Attendees: Jeff Riffell, Mark Willis, Akriti Chadda, Duane McPherson, Geoff Cook, Rachelle Belanger, Ana Jureak, Alexandra Steele, Michael Markham, Rich Satterlie, Natalie Sanchez, Olivia Harris, Jamie Clark, Dave Ernst, Gabriella Wolff, R. Keating Godfrey, Mihika Kozma, Kit Longden, Grace Capshaw, Jim Newcomb, Shaun Cain, Jim Murray, Rosalie Maltby, Mike Baltzley, Alex Kingston

1. Best Student Talk Competition
   a. This year, DNNSB received many more submissions for the best student talk competition – likely due to the lack of an extended abstract
   b. Judging: We had 3 judges for each of the talks. This is good and we should always strive to have at least three judges for each talk and poster.
   c. Best Student Talk winner will be announced at the SICB Business Meeting on Saturday January 6.
   d. Things to make the competition more helpful for students who participate:
      i. Would it be helpful to provide students with the rubric before the meeting so students know what judging is based on? The consensus here was yes, this would be helpful.
      ii. It was suggested that the rubric be posted on the division website and this was very agreeable for all.
      iii. The idea of feedback was presented and it was agreed that generally comments are thought of as a good idea, but it may not be best to include scores.
      iv. Perhaps assigning a single mentor to each student who participates in the best talk competition is a useful way to provide feedback to students. This would consist of a ~10 minute meeting post competition where the student could be provided with direct, immediate feedback. Something to think about in the future.
      v. An extended, very detailed rubric was suggested, but not agreed upon at the time based on how this would be put together. If this is established, it would be very detailed but would provide judges the opportunity to respond specifically without having to provide a lot of written feedback. Judges may be able to “circle an adjective” such as “this presentation was original”, etc. If this is agreed upon, the rubric would be created and circulated to the executive committee and then the division membership to be voted on.
e. The competition award is $150 that is donated by Wiley. Is this enough? Should we be giving a larger amount from division funs from SICB or from the division itself?

f. Do we want to consider named awards? Awards in DAB are named after someone in the society. Is this something DNNSB should explore?

2. Early career awards? Is this something we can create for postdocs? Postdocs and pretenure faculty?

3. Elections for DNNSB are this spring.
   a. Lisa has been secretary for 7 years – does she want to run again?
   b. The division bylaws state that 2 candidates are necessary for each position and positions are 3 year terms.
   c. SICB website has information about officer positions and bylaws for our division.

4. SICB executive committee has openings.

5. This year, DNNSB supported 5 symposia.
   a. There were 16 symposium submissions for Tampa, down from 30, 5 years ago.
   b. Symposia are key to helping ICB and SICB being vibrant and financially stable.
   c. Duane organized the sensory hair cell symposium this year, and described how to propose and fund a symposium.
   d. Symposia should be forward looking, include experts at every level, especially early career participants, balance of women and men, people at different ages/stages, good balance of participants spanning expertise.
   e. Symposia should reach across divisions, have breadth and focus.

6. SICB has a new journal
   a. ICB Communications is a potential name – name suggestions should be sent to SICB exec committee
   b. This journal is looking for associate editors
   c. Everyone should be thinking about inaugural submissions

7. SICB code of conduct is updated and online.

8. DNNSB funds currently go to best student presentations, symposia support
   a. $300 is allocated for best student presentations
   b. $2000 is allocated for symposia support which is distributed to symposia central to DNNSB
   c. DNNSB receives $5 per division member
      i. This is split between divisions if you choose multiple divisions during registration
      ii. This membership money can support the social or external meetings like regional meetings.
   d. The financial books are currently being redone to produce transparency – DNNSB may have several thousand dollars in the bank for additional uses (discretionary funds) and these will roll over with time.
9. SICB is doing a big fundraising campaign right now and has 11 named funds that can be donated to.
   a. SICB is promoting a double year dues campaign to support the current funds.

10. SICB Executive Officers brought news.
   b. The SICB website will be redesigned this year for modernization.
   c. The executive committee wants to do a better job supporting symposia and symposia organizers so they have created a breakfast with the executive committee and symposia organizers to recognize the organizers.
   d. Adam Summers is the Editor of the new SICB journal, which is printed by Oxford University Press, and will be open access.
      i. Goals of the journal include representing integrative and comparative biologists.
      ii. Editorial staff is needed
      iii. Outreach associates are needed – this would be best filled by early career participants to drum up attention for publications via social media, etc.
      iv. Hard launch of the journal will be next meeting (SICB 2019) and Adam will solicit the founding contributions.

11. NSF brings news.
   a. Jodie Jawor is a program officer in the behavioral systems cluster at NSF.
   b. NSF has no budget
   c. NSF will continue to support SICB symposia and is really interested in symposia that bring new groups together, explore new areas, produce white papers or products.
   d. Promoting the participation of women in science and underrepresented groups is necessary in the symposium proposals that go to NSF.
   e. For grants: supplement requests such as REUs, RET, mid-career, etc should go into the grant budget up front – NSF is still accepting these requests.
   f. Preliminary proposals are a thing of the past.
   g. The no-deadline mechanism for DEB and IOS is in place and the new solicitations for all of biology will come out during the summer, June-August, to submit full proposals anytime.
   h. EDGE (genomic tools for non-model systems) still has a deadline of Feb 1.
   i. Career awards, REUs, MRIs still have deadlines.
   j. Guidance for Data Management and Postdoc management and broadening participation is on the homepage for writing grants at NSF.
   k. NSF thanks reviewers of grants.
1. With the new no-deadline system, cohorts of grants will be decided upon within 6 months of submission, depending on how quickly NSF receives enough grants for a panel. Goal is less than 6 months from submission to decision.

m. Rich Satterlie: What is the timeline for resubmission if you submit a grant, get comments, and it is not funded? Jodie: This is not yet worked out but will be by the time the solicitation is released.