

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

May 26, 2015

President David Stone called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:36 pm Central on Tuesday, May 26, 2015.

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

Approval of Draft April 28 Board Meeting Minutes – David Stone

Ioannis Konstantinidis requested that the minutes be amended to refer to him, in the discussion of the selection of Board of Directors officers on page 4 of the draft, as co-chair of the Effective Practices and Professional Development Committee. Rachel Dresbeck moved (seconded by Peggy Sundermeyer) to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Committee Reports:

Executive Conference Committee – Anne Windham. The contract has been signed with the Hyatt Grand Regency Cypress in Orlando for next year’s annual meeting. The meeting will take place May 22-25, 2016. Ann McGuigan suggested that we get a “save the date” announcement on the NORDP website as soon as possible, so people can begin to plan their travel for next year. Anne Windham will contact Matt Dunn to get an announcement posted. Michael Spires asked who is on the ECC; Windham replied that she, Peggy Sundermeyer, Rachel Dresbeck, and Ann McGuigan were members this year.

After a question from David Stone, Rachel Dresbeck brought up the discussion at the last meeting of the Executive Committee related to the need to select conference chairs expeditiously. Dresbeck noted that this can be problematic when we don’t know who on the Board would be interested in serving. Having a site manager as a conference co-chair would be helpful, but the Executive Committee wanted to have a broader conversation around the conference. Michael Spires referred to the minutes of that Executive Committee meeting and noted that Peggy Sundermeyer had said that the Executive Conference Committee had already been having discussions about expanding its role beyond site selection, including helping with the recruitment of conference chairs. Stone asked Windham if she had any thoughts on the matter. Windham replied that, as noted, the committee had already been discussing the change. She plans to propose a set of responsibilities to the committee before July 1 for them to consider. Once the committee has discussed the document, it will report back to the Board. The ECC’s plan was to plan at least two years out, to identify potential conference chairs and site managers. As the regional groups develop, these can be helpful in identifying site managers.

Stone added that the Executive Committee had discussed the value of having the sitting vice president/president-elect serve as one of the conference co-chairs (not the chair), along with a non-Board member if possible. The conference co-chairs could divide the responsibilities between them as they see fit, and then get assistance from a site manager drawn from the region hosting that year. One of the roles of the Executive Conference Committee would therefore be to help identify potential candidates to serve as the non-Board conference co-chair and also the site manager. Windham will incorporate those responsibilities into her draft document and present it to the ECC.

Membership Services – Ann McGuigan. The committee has not yet met since the last Board meeting, but will meet next week. Peggy Sundermeyer has provided new member information to the regional representatives who will be reaching out to welcome them. David Stone asked where we are on the results of the survey, and McGuigan replied that she believes the subcommittee is only lacking her data before it can begin to compose its final report on the survey.

Enhancing Collaborations – Michael Spires. At the annual meeting, a group led by Karen Eck and Quyen Wickham reported that they have been working on a collaboration tool (which they featured in a conference presentation). The group has been working independently, and Spires was unaware of its existence. The sense of the meeting at the conference was that this committee should not be dissolved; the working group has an agenda for moving forward. Spires indicated that he plans to step off as the committee chair. Ioannis Konstantinidis was at the conference presentation on the collaboration tool, and either he or someone else from EPPD will be participating in the next meeting of the working group, as EPPD is interested in knowing what they're doing and keep in the loop as it ties into professional development. Peggy Sundermeyer asked if the tool is up and running and, if so, has it been announced to the membership? Konstantinidis replied that no, the tool is not yet ready for public dissemination.

Effective Practices and Professional Development Committee – Ioannis Konstantinidis

The pre-conference workshops were all successful. Kari Whittenberger-Keith is working on a full report, but the initial indications are good and we seem to have done better than last year. Even at 7:30 a.m., there were 13 people at the EPPD meeting at the conference, seven of whom were new. A couple of people have offered to help jump-start the mentoring program. The committee is hopeful that we will be able to reopen the mentoring program soon. A written report is not yet posted to Basecamp, but it will be up by the end of the week.

Konstantinidis had two really good discussions with Olaf Svenningsen, the chair of the board of DARMA, the Danish Association of Research Managers and Administrators. Svenningsen is also on the board of the European counterpart, EARMA. David Stone said that he and Svenningsen had also had conversations about closer cooperation between NORDP and DARMA/EARMA. Svenningsen's discussions with Konstantinidis revolved mainly around our professional development program: the certificate program, webinars, things that are specific to research development, available resources, and the possibility of sharing resources and coming up with additional collaborations around professional development. There will be ongoing conversations with Svenningsen. Stone asked for Svenningsen's contact information, and Rachel Dresbeck would like to be involved in those conversations as well.

External Engagement – Jacob Levin. Jeff Anderson formally resigned from the committee, since he is no longer involved in research development at least on a regular basis. He continues to be enthusiastic about the liaison program, but no longer has the time available to devote to the committee. With Casandra Rauser, the other co-chair of the committee, Levin is discussing ways to retool the committee to keep it moving forward. He asked Cassie if she would be willing to serve as chair with a couple of other co-chairs. The committee would also like to bring a newer member on board, and work to encourage NORDP members that serving on a NORDP committee is a good way of advancing one's career. The committee would welcome suggestions on how best to do this. Levin would also like to encourage another Board member to consider serving as a co-chair of the committee now that Anderson has left. Rachel Dresbeck agreed, and suggested this might be a good opportunity for one of the new Board members to consider. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that we have more needs than we have new Board members. Levin added that the best person would be someone who is already interested in

the work that the committee is doing. Sundermeyer asked whether the committee had its meeting at the conference. Jacob was not able to participate, but he believed that the meeting did take place. He has not yet gotten a report. Sundermeyer suggested that those in attendance at the conference meeting would be a good place to start recruiting new members for the committee.

Revenue/Finance Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer

The committee has not yet met. The committee members are the immediate past president, the treasurer, and one other Board member. Rachel Dresbeck has volunteered to serve for now. This is the minimum number of members; if others are interested in serving, then Sundermeyer, as treasurer, would serve as the convener and not a voting member. The plan is to concentrate on revenues and sponsorships for now, getting sponsorships better aligned, and continuing the move over the last couple of years to see sponsorships as not necessarily tied specifically to the conference but more as general support for the organization. Jacob Levin asked how often sponsors had exercised the option we provided them (at certain levels of sponsorship) to use the listserv for marketing and other announcements. There wasn't an official count made, but the consensus of opinion was that it didn't happen often, perhaps only twice. Sundermeyer added that the sponsors this year seemed more interested in getting email addresses for people who attended the conference, rather than placing ads on the listserv.

Sundermeyer has posted a preliminary report on the conference finances to Basecamp. The Board had agreed to provide \$30,000 from sponsorship revenues to the conference committee. We've collected \$45,500 in sponsorships. With the \$30,000 assigned to the conference committee, their total revenues would be \$233,453, and their expenses, with a few still outstanding and not yet final, amount to \$213,245. David Stone remarked that the conference came out \$20,000 ahead; Sundermeyer agreed, but noted that they would be \$10,000 underfunded without the sponsorship contribution. Sundermeyer noted that we did about \$7,000 better in terms of net revenues than last year.

Sundermeyer added that there had been some resistance from this year's conference committee to cover the costs of the president's reception as part of the conference budget. Sundermeyer noted that the president's reception really is a part of the conference. The reception this year cost \$2,500, which was more expensive than it was in Portland in 2014 for several reasons. First, we invited more people to attend this year (and more chose to do so). Also, Washington DC is a more expensive location, and that was reflected in the prices quoted for food and beverages. Further, for the Portland reception in 2014, Rachel Dresbeck's husband made generous contributions of his time and expertise to provide refreshments. The cost of the reception last year was charged to the Board of Directors line item, which presents a distorted picture of the Board's expenses. Sundermeyer recommends that going forward the president's reception should be considered a conference expense and charged as such, and notes that if we had done so this year the conference would still be in the black with the sponsorship contribution.

Nominating Committee – Michael Spires

Spires received the certified results of the election from Survey and Ballot Systems this morning. Final participation was just slightly over 31% of the membership; we had 186 votes cast out of 599 that were eligible. The three winners, who received the most votes, were Jeff Agnoli, Terri Soelberg for the designated seat, and Karen Eck. Voters had the option to complete a survey on the experience after voting, and most of those who voted did so, giving us a good representative sample of those voting. Of the respondents, slightly more than 92% said that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the election process; there were only five members who said that they were either dissatisfied or very

dissatisfied. The members seemed to like the way the process worked, though there were a couple of suggestions for improvement. Spires has posted the full electronic report to Basecamp.

David Stone noted that there was one substantive comment from those who were dissatisfied with the process, that we shouldn't force members to cast votes for all open seats. Spires replied that the Board had previously decided to force votes for all three; Stone demurred, saying that now that we've had a chance to see how the process works, that may no longer be necessary. The Nominating Committee should take a look at all the comments received and consider them going forward. Stone also noted that Survey and Ballot Systems earned their money this year: they did a great job, the system worked really well, and having more than 30% of the membership voting in our first year of membership elections is astounding.

Spires noted that, as discussed at the Executive Committee meeting earlier, it may be advisable to consider shortening the voting period next year. We had voting open for a full month; there was a large spike (78 votes) on the day voting opened. There was a smaller spike just after the conference, when people had the opportunity to go to the candidate forum and hear what each of them said, and then the first reminder to vote went out. Each reminder thereafter resulted in diminishing returns, so perhaps we don't need to leave the window open quite so long. Spires recommended taking the suggestion made by Stone (and also in the comments on the election process), to videotape the candidates' presentations at the forum during the conference, so those who are not able to attend the conference itself can still see those presentations and weigh them as they consider whom to vote for. Spires asked that others on the Board who had suggestions about things that went wrong or opportunities for improvement to share them with him and he will then pass those along to the Nominating Committee for discussion.

Jacob Levin asked if we had pressured members to vote, given notice that the election was closing, etc. Spires replied that he had sent notices to the listserv once a week after the conference ended, and then seven days, five days, and two days before the end of voting. Levin also asked whether we wanted to do anything with the information that the candidate in sixth place was only 8.1% (or 15 votes) behind the candidate in second place. Rachel Dresbeck suggested encouraging the candidates who did not win this year to run again next year, since the results were so close, and they would already have increased recognition among the members from their participation in this year's election. The consensus of the Board was that this would be a good idea.

Stone asked Spires to prepare a draft announcement of the election results and send it to the Board for review before releasing it to the listserv. Ann McGuigan asked whether we were going to send notices to those who did not win before announcing the results to the listserv. Dresbeck and Stone will work on a draft announcement to the candidates, which Dresbeck will send. Sundermeyer added that the announcement to the listserv should also have information about how close the election was this year, and the importance of voting. She also suggested that in future, the voting period for elections should take into consideration when the Board meets, since it was helpful to have results available to the Board so soon after the close of voting, especially since the conference next year will be later in the year.

Task Force on Restructuring Board of Directors Terms – Rachel Dresbeck

The task force has not yet met.

Task Force on Emeritus Board Members – Peggy Sundermeyer

The task force has not yet met.

Additional Business

Conference Chair Discussion – David Stone

No further discussion beyond what was previously discussed under the heading of the Executive Conference Committee.

Elections Post-Mortem – Michael Spires

No further discussion beyond what was previously discussed under the heading of the Nominating Committee.

Role of Sponsors in Assisting NORDP – David Stone

Stone noted that this issue has come up several times, and was also discussed at the last meeting of the Executive Committee. There is interest, both among NORDP members and sponsors, to have sponsors play additional roles with NORDP beyond simply providing funding for the conference, running webinars, or getting access to our membership lists. An example that Stone provided at the Executive Committee meeting was the buzz after the conference about NORDP, and Stone had promised at the conference to create some kind of filesharing/meeting platform for NORDP because it will be a very large entity and needs some way of organizing itself and keeping the organization running. There is at least one NORDP sponsor, and possibly more than one, who provide this kind of software. Rather than purchasing it, or purchasing it from a competitor (such as Basecamp), could we structure rules under which sponsors or companies could sponsor NORDP by providing this kind of in-kind support to what we do. If so, how would we want to structure those rules, or what would we need to vet with sponsors in advance while establishing rules?

Rachel Dresbeck added that part of the problems last year had to do with the roles of sponsors, or large commercial entities, on the Board. The question we have to confront is how to engage our sponsors in non-financial development activities without there being a conflict of interest, or without there being a perception of favoritism? Stone replied that the problem was more the latter than the former: there is a consonance of interests, but that could lead to a perception of favoritism. We need to structure our discussions and relationships to avoid that perception. Ann McGuigan noted that it isn't unusual for companies to offer these kinds of relationships as part of a sponsorship agreement, so could we not make it a more transparent process by offering opportunities to bid? Stone would be agreeable to the idea of putting out requests for bid to known sponsors or other interested entities for services that NORDP needs. The Board would then select a successful bid based on announced criteria. This gives everyone an opportunity to participate, and we choose the one that fits best with our needs, without giving rise to any suspicion of favoritism.

Peggy Sundermeyer suggested making the process more open-ended, so we could benefit from things that sponsors have available that could benefit us, but which we aren't aware of. The current sponsorship process involves a sponsor selecting, from a menu of options at different sponsorship levels, of benefits they would like to receive, in return for which they provide us with a defined amount of money. We could open up the process so that sponsors could provide things besides a cash contribution such as use of their tools, or some other benefit that they can provide, in return for sponsorship. We could also provide sponsors with a list of things that NORDP is interested in. Stone replied that if we were only ever involved in sole-source processes, that idea would work well. However, where we have more than one sponsor who could provide a given service or tool, we would want a

process more like the one Ann McGuigan outlined earlier. Sundermeyer agreed, but suggested that we could make a two-tiered process where we would only need to seek out formal bids if two or more entities expressed an interest in providing the service or commodity. Jacob Levin asked whether “we” in this discussion meant the NORDP Board or the membership as a whole? Stone replied that he had been referring to services to the Board, on which the Board would decide. However, Levin raises another possibility for sponsorship arrangements, whereby the benefit could be provided to the NORDP membership and not just to the Board (e.g., a discount for NORDP members who wanted to sign up for Basecamp).

Levin also expressed a concern that we might potentially undermine our ability to attract monetary sponsorships if sponsors can opt to provide in-kind support which is usually less expensive for them, and in some cases (like providing software for use), effectively free. Stone agreed that there was a need for caution, and suggested that we could structure the process in such a way that the ability to provide in-kind support would only be available to sponsors who had already provided some level of monetary support to NORDP.

Ioannis Konstantinidis asked what the sponsors would be getting in return for their support. Would a company be able to advertise itself, as with the Olympics, as an “Official Sponsor of NORDP,” for example, in return for a certain level of support, or would we be offering them exclusivity whereby if we accept their sponsorship, we’d have to use their tool? Stone replied that the benefit to the company that provides the platform for NORDP, say, is that many NORDP members will then have interaction and experience with that platform and know about the company, which is of value to the company. The concern would be that we might lose a sponsor in a situation where we had two or more competing sponsors offering similar platforms, but didn’t have a clearly delineated bid and decision process for deciding which one to use. Even with the process, we run the risk of losing sponsorship from the unsuccessful bidder, but in theory at least everyone should be happy with the outcome of a transparent process that was defined and explained to all interested parties ahead of time. Konstantinidis asked whether the sponsor’s ability to publicize their sponsorship of NORDP would be negotiated separately. Stone replied that sponsors’ ability to advertise to the NORDP membership is already fairly limited: they receive a couple of opportunities to post to the listserv each year. If a sponsor wanted to use one of those opportunities for accessing the listserv to promote its sponsorship of NORDP, that would be OK.

Stone proposed asking the Revenue/Finance committee to develop a process and some procedures for expanding sponsorship in this way. As part of the process, we should consider canvassing some or all of our existing sponsors about our interest in expanding the nature of the sponsor relationship, and try to get a sense for how they might respond in a situation where their company was not the one selected for a given project or product. The consensus of the Board was that it was appropriate for the committee to do so.

Personnel Development for Board of Directors – Rachel Dresbeck

Dresbeck said that she and Peggy Sundermeyer have been discussing the question of personnel development for the Board for some time. Sundermeyer added that, as Jacob Levin had mentioned in his committee report, people should see serving on the Board as a way of advancing in their careers— but if we want to foster that expectation, the Board needs to provide development opportunities for new Board members. BoardSource, with whom we already have an affiliation, is one of the firms that provides such services. We would like to take advantage of one of their services that is included in our membership fee, a survey of the Board across a number of different development dimensions. Normally the survey is only given to current members, but since the NORDP Board is a small one, we have already

asked them if they would be willing to expand the survey to past Board members, and also non-Board members who are committee chairs for NORDP, so we can tap into their experiences and expertise, and BoardSource has agreed to do so. For a small fee, still to be determined, BoardSource would help us understand the feedback they provide in their report after the survey is completed, which would be something that would be particularly helpful at the next Board retreat.

Sundermeyer added that we have traditionally asked serving Board members to act as mentors to the incoming Board members, and suggested that we continue this practice for the coming year. Sundermeyer hopes that one of the incoming members will agree to become the treasurer-elect, and that if so, she would mentor that member. She has asked Jeff Agnoli if he would consider stepping into that role, which she feels would be a good fit with his experience. David Stone suggested allowing Jacob Levin to approach one of the other two new members about stepping into a role on the External Engagement Committee. Spires noted that Karen Eck may be stepping into his role as chair of Enhancing Collaboration, which leaves only one new Board member uncommitted, and we still need someone to be the communications person. Stone suggested that Sundermeyer sound out Jeff Agnoli about serving as treasurer-elect, and then we can have a discussion at the July Board meeting with the new members about who might wish to step into these other important roles.

Dresbeck added that it would be helpful, before having that discussion at the July meeting with the new Board members, if we had a sense of just what roles needed to be filled. Board members can write Dresbeck with their needs, and she will develop a list. Michael Spires noted that there had been discussion at both the April Board meeting and in the Executive Committee meeting this month about scheduling the next Board retreat quickly, and asked whether we wanted to reach out to the new Board members before July and let them know we'd like to know their availability for a two or two-and-a-half day retreat in late summer or early fall? The consensus of the Board was that we should do so.

NORDP Fiscal Year – Peggy Sundermeyer

The current fiscal year, September 1 to August 30, is awkward. The rationale for choosing it was that our Articles of Incorporation were drawn up in September. However, our largest budget item each year is the annual conference, but when we don't have a conference chair identified in June, it's difficult to get an approved conference budget completed by August so it can be included in the overall NORDP line item budget approved for September 1. Sundermeyer suggests pushing the start of the fiscal year back a month from September 1 to October 1, which would require a bylaw change and also we would have to submit an extra Form 990 for the one month. The extra 990 would not require much work.

Sundermeyer added that the bylaw changes approved for discussion at the April meeting have been posted to the Bylaws Circle on the NORDP website. So far, there has only been one comment and one response to those proposed changes, regarding the erroneous statement in the announcement that the changes had been approved rather than approved for discussion. No other discussion has occurred. Michael Spires will include those proposed changes, along with the adjustment of the fiscal year and some others discussed in the Executive Committee meeting this month, in a draft he will send to the corporation's lawyers for their review.

Spires added that the discussion at the Executive Committee meeting had identified a number of potential changes to the bylaws, largely having to do with how we handle elections after moving to a membership vote model. He needs to have a discussion with the lawyers about several of these potential changes, to see whether what we want to do would put us in conflict with applicable law, or would wind up creating work for us where it is not needed. Consequently, the Executive Committee isn't

yet ready to present a full slate of proposed changes to the Board for its consideration, but will keep the Board posted as developments occur.

Additional In-Person Board of Directors Meeting – David Stone

The problem, as discussed in the Executive Committee meeting, is that it may be too expensive or too much of a time burden for the full Board to come together for another in-person meeting each year. However, we could allow for the possibility of having the Revenue/Finance Committee meet at mid-year. The Executive Committee also discussed lengthier or more substantive meetings of the Board at the time of the annual conference, but Stone noted the problem is that we tend to lose momentum mid-year, and need to counteract that, but currently don't have a strong in-person mechanism for doing so. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that perhaps the Executive Committee might also need an in-person meeting, or other smaller committees of the Board. If these are small meetings held in a member's office or on their campus, it would be less expensive than arranging a meeting of the full Board in hotel space. Jacob Levin suggested making the location a factor as well, especially for members of the group with time constraints. Hosting a short, one-day NORDP meeting on a campus could be an incentive for participation; Levin would be willing to host such a meeting at UC-Irvine if needed. Sundermeyer will introduce a line item in the operating budget for in-person meetings as needed, rather than designating it simply for the Board retreat, which gives us greater flexibility.

Rachel Dresbeck brought up two additional items of business. She has asked the secretary to update the committees list to include Board responsibilities that aren't tied to a particular committee (such as the communications function), and would like Board members to advise whether there are any other such functions that need to be accounted for.

Additionally, the Southeast Region has asked us for a website. Dresbeck initially agreed, but when the group contacted Matt Dunn to begin setting it up, they are asking for a website separate from the NORDP site, and with functionalities that are well beyond what Memberclicks can provide (such as providing dynamic content based on the IP address when someone logs in). Peggy Sundermeyer noted that some of what the region is asking for can be accommodated in other ways (such as a PDF brochure rather than the dynamic programming that they've asked for). Ann McGuigan added that from a philosophical standpoint, it's not a good idea to provide content to some members that isn't available to all members. Of course, members in the Southeast Region want to highlight their local organization, but that content should be available to all NORDP members, whether they're looking for information about someone or some organization in the Southeast Region, or looking for examples that they can use to build their own regional site. Having that content be available only to members of the region sets a bad precedent. Ioannis Konstantinidis added that, before we discuss the means to do what the region wants to do, the regional leadership should provide the Board with information about the goals they're hoping to accomplish with this information, so we can best decide what means are appropriate to achieve them. Stone added that we should invite representatives from other regions to the meeting with Southeast, so we only need to have the discussion once, and so that everybody knows what's available and what the process will be. Dresbeck will follow up with Karin Scarpinato from the Southeast Region on the question, and will copy McGuigan on the discussion.

Peggy Sundermeyer brought up the need for the Board, over the coming year, to evaluate all of our existing systems and determine whether we're comfortable continuing to use them or else identifying other possibilities to replace the existing systems (e.g., our payment system through PayPal, the teleconference provider, etc.). She recommended establishing a task force for this purpose. Ioannis Konstantinidis volunteered to serve. Sundermeyer added that we should consider inviting some non-

Board members for the task force, so we would have a user perspective as well. Also a new Board member.

There being no further business, Peggy Sundermeyer moved to adjourn (Michael Spires seconded) at 2:57 p.m. Central. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Board Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 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 June 23, 2015.