

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS**

April 28, 2015

President David Stone called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 7:15 pm Eastern on Tuesday, April 28, 2015.

The following Directors were present at the meeting: Rachel Dresbeck, Gretchen Kiser, Alicia Knoedler, Ioannis Konstantinidis, Ann McGuigan, Marjorie Piechowski, David Stone, Michael Spires, Peggy Sundermeyer and Anne Windham. Michael Spires acted as secretary. The following Directors were absent: Anne Geronimo and Jacob Levin.

Approval of Draft March 24 Board Meeting Minutes – David Stone

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (seconded by Ann McGuigan) to approve the minutes as drafted. The motion passed unanimously.

Committee Reports:

Membership Services – Ann McGuigan. NORDP membership has risen to 605. Gretchen Kiser provided an update on the salary survey. Although the hope was to be able to present data and analyses from the survey at the meeting, the metrics subcommittee is still analyzing some of the data. Ann McGuigan noted that it took a full year to post results from the last salary survey, so we are in some sense ahead of the game. The consensus of the meeting was that presenting even a subset of the preliminary results at the conference would be good. David Stone suggested making one slide to present at the business meeting. Full results should be available shortly, perhaps as soon as within a month after the conference ends. Response rates across the two surveys were almost identical, at about 35% of membership.

David Stone asked about having regional representatives who will do the work of greeting new members. Ann McGuigan replied that Peggy Sundermeyer had taken care of it, and that all regions were now represented. Peggy Sundermeyer corrected that statement to say that she had arranged for hosts at the conference's regional meetings who would likely accept an invitation to serve as regional representatives as well, if they were not already. In a few cases these would be separate individuals. . Stone further asked whether we had some mechanism to connect knowing that there is a new member to alerting a greeter to reach out to that member? McGuigan said no. Sundermeyer added that part of the problem in doing so is the transition to the new regions which isn't yet fully completed in Memberclicks. Gretchen Kiser added that contact with Talley or some similar mechanism would be needed to help get this information to the regional representatives. Anne Windham stated that the Northeast region has already been doing this. Peggy Sundermeyer will take responsibility for reaching out to Talley (either Denise or Joe) to ensure that this information is provided in a timely fashion, either on the dashboard or in the form of a regular (monthly) report. Kiser added that Talley had been very helpful and responsive to requests from the metrics subcommittee while they were working on the salary survey analysis.

Gretchen Kiser is taking over responsibility as co-chair of the Membership Services committee for the remainder of Ann McGuigan's term on the board, and will take over as sole chair in July.

Communications – Rachel Dresbeck. No report.

External Engagement – Jacob Levin. No report.

Enhancing Collaborations – Michael Spires. No report. Peggy Sundermeyer asked if it was the case that this working group had exhausted its usefulness. Michael Spires responded that he had planned to address that question later in the meeting. David Stone pointed out that there is a meeting slot for the committee on the conference agenda, and that before arbitrarily disbanding the committee, we should listen to the opinions of those present and consider what they would like to do. If the committee's focus were narrowed to only one or a few items, there is hope that it might still be viable.

Effective Practices and Professional Development Committee – Ioannis Konstantinidis

The announcement of the next webinar, set for June 4, has gone out. The committee will have more to report after the early morning committee meeting during the conference. The co-chair of the committee is Kari Whittenberger-Keith. She did a great job with the pre-conference workshops, and could be a potential candidate for future Board membership.

Peggy Sundermeyer asked whether the mentoring program was in good hands, but Konstantinidis replied that it is currently in no hands at all. Michael Spires and Anne Windham expressed an interest in working with the program. All of the current participants in the program were approached, but no one currently has the bandwidth to take on leadership of the program. This will be an issue that is discussed at the committee meeting. David Stone brought up the discussion, at the last Board meeting, of having the program be more informal, with a list of NORDP members willing to be a resource when one is needed and either having regular "office hours" or else providing contact information for interested parties to reach out. Konstantinidis noted that this is one of the options the committee will discuss for the program, but if someone is willing to step up and take a leadership role, he would prefer to see the program continue as it has been operating to date. Ann McGuigan proposed posting what would amount to a volunteer job ad for the position.

Executive Conference Committee for 2016 Location – Anne Windham

Next year's conference is pretty much set. We haven't yet signed the contract with the hotel, but the conference will be held in Orlando. NORDP Southeast conducted a poll of its roughly 200 members and identified five possible cities: Nashville, Atlanta, New Orleans, Miami, and Orlando. New Orleans and Nashville both have music festivals in May, and space would have been difficult to secure. Miami was too expensive, leaving the choice between Orlando and Atlanta. Full site visits were conducted in both cities, with volunteers from NORDP Southeast visiting four hotels in each city. Conference dates will be Sunday, May 22 through Wednesday, May 25, 2016. Anne Windham will continue on this committee as a member next year.

Nominating Committee – Michael Spires

We had 599 members eligible to vote when the member database was sent to Survey and Ballot Systems at the start of the ballot design process. The Committee had eight people apply for positions on the ballot. Two of those applicants were deemed not qualified on the basis of a lack of substantial involvement with NORDP. The full committee report on the nominating process has been posted to Basecamp. Voting opened April 21. There were 78 ballots cast that day. We have had fewer than a dozen votes cast since then. It is likely that we will see another spike in votes after the meeting, when members have had the chance to meet and hear from the candidates. Michael Spires will send out

weekly reminders to the listserv to vote. Voting closes at 5 p.m. Pacific time on Friday, May 22. When votes have been tallied, SBS will send Spires the report. Anne Windham and several other members of the Board commended the election site, noting how professional it looked and how easy it was to use. Spires noted that although we had paid the full-service price this year to set up the site and get it running, we can opt to pay a lower fee for a self-service website next year that will incorporate much the same look and feel.

Conference Chair – David Stone

David Stone noted that historically, the president-elect and the conference chair were the same person because it gave them the opportunity to really learn the organization and then assuming the leadership role. This worked really well in the past, but the tradition was broken when David had to step in as president-elect when the person elected to that role abruptly resigned from the Board. Stone suggested that Gretchen Kiser would be a good candidate for next year's conference chair: especially, as Rachel Dresbeck noted, since she has been on the conference committee for the past three years.

Anne Windham noted that the Executive Conference Committee has begun thinking about establishing a more comprehensive vision for the conferences going forward. This year, the committee worked proactively with NORDP Southeast, both to identify potential conference locations and also identifying a site manager who will be available to assist the conference committee with logistics and local support. We need to be planning further ahead, identifying the region for next year's conference and identifying a site manager there who can get involved with this year's conference planning so s/he will be better able to assist in running the conference in the following year.

Michael Spires proposed making the Executive Conference Committee a permanent part of the conference process. The consensus of the Board was that this is a good idea. Spires added that this is an instance where we've been operating on an ad hoc basis and that formalizing the arrangement would be beneficial so it becomes a matter of policy rather than preference. Peggy Sundermeyer also proposed expanding the scope of the committee's responsibilities beyond simply site selection to include a role in identifying and selecting the conference chairs as well. Rachel Dresbeck added that the standing Executive Conference Committee could also help identify topics and themes for the annual conference planning committee to consider in developing that year's program. The Board member's role on this conference would be to ensure that the conference is meeting the goals set by the Board, rather than the day-to-day management of the conference.

Gretchen Kiser expressed her willingness to take on the role of conference chair for next year's conference. She also noted that it's important over the next six months to codify what we want in terms of the Executive Conference Committee's role(s) to be. David Stone added, to general agreement, that the Executive Conference Committee's role next year should be to identify at least two sites: we should be planning meetings at least two years in advance. That was the intent for the committee this year, which is why discussions have been held with Michael Spires as the Board member from the Midwest/Mountain region about the 2017 meeting. Anne Windham and Ann McGuigan both expressed a willingness to continue serving on the Executive Conference Committee.

Institutional Memberships and Revenue Generation – Alicia Knoedler and David Stone

Alicia Knoedler provided feedback on discussions with the consultant about institutional memberships. She provided information about NORDP, what we do, and what its aspirations, membership, etc., are. The consultant's finding is that we are not yet in a position to discuss institutional memberships until we

have a better brand that we can take to people and institutions outside of our current membership. What we need is not so much a certain number, it's a value, or a thing that we can market. David Stone asked if this meant we needed to develop programming that we can offer as value-added to make institutional memberships more attractive, as opposed to a group of individual memberships. Knoedler agreed that this is one thing we can do, but we haven't yet brainstormed in a focused way about what the broader audience might be, and the NORDP session could be very helpful. A question remains, however, about what comes after that: is there a set of people who are really committed on making that part of the value statement, which translates into new programming, and that translates into brainstorming about what audience wants that new programming?

Knoedler noted that 75% of the conference attendees didn't want to volunteer to help with the conference. Stone noted that this is actually 15% better than NORDP overall, where we have 600 members and perhaps 60 people involved on all the committees. Knoedler argued that our "volunteer problem" could be indicative of a number of issues. We may have a number of members who don't feel they can yet make a contribution, because it's too early in their careers and they just don't know what to do. To address this, NORDP could do a better job of communicating why everyone has a role to play. But we also had a discussion at the Board retreat about developing a kind of career trajectory for people, so people could get involved with some of our programming and move forward on that path. We also want to encourage members to have discussions with the conference sponsors, even if they aren't in a position to buy (or recommend buying) their products or services, because those conversations help our sponsors identify what our needs are. Perhaps we should discuss this with the membership: if 75% of you don't feel you can volunteer to help with the conference, help us to identify ways that we can engage you in NORDP.

Peggy Sundermeyer noted that we have had a higher percentage of membership renewals this year than in previous years, which is a good sign. But Knoedler responded that at least back in November when she ran the data, we had more new members coming in from large research universities than from smaller institutions. During a lengthy discussion of potential price points and scenarios, it emerged that there are currently fewer than 10 institutions for whom institutional memberships in NORDP would make financial sense. David Stone noted, however, that across the industry, many other organizations have established institutional memberships and that these are profitable for those organizations. What remains for NORDP is to identify the value proposition(s) that institutional memberships in NORDP would provide, and to market them effectively to the right people at those institutions.

Additional Business

Selection of Board of Directors Officers

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) the election of Michael Spires as Secretary. The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

Peggy Sundermeyer will continue as Treasurer for next year. Historically, we have tried to stagger the terms of the Secretary and the Treasurer, as a means of providing continuity on the Board. She will be looking at the new Board members, once the election is complete, to identify candidates to succeed her. If none of them is interested, Ioannis Konstantinidis would consider stepping into the role, though his preference would be to continue as co-chair of the Effective Practices and Professional Development Committee.

There was some discussion of whether having Ioannis, as an independent consultant, in a position that includes a seat on the Board's Executive Committee, could present a political difficulty. Rachel Dresbeck noted, however, that the provision in the Bylaws excluding affiliate members of NORDP from serving on the Board was not intended to exclude all employees of consulting firms, and in fact we want to encourage representatives from the smaller firms to get involved in NORDP and on the Board. Rather, the concern was that having a representative from a large corporation (and potentially a major sponsor of NORDP) on the board could create the perception that the firm(s) thus represented had preferential access to the Board and the NORDP membership, when our goal is to provide all sponsors with appropriate access.

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (David Stone seconded) the election of Gretchen Kiser as president-elect. The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

Rachel Dresbeck moved (Peggy Sundermeyer seconded) to table further discussion of the conference chairs for next year's meeting until the May meeting of the Board. The motion carried unanimously.

Increasing the Number of Board Members from 14 to 15 – Peggy Sundermeyer

The number of Board members we have (12) inhibits much flexibility in terms of who takes on what roles. Every year we elect three new members, and two of them essentially have to be president-elect or treasurer, and the next year there needs to be a new secretary. This year we've announced that we will be electing three new members to the Board. But for next year, we should consider expanding Board membership to a larger number of people so we have some flexibility. This also helps when a Board member leaves before the end of his/her term, and suddenly there is one fewer Board member eligible to be considered for a leadership role. Ann McGuigan agreed, noting that the problem is we don't have a reserve of people who have been on the Board and can step up to take a leadership role after having had the opportunity to get to know the Board and how it operates.

Rachel Dresbeck asked if anyone had done research on the size of boards in relationship to the size of an organization's membership. Sundermeyer replied that we are a very small board for the size of our organization. David Stone noted that NORDP had a membership of 150 when the maximum size of the Board was set at 12 members: or 10% of the organization.

Michael Spires moved (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) to consider changing the Bylaws to allow a maximum of 15 members for the Board, rather than the current 14. Increasing the Board's membership to 15 allows us, either by staggering the terms of the new members (electing one to a one-year term, one to a two-year term, etc.) which would immediately give us an additional Board member in each class, or, taking a more gradual approach, to add one additional member with a full four-year term in each of the next election cycles until the Board reached 15 members. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that 15 members is a manageable size, and Rachel Dresbeck added that having an odd number of members is preferable for governing bodies as it minimizes the possibility for tie votes. Motion carried unanimously.

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (Anne Windham seconded) to extend Rachel Dresbeck's current three-year term by one year, to allow her to fulfill her role as immediate past president on the Board. Motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

Alicia Knoedler pointed out that when she, Peggy Sundermeyer, Jacob Levin, Marjorie Piechowski, and Rachel Dresbeck were elected to the Board, they were elected to three-year terms, whereas new Board members are elected for four-year terms. We have voted to extend Rachel's term by one year to allow

her to continue on the Board as immediate past president. However, we are still left with current Board members whose terms do not fit conveniently into the rotation cycle, and this is an issue that should be addressed in terms of rotation on the Board.

David Stone moved (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) to create a task force, consisting of Alicia Knoedler, Rachel Dresbeck (as current president-elect) and Gretchen Kiser (as the incoming president-elect), to consider how best to restructure the Board terms so that we can increase the size of the Board and maintain an orderly rotation of terms. The task force will present recommendations to the Board for its consideration at the May meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Emeritus Board Members – Rachel Dresbeck

In discussions with Peggy Sundermeyer over the past year, it has come to light that in a sense, we are victims of our own success: we keep adding members and tasks, but this leaves us with more work than we can currently do with the current Board structure. We have a great deal of work to do, and a great deal of expertise on the Board—but we don't do a good job of keeping Board members whose terms have ended involved with the Board, because we simply don't have enough bandwidth to take on that task alongside all of our other responsibilities. A large number of former Board members are not even attending this year's conference. Creating non-voting, *ex officio* emeritus positions would be one way of achieving both ends, and retaining the expertise, institutional memory, and good will of former members of the Board. Such a position would also be a way of keeping connections with former Board members who have moved out of research development as their primary institutional role. That individuals are no longer directly involved in research development doesn't mean that they have nothing to contribute to the field, and these individuals would be excellent resources as we move forward with NORD and the leadership development program. The emeriti could be brought in to work on projects of their own choosing, for as long as needed or for as long as they were willing to serve. Rachel Dresbeck moved to establish such a position. Michael Spires offered a friendly amendment to establish a task force to discuss the question and present a plan or plans for consideration at a future Board meeting. Gretchen Kiser seconded the amended motion, which carried unanimously. Rachel Dresbeck, Peggy Sundermeyer, Michael Spires, and Ioannis Konstantinidis agreed to serve on the task force to discuss ways (including the emeritus Board position) of retaining and engaging former Board members.

Increasing the President's Signature Authority to \$5,000 – Peggy Sundermeyer

The President currently has authority to approve purchases only up to \$1,000 for items not in the approved budget for the current year. Anything above that level (as, for example, the contract with Survey and Ballot Systems to provide services for the current Board of Directors election process) requires approval from the full Board, which introduces delays and other complications into the process. When the approval limit was originally set, NORDP's annual budget was on the order of \$60,000, and \$1,000 represented a fairly significant proportion of that amount. With revenues now approaching \$400,000 annually, even \$5,000 represents a much smaller percentage of the organization's finances. Rachel Dresbeck and Anne Windham suggested that, in addition to raising the signature authority, some limit should be placed on the number of times in a year that it could be exercised, as a safeguard against unilateral action by the President. David Stone disagreed, noting that it was unlikely that a President would act in that way, and Peggy Sundermeyer added that one of the Treasurer's responsibilities is to ensure that such behavior, if it occurs, is brought to the attention of the Board for discussion and/or possible action. David Stone moved (Peggy Sundermeyer seconded) to consider amending the Bylaws to increase the President's signature authority to \$5,000 per transaction. Motion carried unanimously.

Establishing a Standing Executive Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer

There is typically a standing committee on most boards of directors which is usually comprised of all the board officers, and which is empowered to set the agenda for the full board and to carry on the business of the organization as needed in the interim between regular board meetings. The NORDP Bylaws identify all the officers of the Board, but do not constitute them as a committee in this way. The officers have been meeting regularly for the last 18 months, and at least intermittently for the 18 months before that, acting as an informal advisory group and setting agendas for meetings of the full Board. Ann McGuigan noted that during her year as president, she worked with the Board officers in this way, but that the practice was not continued by her successor. David Stone asked whether establishing this committee would require an amendment to the Bylaws. Peggy Sundermeyer responded that the Bylaws give the Board the authority to establish new committees, with or without corporate authority, as the Board sees fit. Rachel Dresbeck added that moving from an informal, ad-hoc group to a formal standing committee is a natural evolution of the way the Board operates after seven years of NORDP's existence. Michael Spires moved (Peggy Sundermeyer seconded) that the Board establish a standing Executive Committee, to be composed of all officers of the Board (the President, the President-Elect, the Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Immediate Past President), with corporate authority. Motion carried unanimously.

Gretchen Kiser posed the hypothetical that a Board member could see such a committee as a clique of insiders, running things behind the scenes. Peggy Sundermeyer replied that the committee would be expected to provide minutes of its meetings to the full Board at their regular meetings, because the full Board needs to know what the committee is doing and thinking. The informal committee has not done this, because it lacked any formal standing. Michael Spires added that if the Executive Committee acted in a way that the full Board disagreed with, the Board has the authority to overrule the committee.

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) that the Executive Committee be tasked to set the agenda for Board meetings, to recommend action items, and to report its actions to the full Board. Motion carried unanimously.

Participation of Board of Directors Members on Committees – Peggy Sundermeyer

Over the past seven years, a number of good and effective practices have arisen in the course of doing business or been implemented on an informal or an ad-hoc basis, without being codified in policy. One such practice is having a member of the Board on important committees (such as Membership Services). This need not be written into the Bylaws, but should at least be adopted as a policy of the Board. David Stone moved (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) that all committees recognized by the Board of Directors must have a member of the Board as either the chair or co-chair. Motion carried unanimously.

Establishing a Communications Position on the Board – Rachel Dresbeck

Trying to handle communications for NORDP through a committee has not proven effective. Michael Spires added that, in the spirit of openness and transparency, the Communications Committee attempted to include at least one representative from every committee and working group—which made it very difficult to schedule meetings or to respond in a timely fashion to developing events. Rachel Dresbeck noted that the very nature of the communications arena is that there is always something happening or needing to be done, which requires a great deal of work to do professionally. Ideally, this would be a position at some point where NORDP would seek to hire a professional to take over the responsibilities from volunteers who all have their own jobs and responsibilities.

Peggy Sundermeyer added that another problem was the lack of a dedicated budget line for communications expenses. Things need to be purchased (web hosting, design or production assistants, printing services, and the like). Rachel Dresbeck added that the Board should discuss at a future meeting how we best can utilize the services of Matt Dunn. The communications function should have a dedicated budget, perhaps up to \$10,000, which could include personnel costs to hire consultants or part-time staff when needed.

Rachel Dresbeck moved (Gretchen Kiser seconded) to appoint a Board member to be in charge of communications. Motion carried unanimously.

Establishing a Designated Personnel Development Position on the Board – Peggy Sundermeyer

Part of NORDP has always been professional development. Board members bring different levels of prior board experience to the NORDP Board. It's an opportunity, but also a responsibility of the Board, to provide both new and current members with additional professional development opportunities so they can continue to grow as professionals and add effective board responsibilities to their resumes. The Board should therefore designate a member to be responsible for personnel development. This person would handle things such as Board member transitions, joining of Board Source as a resource for Board development, mentoring of new Board members, and similar responsibilities. Rachel Dresbeck added that NORDP is an all-volunteer organization. In order for us to recruit members, we need to provide them with something that brings them value in return for their participation; further, having an active plan for Board development dovetails nicely with the plans discussed at the Board's 2014 retreat for the leadership development program in NORDP. Dresbeck suggested that perhaps the past president would be appropriate. Michael Spires suggested that this could also be a good role for one of the emeritus Board members, if they are interested. This item will be discussed in greater detail at a future Board meeting.

Spires added that the Board should also discuss some mechanism, even absent a designated personnel development person on the Board, for welcoming the incoming Board members and helping them integrate themselves into the Board and its functions. Rachel Dresbeck agreed that we want to do something, but probably not personal mentoring. Peggy Sundermeyer suggested making orientation for new Board members as an agenda item for the May Board meeting.

Establishing a Standing Revenue/Finance Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer

Typically, most boards of directors have a standing committee dedicated to the question of revenues and/or finances, with the twin goals of advising on budget questions (both the overall operational budget and also budgets for large projects such as the annual meeting) and also seeking new revenue streams and enhancing existing ones. Establishing such a committee would again help to streamline the Board's operations by taking a leadership role in these complex questions, and providing recommendations for, and advice about, Board actions.

Gretchen Kiser felt that there should be two separate committees, one for revenues and one for finances. Peggy Sundermeyer agreed, but noted that at present we have neither. Once we have identified additional revenue streams and have funds coming in from them, we can always split the committee into a revenue part and a finance or budget part, but for now the important thing is to get a committee in place to help the Treasurer with this function. Rachel Dresbeck added that there could also be a third part of the committee, or possibly one person on the committee, tasked with handling sponsor relations. Sundermeyer suggested that possibly the Membership Services chair or co-chair

should also be on the committee, given that membership dues are currently our largest source of revenue.

David Stone moved (Peggy Sundermeyer seconded) to establish a standing Revenue/Finance Committee, to be comprised of the Immediate Past President, the Treasurer, and at least one other Board member. Motion carried unanimously.

Board of Directors Retreat – Rachel Dresbeck

Rachel Dresbeck and Peggy Sundermeyer have had several discussions about the Board retreat. In order to help with sustainability and continuity on the Board, it would be a good idea to engage Board Source to do an assessment (which is included as part of our membership dues), which Board Source describes as laying “a foundation for setting board development priorities and motivating board members, individually and collectively, to strengthen the board’s governance performance and practices.” Board Source would send a survey to the members which we would complete, and then Board Source would send a facilitator to help us understand the results. Through Alicia’s leadership we’ve done some of this before, but engaging Board Source would take it to the next level. Dresbeck suggested that the survey should be sent, not just to current Board members, but also to the incoming members and past members, to give as wide a perspective as possible. David Stone countered by saying that we should ask Board Source how to do that in such a way that the past members are talking about the current Board, but have some relevant information that could be helpful. The plan would be that when the Board has its retreat, Board Source would send a facilitator (or the facilitator could participate through Skype or videoconferencing) and we all work through the survey and analysis of the results in order to set priorities and identify next steps.

Sundermeyer added that with the move to membership election for the Board with the results not being known until the end of May, we’ve lost the ability we’ve had in previous years, when new members were known at the time of the annual meeting (several months before their terms of office began), to help new members acclimate to the Board. But by moving the Board retreat earlier in the year (perhaps July, or perhaps the latter half of August) and including both new and outgoing Board members in addition to the current Board, we will have an opportunity to facilitate that process in a somewhat more concentrated way. Dresbeck noted that the retreat has typically involved a day and a half of working sessions, and that we should consider making it two full days even though this increases difficulties with travel and work schedules, because we’re facing a liminal point where we need to make critical decisions about the future of the organization. Michael Spires concurred, noting that if we’re bringing in Board Source facilitation, that adds another task which will automatically require more time.

Gretchen Kiser suggested that we might also, in future, consider leveraging the annual conference as an opportunity for the Board to have time for longer in-person working meetings by coming in for a full day in advance of the meeting (or staying afterward). David Stone pointed out that tying that meeting to the conference meant it would only involve the current Board (including some members whose terms are ending), when we would also want to include incoming Board members who would not be known at the time of the conference.

Dresbeck suggested that the Board take up a discussion of the timing of the retreat as an agenda item for a future meeting. Sundermeyer concurred, but also suggested a separate discussion of the time for the Board’s regular meetings. Having the Board meet at the end of the month creates extra work for the Treasurer, which could be alleviated if the meeting time were changed. Stone pointed out that we need to include the incoming Board members in any discussions about scheduling the meetings.

Dresbeck noted that we have a number of important items to discuss at the Board retreat, including NORD and LDRD. Anne Windham added that the discussions about the Board's meeting times, the Board retreat, NORDP's fiscal year, and onboarding new Board members all play together, and that we should try to arrive at a solution that makes the most sense for all of the various pieces.

Final Discussions – David Stone

As Gretchen just pointed out, this is one of the two times a year that we as a Board meet in person to discuss NORDP. We've just spent three hours working through an agenda that's been building up for 11 months. So let's take the opportunity to think for a few minutes about other issues that we should consider or discuss.

Rachel Dresbeck suggested, even though it would mean adding costs to the budget, considering one more in-person meeting each year. David Stone noted that this idea had been floated in the past, and scheduling didn't allow for it to take place. Peggy Sundermeyer added that the budget would be able to accommodate another meeting. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting.

Anne Windham pointed out that we will need to sell the idea of NORD, because at the moment there are very few people outside the Board who've even heard about it. Sundermeyer reminded her that the Northeast and Southeast regions have already discussed the idea, and at least one other NORDP region has asked about it, so the concept is getting out to a broader audience already. Stone added that analytics have shown that more than 300 people have read both of the "Dispatches from 20 N. Wacker" in which he first floated the idea.

Windham also noted that there were a number of associate vice presidents and a couple of vice presidents in attendance at this year's conference. This new level of involvement (and her own new position in the Dean of the Faculty's office) suggests the possibility of new connections between NORDP and other areas of the university. This is something the Board may want to consider as a future initiative for helping to differentiate NORDP from NCURA and SRA.

Michael Spires mentioned an idea that had come up in conversation as he and his co-presenters were brainstorming their presentation for this year's conference, a thought piece around what kind of a person gets into research development, what kinds of skills do they bring to the table that predispose them to want to become involved, or what skills do they need to be taught or otherwise acquire in order to be effective? If we want to describe what we do as a profession, this is the kind of information we need to have. Stone added that there are actually two papers to be written around that thought: a theoretical one and an empirical one: who's doing it now because they fell into it, and what skills do we think, when you look at them, would make a really good development person. Gretchen Kiser noted that the metrics committee has been looking for other topics on which to survey the membership, and Spires said that he had mentioned that in the discussion.

Peggy Sundermeyer noted that the Board has been banking revenue carryovers as a way of building toward being able to hire an executive director, but that some of those reserve funds could also be used to provide NORDP members with ideas with small honoraria or seed funds to carry out projects related to NORDP's mission and goals, or with the potential to be of benefit to the profession. Stone felt that this activity would be a better fit with NORD, and expressed a reluctance to expend too much of the reserve funding on these projects because it would potentially make it harder to hire an executive director. But small projects would not make that much of a difference, and would provide opportunities for professional development for NORDP members, and also help to position them to seek larger grants

to carry on the work from outside funding sources. He suggested that giving members a small amount of money, perhaps \$500, would help guarantee that the work got done because there would now be an expectation of a deliverable. Further, if the work were eventually published, those on the team could also perhaps be given a free registration to the annual meeting in return for putting the work in circulation. Stone further noted that one part of NORD was to get people who are not NORDP members interested in NORDP and its members, who can then work with NORD and NORDP to study the organization and its membership in ways that are beneficial to all concerned.

Anne Windham noted that NORDP Northeast will be meeting at Brown University on Monday, July 27, and that it would be nice to have some Board involvement with the meeting. Rachel Dresbeck will try to attend the meeting, either virtually or in person.

Peggy Sundermeyer noted that the NORDP regional meetings are currently breaking even: they charge the members what it will cost. Anne Windham responded that, while doing so was probably not going to add significantly to the NORDP revenues, the regional meetings could charge a little more than break-even costs as a way of providing for programming, or providing a transportation subsidy for a speaker or a Board member in attendance. NORDP Northeast will be something of a model for the other regions, although because of their size, what they do may not necessarily translate to other regions. Windham added that regional meetings face a delicate balancing act between needing to have an agenda that's sufficiently robust to attract people to come, but without taking away from the national meeting. Sundermeyer pointed out that the other regions, apart from Atlantic and Great Lakes, face a geographical challenge with holding meetings because they cover so much territory. Michael Spires countered that we could follow the practice that SRA has adopted recently, of having joint meetings of two or more regions, so there would be enough members with an interest in attending to make it feasible, and rearranging the pairings every year or two so that the meetings move around and it isn't always the same people in attendance. Sundermeyer noted that these can also be used as opportunities to recruit new members, and Spires added that they can also serve as a developmental opportunity for people to try out ideas and presentations on a smaller audience that they can then revise from feedback they receive at the regional meeting before presenting them at the national meeting. Windham suggested that a blended meeting model could also be tried, where there were some presenters (or attendees) present in person, while others participated through videoconferencing.

There being no further business, Rachel Dresbeck moved to adjourn (Anne Windham seconded) at 10:34 p.m. Eastern. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Board Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 26, 2015, from 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central Time (2:30-4pm Eastern, 11:30am- 1pm Pacific and 12:30-2pm Mountain)
Approved by the Board of Directors at its meeting May 26, 2015.