's board meeting.

---

**Reply author:** clitchfield

**Replied on:** 24 Mar 2009 10:58:03

**Message:**

I'm in favor of the motion.

---

**ISSLR Forums** : <http://www.isslr.org/forums/>

© **International Society for Salt Lake Research**

[Close Window](#)