

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

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

President Rachel Dresbeck called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:32 pm Central on Tuesday, September 22, 2015.

The following Directors were present at the meeting: Jeff Agnoli, Rachel Dresbeck, Karen Eck, Alicia Knoedler, Ioannis Konstantinidis, Jacob Levin, Marjorie Piechowski, Terri Soelberg, Michael Spires, David Stone, and Peggy Sundermeyer. Gretchen Kiser was absent. Denise Smith of Talley Management attended the meeting as a guest.

Approval of Draft August 25 Board Meeting Minutes – Rachel Dresbeck

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

Committee Reports:

Executive Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.

The Executive Committee discussed the Designing Events contract, which has now been approved. Also discussed was the Executive Conference Committee, which is tasked with identifying sites for the annual meeting two years in advance, and also with identifying conference chairs and site managers. Barbara Walker proposed creating this committee several years in the past, and Anne Windham has been running it. Dresbeck spoke to Windham to determine her willingness to continue in that role. Windham has tentatively agreed to continue on the committee for this year, depending on the amount of work that will be needed, but we need a Board co-chair for the committee. Dresbeck called for volunteers to serve on the committee. Michael Spires noted that he had previously expressed an interest in serving. Peggy Sundermeyer also volunteered. Dresbeck suggested that Jeff Agnoli might also consider serving, so that when he takes over as Treasurer, he will have an understanding of how negotiation of the hotel contract proceeds. Gretchen Kiser, as this year's Board conference co-chair, is also on this committee.

The Executive Committee also discussed the search committee for the executive director position. The Revenue subcommittee will work on a three- to five-year revenue plan, with the goal to have a preliminary draft by October 9 so the position announcement can be posted between Oct. 12-23. The NORDP brochure should be updated to show the current Board photo and all the right institutional information and the Board members. The brochure will eventually be completely redesigned by Matt Dunn, but we need to have an updated version for several Board members' travel needs. David Stone will work on draft language that we can provide to search firms for relevant searches.

Karin Scarpinato from NORDP Southeast wanted permission to set up a website and a listserv for the group. Dresbeck has reached out to Alicia Knoedler to have her work with the group, and would like for the discussion to include a representative from NORDP Northeast, so that the various regional groups are keeping consistent.

The next Executive Committee meeting is October 13. Board members who have agenda items for inclusion should please notify the Secretary in advance of the meeting.

Revenue/Finance Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer

The three reports are on Basecamp. The balance sheet shows good news in a way, in that we are going to be carrying forward \$3,000 more than anticipated at the retreat, because Talley did not cash its check until September 1 (though the carry-forward will be offset when that expense hits the books, one of the issues with accounting on a cash basis). As of August 31, we are at \$197,438.52 for the total of the carry-forward revenues, although as of September 1, that figure is \$194,521. The operating budget shows how we did throughout the fiscal year. In revenues, we took in \$8,000 more in membership dues than we had budgeted for in the revenue stream. There's an item in the final column for \$150 transfer to savings. This represents the voluntary \$5 contributions that 30 members made to NORDP when joining or renewing. Rather than transfer these contributions \$5 at a time as they come in, the Treasurer has historically transferred the total amount to savings at the end of each fiscal year. Sundermeyer suggested that we might consider updating that amount to \$25, or else have the contribute link lead to another form that the individual could fill out and indicate a donation amount. The form would also then generate a receipt for the donation that could be used for tax purposes.

The other major revenue stream is registration fees for the annual meeting. Sundermeyer has not audited the total shown on the budget against the conference report yet, so there may be some differences in the totals after that audit is complete. She will report next month on the audited results. Sponsorship revenues were \$48,000 last fiscal year, which puts us above the \$300,000 threshold set by Illinois law for a mandatory public audit. That audit has begun, after authorization from the Board at its August meeting. The auditors have produced a two-page list of materials they would like to see.

There isn't anything out of line in the expense report, though Sundermeyer offered to discuss it offline if any Board member had questions or concerns. The current year's operating costs were \$100,155, under what had been projected or budgeted for at the beginning of the year. If you treat just the membership dues (both new and renewals) as operating revenues, then we have lost \$10,644 over the year. Similarly, the conference lost \$6,375 considered from a net perspective, though both of those losses were offset by sponsorship revenues. We will carry forward \$30,981 this fiscal year, bringing the total amount in the bank to \$197,438.

Michael Spires said, apropos of the 2016 operating budget, that he had received an inquiry from Survey and Ballot Systems about election services this year. He responded to their inquiry by saying that the Board has not set firm dates for the election yet, but gave them ballpark figures based on last year's process, which SBS indicated would be sufficient for the purpose of generating quotes. Spires asked them to quote for both the full-service option (which was used last year) and the self-service option. He has not had a reply with the quotes yet, but once we do, we'll have a better sense of what the cost will be.

Sundermeyer, Ioannis Konstantinidis, and Jeff Agnoli met, at the request of the Executive Committee, to gather information about compensation for the executive director. The subcommittee has begun the process of collecting data, and will report back to the Executive Committee at its meeting October 13.

Member Services – Marjorie Piechowski/Terri Soelberg

Terri Soelberg convened a meeting with the existing committee members, and has reached out to regional representatives who were not already members of the committee and invited them to participate in future meetings. At the Board retreat, David Stone asked the committee to compare the institutions with members in NORDP to the AAU and NSF top 200 institutions. This has been done, and Soelberg has begun sharing the information with others. Stone added that between the two lists, there are 107 institutions that do not yet have NORDP members, which leaves considerable room for future

expansion. Soelberg would like to tidy up the information that is provided to new members, so the committee will begin to devote its attention to the welcoming and onboarding process. The committee will engage with EPPD and External Engagement to develop some welcome materials from their webinar presentations. Once that process is complete, the committee can begin doing some grass-roots recruitment with the new materials ready to welcome the new members once they join.

An FAQ for members is in development. If Board members have items they would like to see included in it, please email suggestions to Soelberg. The committee's website should be updated by Friday.

As points of discussion, the committee would like to add a new question to the membership application on Memberclicks to assess individuals' interest in volunteering to serve on NORDP committees, but did not know whether it needed the Board's permission to do so. Rachel Dresbeck suggested that the committee would be within its authority to make that change, and the Board gave unanimous consent to do so.

The salary survey analysis by the Penn State Statistical Consulting Center produced a model that allows us to account for different variables. A perk of membership could be the salary calculator, which we could potentially extend to non-NORDP members for a fee as well. Jacob Levin noted that it was probably best to leave the salary calculator as a perk of (or an inducement for) membership, since the limitations of our credit-card processing system would likely make assessing and collecting such a fee from non-members difficult. Peggy Sundermeyer concurred that the administrative costs would probably be on a par with the revenues in this context, and that it would be nice to have an additional perquisite to offer to members. Soelberg and the committee will work on ways to promote it to the membership.

A summary of the full salary survey report will be developed to share with the NORDP membership before the poster is presented at SRA in October. Lorraine Mulfinger of the metrics subcommittee approached Gretchen Kiser and Soelberg about NORDP's participation on a large proposal support survey that Penn State has been running in partnership with Huron Education. Penn State is hoping to have this as a collaboration between multiple professional organizations, but with one taking the lead and potentially providing some kind of support or resources. Soelberg asked for clarification about what kind of support or resources the survey would need; apparently Huron has been providing meeting and webinar facilitation services as an in-kind contribution toward the effort. The last time the survey was done, the cost was about \$5,000 for the Penn State group to set up and administer the survey in Qualitrics; the group would welcome expressions of interest from other institutions to take on that cost (or to perform the work in-house, possibly for less money) or to help with data analysis. Would NORDP want to partner on this project (or similar multi-organization surveys), and if so, what would our participation look like or entail? Alicia Knoedler asked for clarification whether this collaboration would be on the survey that has already been completed and analyzed. Soelberg replied that the group would either like to make the survey an annual one, or at least to run it one more time but with a much larger participant base. They're hoping to tap into professional organizations to extend their reach to potential participants, and also to find additional support for the costs. Knoedler added that her institution participated in the last iteration of the survey, but that she had to reach out to her sponsored programs office since that was where most of the relevant data were available. Although Knoedler is not opposed to the idea of the partnership, given the difficulties we have encountered with keeping profiles in Memberclicks up to date, she suggested that NCURA or SRA might be better partners for this specific project. Peggy Sundermeyer concurred, saying that the University of Minnesota had also participated in the survey when she was there, and noted that the questions were not sufficiently refined to allow a determination of the precise information being sought for the survey. Michael Spires suggested that

perhaps that was an argument for joining the partnership, to help the researchers come up with better questions that would be easier to answer. Further, given that there are apparently more than a hundred major universities that do not yet have NORDP members, having NORDP associated with a survey they are likely to participate in might be one way of piquing some interest at those institutions. He added that while we might not want (or be able) to take on the survey ourselves, it would be worthwhile to have some further conversations with the researchers about how we might help. Ioannis Konstantinidis concurred. Soelberg clarified that the request was not specifically that NORDP contribute the \$5,000, merely that they were interested in discussing ways that the organization might be able to help support the effort. She added that the researchers felt they had learned a great deal from the last iteration of the survey, and were looking at improving the questions already, so perhaps our involvement could be simply providing some individuals with relevant expertise to help in that process. Sundermeyer asked whether Soelberg had seen the survey report. She said that it had been shared in confidence as the report is not yet available for public release, and that it contained information such as proposal success rates by award size, proposal acceptance rates versus number of hours, success rate relationship among funding levels, proportion of awards greater than \$1 million, which does seem to reflect on OSP. Sundermeyer noted that the hours were one of the things that proved difficult to estimate the last time the survey was done. She added that she is not opposed to assisting with the project, but that we would want to be realistic about what kind of work we might be taking on. Knoedler suggested that the group should write a call for proposals if they're looking for a monetary contribution, or some other way of quantifying the amount of work that would be done. Spires agreed, saying that we need more information about what the group needs, what kind of time commitment would be involved, and what kind of expertise is needed. We should have a further conversation with the group and then consider whether we have the resources and time to go forward. Dangle the possibility of collaboration in that conversation, but make it clear that we can't commit to anything until we understand what we'd be committing to undertake. Rachel Dresbeck asked what the deadline for a response was. Soelberg replied that Mulfinger didn't give a firm date; she wanted to start with NORDP first and would look for further support elsewhere if we can't provide it all. Soelberg will ask for additional information and report back to the Board when she has received it.

External Engagement – Jacob Levin

No report. Rachel Dresbeck will send a notice to the listserv on behalf of the committee asking members to consider volunteering to serve on the committee. Expressions of interest from the membership should be emailed jointly to Levin and to Casandra Rauser. Terri Soelberg asked whether this might be a suitable opportunity to reach out to individuals who ran for the Board last year but were not elected, as a means of helping them to increase their service to the organization. Levin agreed, and suggested that perhaps an individual outreach to those individuals might be done before the message was sent to the listserv for the membership at large.

Enhancing Collaboration – Karen Eck

The committee has updated its website. The new site also includes a link to previous information and resources as an archive, so that information is still available to members. IRB approval for the survey is still pending, but Eck hopes that it will be secured by mid-October at the latest. The survey will go out via Oklahoma's Qualitrics license, but should we be using the NORDP Survey Monkey subscription instead? Rachel Dresbeck replied that Survey Monkey is an option, but that if an institution is willing to allow us access to their Qualitrics subscription at no cost, that is fine. The ultimate goal is to get the information needed by the committee, preferably without having to add additional costs to the budget. Eck added that the plan is to send the survey request to the NORDP listserv, but also to utilize a Google group the committee has created, of individuals who have already expressed an interest in the survey or a willingness to participate as part of a pilot study involving some of the potential questions. Dresbeck

recommended using the Basic Contacts list in Memberclicks rather than the listserv, since the former would provide additional names of people who, while they may not be current members of NORDP, have been involved with NORDP in the past. Jeff Agnoli added that there are several lists in Memberclicks, including people who have ever attended a NORDP meeting, who may not have joined (or renewed). He offered to help in selecting the appropriate list(s) when the survey is ready to go out. Dresbeck asked to have a copy of the survey provided to the Board before it is sent out, which would then help in determining what would be the most appropriate target audience. Eck will provide a copy on Basecamp once the committee has arrived at a final version.

Effective Practices and Professional Development – Ioannis Konstantinidis

The first webinar is scheduled for October 23 (announcement to come out this week) and will be on the NSF's new Ideas Lab solicitation. NORDP will get a preview on this mechanism even before NSF's program managers get the update, which is a feather in our caps. Michael Spires noted that NSF has already run two competitions under this solicitation, but Konstantinidis replied that there will be an updated process announced in November, which is what will be covered in this webinar.

The plan is to have the orientation webinar the first week in November. An additional webinar will be scheduled using a different platform in place of WebEx. Tokesha Warner's institution has a subscription to GoToMeeting and will allow us to run one on their platform as a test. The idea is to investigate technologies that are either more cost-effective and/or more responsive to our needs. One problem we have had with WebEx is the involvement of multiple presenters. The committee will finalize the spring webinar schedule at its next meeting. It looks like we're on track for three in the fall and another three in the spring.

Anna Brailovsky has taken charge of the mentoring program. The call to participate is scheduled to go out at the end of October. The committee would like to increase participation by mentors, and will reach out to everyone who participated in the past, and will post an FAQ for what mentors could expect. The application form is being redesigned to make it easier and more straightforward. Once the call goes out and the committee has a sense of what the potential is for participation, they will monitor to see whether a different mentoring format will need to be adopted, but for now the assumption is that there will be sufficient support through the publicity campaign to maintain the previous model. Karen Eck asked whether there would be a webinar to orient participants in the mentoring program. Konstantinidis replied that no, the orientation webinar referred to in his report was for the general membership, on what NORDP is and does, and how to get involved. However, it might be a good idea to have a conference call or some kind of forum to discuss what it means to be a mentor.

Part of the publicity campaign will be to have people who previously participated in the mentoring program share some of their experiences, whether they felt it worked or did not, as the case may be. Those conversations will help inform the committee's decisions about what to include in the materials that are provided to participants, and also what gets included in the call to participate initially. These could take the form of blog posts or some kind of discussion.

The other question is the issue of monitoring and evaluation. Previously, the committee sent out the call, matched mentees to mentors, and then largely disengaged. This time, they are thinking about ways to monitor the process throughout the year, including the possibility of having some kind of mentoring meet-up at the conference or some similar activities. We do not want to leave people in a situation where they sought mentoring, were matched to a mentor, and then there was no follow-through.

A conference call is scheduled for next week to work on the call for pre-conference workshops. The committee will review evaluations from this year's workshops and will also review materials used to see if they are still current. The committee will provide a final report on the workshops from this year and use this feedback to propose changes for next year's call. Board members are encouraged to suggest topics for workshops, or to provide feedback that the committee can use in reviewing and revising this year's call. Those suggestions should be sent to Konstantinidis or to Kari Whittenberger-Keith (or both).

Governance Committee – David Stone

Stone has traded versions of proposed changes to the bylaws with the Secretary. We are close to having a version that can be shared with the full Board and posted for notice. Rachel Dresbeck asked whether we needed to have the changes done before we post a notice for the executive director position. Spires replied there was no particular reason the changes needed to be approved before we posted the job, and Stone concurred. Spires added that the only substantive change in the bylaws affecting the executive director's position is to change that individual from being a voting *ex officio* member of the Board to being a non-voting *ex officio* member, which we can make clear in the position description.

Emeritus Board Member Task Force – Peggy Sundermeyer

No report.

Additional Business

Board of Directors Listserv – Rachel Dresbeck

It was brought to Dresbeck's attention that the Board listserv is currently not restricted only to Board members, and there are currently NORDP members, not members of the Board, who are subscribed to the listserv. Michael Spires noted that the Board listserv should be restricted to Board members, since its purpose is to allow us to communicate among ourselves, and those communications will often contain confidential or sensitive information that should not be available to non-Board members. It's fine, in the interest of transparency, to have a way for the Board to interact with the membership—but there should also be a secure means for disseminating information (especially sensitive or confidential material) and discussing it, that is only open to current Board members. David Stone asked Denise Smith to take a look at the Board listserv and report back on who is currently subscribed, since the expectation was that the list would be limited only to current members of the Board. Smith replied that she checks on the listserv about once per month and unsubscribes anyone not a current Board member. Stone asked whether we could change the subscription settings so the listserv is not visible to the membership as a whole. Dresbeck asked the Secretary to include this as an agenda item for the Executive Committee's meeting on October 13. Jeff Agnoli checked the listserv membership, and found four individuals subscribed who are not current members of the Board.

Resources Listed on the Web – Rachel Dresbeck

This was an item that had been scheduled for discussion during the Board retreat in August, but which had to be tabled for a lack of time. On the NORDP website is a page describing resources. The page, which includes a disclaimer, lists things such as grant writing workshops and consultants. The question, which has arisen before, is how does this list get updated? A member had downloaded the page and sent an updated version that we were asked to load in its place. We do not have a good process for vetting or reviewing this information, making sure that it is still current, and making changes when these are needed. Dresbeck asked whether we should table this discussion until the executive director in place, or whether the Board wanted to discuss it now. Terri Soelberg replied that this was a timely question, since a member of Member Services had expressed an interest in resurrecting the evaluation consultant survey. Soelberg asked her whether the intent of doing so was to develop something like

what is currently on the resources page or if it was for something more complex. She is still waiting for a response from the individual, but thinks that the intent was to develop a group of individuals, not affiliated with institutions of higher education, who do evaluation and who could form their own cohort. In absence of more information, Soelberg wondered how this request should be handled, and whether these requests for data-gathering need to be vetted in any particular way. Michael Spires suggested asking this individual to write up a short, one-page summary: what information would be solicited, for what purposes, how it would be used, etc., and then the Board (or the committee) can look at it and make a determination of whether or not it would be appropriate. Spires added that the phrase “form their own cohort” worried him, since it sounded like the intent might be to use NORDP and its resources to form a group that might split off from NORDP. If they aren’t getting what they need out of NORDP, that’s certainly their right—but they shouldn’t be using NORDP’s resources to get that group up and running. Soelberg will try to get more information and will report back.

Dresbeck added that currently, Loren Walker from the University of Massachusetts is maintaining the list. If he is no longer willing or able to maintain the listing, or if the Board feels there is need for a different process, then we can discuss that at a future meeting. In the meantime, there should be a disclaimer on all such pages, similar to the one that is on the resource page now, that NORDP is providing the list of resources purely for information and that no endorsement is implied.

Board Source Report – Rachel Dresbeck

Dresbeck will send a copy of the report to the full Board (it was previously shared with the Executive Committee) on Basecamp, and we will discuss it at the October meeting.

Communications – Rachel Dresbeck

Marjorie is signed up for October.

2016 Conference – Rachel Dresbeck

The conference committee is looking at potential keynote speakers and conference themes. The conference committee would really like suggestions from conference chairs for topics for the keynotes and the plenary sessions. There is sometimes a disconnect between members with considerable experience in research development, who are thinking about strategic plans and career moves, and newer, less-experienced members who are just trying to find ways to write better proposals and identify better funding opportunities. We want to have plenary and other sessions that everyone can see themselves in and that they will be able to use in their work lives. There is a lot of opportunity for this in the LDRD initiative that we are starting this year. The Board should think about the kind of topics we would want to see. There is a lot of professional development that needs to go on at these meetings (which is also a way to get conference travel paid for even if you’re not presenting). In the past few years, we have asked for conference proposals by assuming everyone would give oral presentations. One thing we’re considering this year is to assume everyone will be presenting a poster and then picking a subset of those to be given as oral presentations. This is particularly important in the context of leadership development, since not everyone excels at speaking in public. Perhaps we would want to identify or solicit people to give at least some of the leadership development talks (including Board members or people in the membership that we know) who are both knowledgeable in the subject matter but also good speakers. Please think about topics that you would like to see addressed over the course of the conference, at any level.

David Stone replied that one thing he noticed during his year as NORDP president and as an ACE fellow was that few other ACE fellows in his cohort had come from a research background. They draw faculty members, student affairs personnel, people from the provost’s office, associate deans—people who, in

the opinion of their university presidents, have leadership potential. Part of the point behind LDRD was because we are strategic thinkers, we have research potential. We could possibly invite Molly Broad, the president of the American Council on Education, to speak specifically on leadership and the value of strategic thinking in leadership, which would introduce NORDP members to the ACE fellowship program. There are many NORDP members who could benefit from the ACE fellowship program, and ACE would benefit from an influx of applications from a whole sector of universities that it doesn't currently reach. Dresbeck asked Stone to contact her and ask if she would be interested and available. She lives in North Carolina and commutes to DC, so a trip to Florida would not be difficult.

Dresbeck asked that if Board members have other topics they feel would be of interest (and especially if they have speakers in mind who could cover those topics), please write to the Board listserv so that Gretchen can see it and the conference committee can take those suggestions into consideration.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 24, 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 October 27, 2015.