

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

**Sunday, May 22, 2016**

President Rachel Dresbeck called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 3:10 p.m. Eastern on Sunday, May 22, 2016.

The following Directors were present at the meeting: Jeff Agnoli, Rachel Dresbeck, Karen Eck, Gretchen Kiser, Alicia Knoedler, Ioannis Konstantinidis, Marjorie Piechowski, Terri Soelberg, Michael Spires, David Stone, and Peggy Sundermeyer. Jacob Levin was absent. Executive Director Keith Osterhage was also in attendance.

President Dresbeck suggested a change from the usual structure of the meeting. Since the four major committees will be reporting to the membership at the annual conference this week, and also meeting during that time, rather than the usual committee reports, we would like the committees (including those Board committees that will not meet or present to the membership during the conference) to focus on issues, goals, and priorities for the coming year rather than presenting their normal reports. This will also help set some agenda and discussion items for the Board's annual leadership meeting this summer.

**Approval of Draft March 22 Board Meeting Minutes – Rachel Dresbeck**

Rachel Dresbeck moved (seconded by Peggy Sundermeyer) to approve the minutes of the April 26 meeting as drafted. The motion passed unanimously.

**Remarks from the Executive Director – Keith Osterhage**

After discussions with both current Board members and selected past members (the "listening tour"), Osterhage plans to develop the themes that emerge from his discussions with the Board members into a work plan. That work plan will hopefully be shared with the Board not long after the conference for discussion and eventual approval. The hope is that these discussions will also help in the development of roles and relationships for how the ED works with the Board as a whole and with individual Board members, committees, etc.

Osterhage provided a handout to the Board identifying some of the themes that have emerged from his discussions so far. There are some concerns for establishing NORDP's baseline fiscal health; some tactical issues; how we can increase membership and sponsorships; how we can build or increase our participation and/or representation with the many federal agencies and other professional associations in Washington, and theirs with us; development of our brand; and moving from a successful youth phase of the organization into a more advanced phase. Osterhage encourages critiques from the Board members if there are areas that were not mentioned in the draft plan, or if there are different ideas about prioritization.

Rachel Dresbeck noted that we are used to being a Board that does everything. But now, as Keith said to her earlier today, it's not that it's his role to be the concierge: he's a working professional and we need to decide how best to divide the responsibilities between the Board, which remains a working Board, and the ED, and what is the best balance between the two. We also want to acknowledge that these relationships will evolve over time.

Michael Spires noted the item on the handout “Certification—pros and cons,” and added that he and several colleagues, with Marjorie Piechowski as a discussant, will be presenting a panel on that question at the conference on Wednesday. We’re aware that this is new-ish territory, and the working group does not have a roadmap drawn up yet. We have some ideas that we’ve sketched out, but our process has always been grounded in the need to discuss with the membership what it wants and needs from any kind of certification process, since there isn’t any point in building it if they aren’t going to come. Osterhage replied that he had heard much the same information from Ioannis Konstantinidis in their phone conversation. However, the point of raising certification on the handout was not to suggest a defined plan of action to the working group, but rather to point out that many or most of the items on that list connect to or overlap with other areas (e.g., giving CEUs for attendance at webinars or conference presentations). Osterhage’s goal would be to develop a series of plans or options for the Board (and/or its committees and working groups) to consider and then, once approved, for him to move forward on in concert with the Board and its committees and working groups.

Piechowski asked if anyone had mentioned the words “strategic plan” thus far in the discussion, as that seems like a logical next step. Dresbeck replied that the issue had come up in some of the discussions around the Board retreat. There is something of a strategic plan, the 2014 Statement of Vision and Goals that arose from the Board’s leadership meeting that fall. David Stone remarked that they were bullet points that arose out of his 20 N. Wacker articles. Gretchen Kiser forwarded the document to the Board members and Osterhage for reference.

Ioannis Konstantinidis asked whether, as part of the discussions around a strategic plan, there would also be discussions about recruiting new members to the Board. Dresbeck responded that she was reminded, while reviewing the Bylaws, that we are adding a new seat to the Board this year. Spires added that there would be one new seat this year, one new seat next year, and a third new seat the year after that.

Piechowski also noted that both NCURA and SRA have cadres of past presidents. Now that NORDP has a group of past presidents that’s bigger than 3-4, would it be worthwhile to consider formalizing a group of such people as an advisory committee? Dresbeck responded that she had just been discussing that idea earlier in the day, and will bring the topic up again at dinner, since she has some specific ideas to discuss about how such a group might work.

Peggy Sundermeyer brought up the question of having Board members (or at least committee chairs) recruit people to replace them when they step off the Board. There have been examples (e.g., Member Services and EPPD) where this has been done, but we could be doing a better job of it overall. Konstantinidis suggested that part of the problem may be our lack of a recognized process, especially now that we have transitioned to having the membership vote on Board members: we have the election guidelines that specify the requirements for serving on the Board, but we aren’t making it clear to people when they join a committee or a working group that after being involved for a year, they could be eligible to run for election if they were interested in doing so. We’re all very busy, but it’s become very clear that it takes more time than just six months to recruit and get people ready to run, and we need to do a better job of it.

Gretchen Kiser responded that we already have at least some of what’s needed in place. The requirements are stated in the policy, and we reiterate them on the application form a candidate has to fill out before being nominated. Maybe we also need a flyer or some other way of getting that information to people who are both qualified for and who might be interested in running for the Board. Konstantinidis agreed, and added that it should also be something that is discussed when the

committees meet and bring on new members. We need to make it clear that we're not simply seeking volunteers to help on the committee: we're also looking for people who are looking to get involved in the leadership of the organization down the line.

Spires concurred, and noted that it was that last item that we haven't been doing all that well on. It's established in the Bylaws and the procedures what the requirements are—but then the applications and nominations that come in to the Nominating Committee demonstrate that not all of our members are familiar with the Bylaws and the requirements. If we did even a slightly better job of communicating those, we'd go a long way toward streamlining the nomination process.

Sundermeyer added that one of the reasons behind requiring that our four main committees have at least one co-chair who is not a Board member was the expectation that the non-Board member would eventually succeed to the Board position. We have just not done a good job of communicating that expectation to the committee members. David Stone noted that what we had previously was essentially an informal pathway for being invited to be on the Board: if you did good work as a chair, someone from the Board would reach out to you and invite you to be on the Board. Now that process has been replaced by one of eligibility: if you do all of those things, if you're someone who works well with others and have a commitment to the organization, you're eligible to run for the Board. But at some point, we're going to need something more than that: another level of leadership engagement. Maybe there should be a quarterly or semi-annual meeting or conference call where all the non-Board committee chairs get together to learn more about NORDP and its future plans. If we include the ED on that call, then the ED, in addition to getting a chance to present NORDP's goals, aspirations, and plans to this group, also gets to hear the perspectives of people who are involved in the organization, but not on the Board yet, about how things are going. Keith Osterhage added that perhaps these individuals could be invited to come a day early or a day after the leadership meeting.

Spires noted that something he's observed as the Board's representative on the Nominating Committee the last two years is that right now, the nomination process is only looking at eligibility: as long as individuals meet the eligibility criteria, they can get on the ballot. For now, that's probably OK, and the process has not produced candidates that we would not have wanted to invite on the Board if we were still doing things the way they were done before we moved to member elections. Eventually, though, we want to get to a position where we have far more qualified applicants than we need to fill the number of open seats and give members a choice of candidates for each. Rather, we want to get to the place where the Nominating Committee does the other thing they're empowered to do under the established procedures, and actually selecting candidates for the ballot on the basis of how well the committee thinks they would fit with the current Board, their ability to move the organization forward, etc. Stone replied that the thing the Board should look to develop is a way of bringing in new Board members who could hit the ground running, in ways that all of us now on the Board might not have been able to do, because in addition to the work they were doing on their particular committee, they also had that broader vision of what the Board was doing and what the organization was about. When we all came on to the Board, we came through some committee where we knew what was going on there, but had little to no idea of what the larger issues and questions and concerns were. Having that next level of leadership potential, and getting them engaged in leadership issues, is something we need to socialize toward over time.

Jeff Agnoli asked how it went with the individuals we had to turn down as not qualified. Spires replied that one of the three indicated that he'd known he was not qualified, but since we kept asking for people to apply, he decided to apply anyway. Karen Eck added that all of them were gracious in their replies to the Nominating Committee after being notified. Agnoli asked if they had been placed on a

committee or otherwise encouraged to get involved with NORDP so they will be eligible in future. Dresbeck responded that all of them have been invited to the president's reception. She would like all of the Board members to know their names (Joanna Downer, Don Engel, and Donna Scott Tilley), and make an effort to meet with them at the reception or some other time during the conference. Thank them for applying to run, invite them to get involved with your committee, and encourage them to apply to run again in future after they've gotten that experience with NORDP. Spires noted that Osterhage might be able to make a personal outreach to Engel, who is at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and consequently within a short commute. He will email the names of the three individuals to the Board members before the reception. Dresbeck added that all of the candidates running for election to the Board have also been invited to the president's reception: David Stone, Kari Whittenberger-Keith, Kathy Cataneo, Karen Fletcher, and Janet Nelson.

Dresbeck noted that we had gotten a little off-track from discussing what we wanted Keith to do. Agnoli responded that he felt Osterhage should concentrate on the low-hanging fruit at the outset. If there are key sponsors or new members that we want to bring into the organization, that's a good place to start. Osterhage noted that he would like to reach out to the various federal agencies and try to get each of them to let us post, or post something on our behalf, to their mailing lists. We can potentially buy access to those lists, but if it's possible to avoid doing so, that would be preferable. Agnoli agreed, and also noted that Stone had previously brought up a certain number of institutions that we wanted to target (AAU members and members of the NSF top 200 research institutions who are not already NORDP members). Stone asked whether Member Services had the data needed to begin the process of contacting those institutions. Terri Soelberg replied that she had run the query, though it is a few months old, since the committee wanted to get its materials and procedures for welcoming new members sorted out before making a concerted effort to bring in even more new members. However, now that those have been worked out, the committee can begin making outreach efforts to those institutions identified as not having any NORDP members.

Ioannis Konstantinidis added that if we're going to go out and try to bring in new members, what we understand about the organization is not necessarily what we can easily communicate. We have learned a lot of things almost by osmosis. One of the things that would be really useful is that if we had someone, such as the ED, who could serve as a central point of reference (e.g., "Send me the strategic plan, with your edits"), that helps all of us align. The ED can be the U.S. Naval Observatory that we all set our clocks by. Osterhage replied that he hopes the exercise he's begun with this draft, healthy debate and discussion by the Board, and eventual approval as an action plan, is the start of that process. Konstantinidis added that we all need to know what we could be doing, as committee chairs, to forward the strategic plan. Mission and vision: does that need to be updated? If we can't have a vision statement that can be explained in one sentence, we can't sell the organization. Having the strategic plan alone is not enough: we need to develop performance measures, goals and objectives that follow from that, so that we know we're making progress. This is not just for the director, it's for all of us, because we all have complementary roles.

Spires returned to a comment Osterhage made and told him not to be afraid of what he called his "freshman enthusiasm." You're coming in, you're seeing this with new eyes: maybe there's stuff that we've been so far down in the weeds that it's been right in front of us without our noticing it. So please, when you see it, call it out. Osterhage replied that one of the things that got him excited as he was applying for the job was the Dispatches from 20 N. Wacker. When he updated his LinkedIn profile after taking the job, he adapted a couple of paragraphs from there to try and capture the mission accurately. This comes back to the strategic plan: what is this organization, what are we about, what are we trying

to do? And those were the words that he felt could best convey that information to others easily. What Konstantinidis and others are talking about are tactical steps.

Peggy Sundermeyer concurred with Konstantinidis. She added that one of the things she enjoyed about being Treasurer was that the work came at her. That's a benefit that committee chairs don't have. When you have a project, you work on it for a while, but eventually it has to be put aside because something else comes along—and then you go cold. When you finally do get back to it, you have to learn it all over again: what were we doing with this? Who was supposed to get back to me with that information? If Osterhage can keep all of us to keep things moving, that would be very important.

David Stone explained, for the benefit of the people who were not at the leadership meeting in Chicago in 2014, that the purpose of the mission and vision statement that people have been calling the “strategic plan” was driven by the fact that we'd gotten fairly comfortable at a tactical level about where we are and what we do and how NORDP works. But if we don't keep moving, we run the risk of being swallowed up by another organization or, at the very least, getting stuck in a rut and not moving. So Stone proposed two very specific ways in which we could move forward in bold new ways. The mission and strategic elements that are in that document are the “shark element” that helps us look way further in front of us and decide who we want to be. We have to be a field, not just a profession, and we must recognize that the research development ladder has only about three rungs on it—and will always have three rungs on it. We must realize that people will come into research development, stay in it for a decade, and then go on, we hope, to other areas of higher education or research leadership. We need to be preparing people for that: we're going to be VPRs, college presidents, and heads of research organizations. They will come to those positions through research development: so what can we do for those people, while they're in the research development field, to have a better self-understanding of the kinds of strategic thinking that they do and use every day, and how those modes of thinking and working can then be translated into other fields. We also want to retain those people, because they self-consciously got that from us: so even if they become college presidents or whatever, they stay NORDP members and continue to beat our drum, because they realize that we were their graduate school in that world. Osterhage added that what Stone was describing drives a lot of the tactical items or steps that we've been discussing. That kind of approach could drive how we organize a body of knowledge, whether we have certification or not. How do we organize a logical series of webinars for people at this level or that level (or, as Spires added, how do we teach people who are brand new to the profession). How do we develop and organize a minority or diversity initiative to bring people up? And not everyone has “research development” in a job title or job description—even though they're doing it. Osterhage sees a progression from the strategic vision—hopefully a sentence or a short paragraph—that can attract the attention of a federal agency or a sponsor and make them want to know more about the organization and how it can help them, to the specific tactical steps and projects we put in place to implement that vision—but they are all interconnected. Stone agreed that these are things that we need to begin to socialize, but some of them are very specific things that we need to provide to members of the organization who need help now with various things. We don't want to lose sight of that need, which is why Stone is uncomfortable calling this statement “the strategic plan.” It is two strategic initiatives that are beyond the five-year horizon.

Konstantinidis said that we probably all have strategic threads that we want to weave into this. So far, NORDP has been a nominative organization: if your title is this, then you belong. But we need to move toward a functional definition: If this is what you do, then you're one of us. We've been struggling with making that explicit in a way that plants a flag.

Gretchen Kiser disagreed, noting that NORDP has very clearly said, from its establishment, that we understand we're research development people, not because we're called that, but because of the kinds of things we do. That's what led to the information on our website that Holly and the very first members put together: "If you do all of these things, then you're a research development professional." Dresbeck and others noted that the two positions are really not in disagreement.

Spires added that one of the things he's been thinking about as he's been working through the certification questions is that we spend an awful lot of time talking about what people currently do. But particularly as we are trying to become more strategic, and position ourselves as a field as well as a profession, we need to start answering the wider questions: what are the things that research development professionals can do that maybe nobody is doing right now, or that nobody thinks of in those terms? Because otherwise, we're basically just collating position descriptions, and that won't get us where we want to go.

Karen Eck noted that she was on a panel at the National Institutes of Health with Ken Gertz from the University of Maryland and two others. There was a lot of talk about research development: Gertz spoke about it, and so did Eck. There were potentially 18-20 postdocs in the room, and Eck believes a lot of them are looking for career alternatives. This is a place where we need to go, because there were a lot of questions. Eck made a handout from the Wikipedia entry to help illustrate the kinds of activities that RD involves. Eck said she got a lot of questions about what people need to do to prepare for a career in this field, what kinds of things do you need to be good at? Spires replied that while Eck was speaking to the people in the room at NIH, NORDP should consider broadening this kind of discussion beyond the sciences. He mentioned a call put out by the National Endowment for the Humanities late last year or earlier this year on promoting alternatives to the traditional academic track for humanities Ph.D.s. Eck replied that perhaps we could explore putting together a panel of NORDP members who could talk around this topic at various conferences.

Kiser replied that she's already been doing some of that work with AAAS. She and Cassandra Rauser have begun creating a module for AAAS, intended to be an online webinar in the 60-90 minute range with quizzes and other interactive features. They're now beginning to identify subject-matter experts so that AAAS can utilize it in their traditional format. It's RD-based, and they would like us to do a series, including other alternatives such as patent lawyers that would require expertise beyond that of NORDP. The webinar is meant to be in production some time in the fall, and AAAS is paying for it. One of the segments will be specifically on NORDP, which Kiser will be narrating using data from our salary survey. The rest will be people who have come into RD from various positions, and who represent diversity, since that is also an interest of AAAS's. Obviously, we could expand on this for the humanities, since AAAS's focus is on science Ph.D.s, but once this module is done, it's something we can point to.

David Stone replied that it's only half the battle. We train people who can do this, but we also need to train the people who would hire those people. Until they understand what the value of these people, there are going to be one-person or very small RD shops even in AAU member institutions. This is the work that Alicia Knoedler has been doing with APLU's Council on Research. Before she described that work, Knoedler suggested that one task the ED might concentrate on is collecting an inventory of initiatives and outreach activities to agencies and other associations. More than a year ago, Knoedler made a presentation to the National Science Board, for example. So while the NSB is aware of NORDP and what we do, we can leverage that—but we need that inventory to know what has already been done. Osterhage asked that Board members email him details about such projects, both past and also future. Konstantinidis responded that Osterhage needs to give us deadlines for that so we don't get

caught up in the day-to-day processes and forget to follow through. Sundermeyer replied that Osterhage should send us an email with the deadline, so we're reminded we need to do that.

Knoedler continued that APLU has a Council on Research, which was formerly known as the Council on Research and Graduate Education. This is basically the vice presidents and vice chancellors for research, but has now expanded to include associates: these can be an assistant VPR, an associate VPR, a dean of research—someone who might have a path that might potentially lead them to research leadership at some point. Knoedler and Robert Nobles of the University of Tennessee have taken over the workshop that COR puts on for new vice presidents and vice chancellors of research. They are organizing the entire onboarding workshop, with VPRs and VCRs as subject-matter experts. But they also have a set of separate sessions for the associates at COR's summer meeting, when they can come to participate along with their respective VPR/VCR. The associates participate in both the regular sessions that are open to all, but also in sessions that are specifically targeted to them and to their pathway. Knoedler noted that they've discussed issues of diversity in research leadership; what sorts of things that associates can do that their primaries either can't do, or don't have time to do; and so on. Stone pointed out that if Jacob Levin were here, he would have plenty to say about our liaison program, and all the people we have identified and tasked to serve as a resource and a conduit to a large number of agencies and associations. One of the things this program has struggled with is NORDP's inability to provide them with timely, current materials that they can share with their assigned agencies, associations, and groups.

### **Committee Discussions**

#### *Executive Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.*

The Executive Committee is made up of the Board officers, so Gretchen Kiser will be leading it starting in July, and Jeff Agnoli and others will be joining it once we have elected the Board officers for next year. One of the things we worked on this year was reporting action items from our meetings right away (if possible on the same day as the meeting), so hopefully that's helped with transparency and keeping everyone up to date. It is a very basic working meeting: what's on the agenda from last time that we didn't get to, what do we need to add? But it does help us get a sense of how the Board is functioning and what our emerging issues are.

#### *Executive Conference Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.*

Dresbeck will be speaking briefly about this committee at the annual business meeting, essentially to announce the 2017 conference site and that we will be returning to the DC metro area for our 2018 meeting although the site remains to be determined. Jeff Agnoli inquired if Dresbeck was also going to announce the conference chairs at that time, and Dresbeck responded that she would. She will also provide a brief explanation of why we have this committee and what it does to help the Board in the site selection process.

#### *Revenue/Finance – Peggy Sundermeyer.*

Sundermeyer noted that she and Agnoli would be meeting with Keith tomorrow to discuss the reports that the Treasurer provides and to go over the books. Dresbeck replied that this would be a central part of the leadership meeting in terms of revenue generation and the need to put NORDP on a sound fiscal footing.

#### *Governance Committee – David Stone.*

The Governance Committee is working on draft policies that Jeff Agnoli had forwarded to us. Michael Spires added that Dresbeck had asked him to make a brief presentation about the highlights of the changes we made to the Bylaws in 2015, even though they were posted to the circle and disseminated to the listserv while they were being discussed. We are not contemplating any new changes to the

Bylaws, we're just summarizing the changes that have already been made, for the benefit of those who may not have seen the original information that was provided to the membership. Stone added that the committee will also be working on documents explaining why we want members to serve on committees, so that governance has some momentum and isn't simply limited to adopting or changing the Bylaws and policies.

*Nominating Committee – Michael Spires.*

Rachel Dresbeck said that she would include some comments in her opening remarks to address the perception that we're having trouble attracting candidates to run for the Board. Really, this is a function of having member elections for the second time. We were so proud of getting the elections going last year that we forgot we needed to sustain it: we need a pipeline of people who are involved with the organization. This is a lesson learned for us: we had such a positive response in the first year that we assumed it would take care of itself—and then realized that it would not, and that we needed to put in more effort to make people aware of both the opportunities they have to get involved with NORDP and the need to do so if they are considering running for election to the Board.

Jeff Agnoli noted that when the election provider sent out the ballot link for this year's election, there was no language indicating that people in attendance at the conference could meet the candidates—which was a missed opportunity for an integrated approach to what we're doing. Perhaps that could be a function of the executive committee, to monitor the communications that are going out? Spires responded that he was the one who provided the language to the election provider, and it never would have occurred to him to include in the ballot email any discussion of the candidate forum at the conference. That information was, however, very clearly and prominently included in all of the communications to the members from the Nominating Committee.

Karen Eck stated that there were at least two reasons why we're having problems recruiting candidates for the Board: one of which is within our control, and the other of which is not. The one that is not under our control is that most of us have deadline-driven jobs where other people determine our workload. As people get to more senior positions in research development, they have more say over their time. When we get to a point where we have time in our work to take on a leadership role, we do so—but not everyone is at such a point in their careers. People don't come forward because they don't see how they could fit Board work into their daily jobs. However, that means we need to do a better job of communicating what it means to be a Board member and what the time commitments are. We have some of that information, but not enough. Eck said she found that the people who were interested in getting onto the Board are interested because they're connected to someone who's already on the Board. But this poses a problem, since from a diversity perspective we don't want more than one person from the same institution on the Board at the same time. Eck has a number of people at her institution to whom she's spoken about her work on the Board, and how interesting and rewarding it is, which has gotten them interested in potentially running someday—but how do we sustain that interest until they're in a position that they could run? Perhaps the three new members who joined the Board this year could write up something for the blog about their experiences during their first year: what was it like, how much time did they spend, etc. Kiser responded that we should consider separating the time spent on committee activities versus the time spent on Board activities.

Ioannis Konstantinidis agreed that we need to be up-front, to the extent that we can be, about the time commitment needed to serve on the Board. But at least as important should be a discussion of what it is Board members are expected to do or accomplish: what are the projects you'd be working on, or why might you want to make that time commitment to serve on the Board? We all had our various motivations for wanting to serve, but we need to make it clear that if we don't have people on the



Board, the whole enterprise goes away. David Stone disagreed: NORDP would not just disappear. Besides, one thing he learned as an ACE Fellow this past year is that you don't want to scare people into doing something, you want to motivate them to do something. The first part of Konstantinidis's comment, about the Board being a place where you come with your ideas, and do good work, and work at an executive level where you can speak freely and have input into how things get done that you may not get in your day job all the time. That's what we want to lead with. We also need to be careful how we talk about our fiscal health. We're fine, we're not in trouble, we're just looking at ways to secure what we have now and enable us to grow and do more things in the future to support the membership. Spires replied that this is exactly the reason why we're adding more members to the Board over the next three years: as we try to do more things, we need more boots on the ground to be able to manage them. Dresbeck asked him to make that point in his presentation on the Bylaws changes at the business meeting, and Spires said that he would.

Terri Soelberg added that she had spoken to someone who was interested in applying to run for the Board, but who was maybe a year or two away because of some ongoing issues at her institution. Maybe one of the things we can do is to help people who might not yet be at a leadership or executive level sell serving on the Board to their leadership, so they get the support they need from their institutions to make the kinds of time commitments needed to qualify. Spires replied that he was lucky to have landed at Colorado, where one of our office goals is to raise CU's visibility on the national stage by engagement and involvement with relevant professional associations. He added that the director of his office was perhaps more excited than he was when he was elected to the Board, and wanted to announce the news to the office the very same day, even before it had been announced to NORDP's membership. Kiser added that she, as a representative of a large and well-known institution, had explicitly positioned her involvement with NORDP to her leadership as continuing the institution's long-standing tradition of strong involvement with relevant professional associations and groups. Stone noted that this is precisely the kind of thing we haven't communicated to people who are running, or interested in running, for the Board: doing so raises your visibility in the profession, and it also raises the visibility of your institution, so they can use that, if needed, to get support from their leadership. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that, when NORDP had its first leadership meeting, she and others had been able to get support from their institutions to cover the costs of traveling to that meeting. It's a point of pride that NORDP no longer needs that kind of assistance and can now support its own leadership expenses on behalf of the organization—but that willingness does speak to the value that institutions put on having their people involved in leadership roles.

#### *Member Services – Terri Soelberg/Marjorie Piechowski.*

This past year, Soelberg said, the committee had focused on improving and expanding the welcoming process for new NORDP members. That work has progressed to a point where the committee feels it's in good shape to take on additional projects. One will be recruiting new members, particularly from institutions in the AAU and NSF's top 200 that do not currently have a NORDP member on their campuses. What isn't clear is how we want to integrate the regions into the community. The regional liaisons are there to welcome new members in their respective regions. But as some of these groups begin to organize and to do things in their regions, the regional liaisons feel like they're being asked to wear two hats. For regions like Midwest/Mountain, that are so geographically large and under-represented in terms of members, the thought of having a region and a regional meeting just seems out of reach. Michael Spires replied that the argument cuts both ways: the region could be another pipeline for developing talent and fostering involvement that could eventually lead to a Board position at the national level. He noted that his office is struggling to support its desire to ensure that all staff members have the opportunity to attend at least one professional meeting or training opportunity each fiscal year, given that we've basically doubled the size of the office in the last three years. So when it was

announced that the 2017 annual meeting would be in Denver, the administration was quite happy, since it's in our own back yard, as it were: those who are interested in attending that meeting can do so at a relatively lower cost, which frees up funds for others who need or want to travel longer distances. Maybe we are the region that needs to get organized next.

In response to Soelberg's first point, Gretchen Kiser argued that the regional representative should be Board-driven. That person should be the liaison between the region and NORDP's national organization. There needs to be greater connectivity between the regions and NORDP national, which was Soelberg's main point. Soelberg agreed, but noted that it's difficult to have a shared model when not every region can support one. Spires noted that he's not entirely convinced that we need every region to be homogeneous in that way. What we do need is to begin thinking about how we want regions to work with NORDP national: we've been kicking that particular can down the road for at least a year, and we're getting to the point where we've got to have a policy before too many more things start happening. Kiser noted that she's been worried on this point for some time. NORDP is still a small organization, and having regional groups hosting their own meetings on the grounds that these would serve as a pipeline to feed material and talent up to national—an idea that works in larger organizations with thousands of members—could actually wind up driving down attendance at and participation in national-level events for NORDP. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that there have only been two regions who have done this as yet: Northeast, where Anne Windham, who shared Kiser's concerns, was able to guide discussions about how the group would function within the broader national framework; and Southeast, which is just beginning to reach the same organizational level as Northeast. This is certainly an issue that is ripe for us to take on, but it hasn't gotten away from us yet.

Spires added that while he shares a number of Kiser's concerns in this regard, there is perhaps a silver lining. Something that NCURA does very well, and SRA does well enough, is that they use their regional conferences as a proving-ground. If someone has an idea that they think they'd like to present, but they're not sure it's ready for a national-level stage, they'll take it to a regional meeting and get feedback that allows them to polish and improve it before going on to the national level. Soelberg countered that people would then have to pay to attend two conferences. Spires agreed, but added that it's a question of leadership development, which is something that organizations are usually happy to provide for. Kiser demurred, saying that, again, this model works for a larger organization but might not be as successful for NORDP. Soelberg again referenced the disparity between the NORDP regions: some have a governance structure in place, with representatives elected by the regional members, while other regions are happy just to have a listserv but found no interest in having a regional meeting or any kind of formal organizational structure. And in some regions, particularly the larger ones, the cost of traveling to a regional meeting might not be substantially less than the cost of traveling to the national meeting. Kiser agreed, and also noted that she would prefer to see people trying out their ideas on a national stage to begin with. Spires responded that realistically, there's a mental barrier that some people have to get over about the idea of presenting at a national meeting. David Stone concurred, and added that for people who don't have a background in public speaking, or who might not have a Ph.D., it's a real challenge to ask them to stand up in front of a crowd of peers from across the nation to give a talk. It's good to have a "minor leagues" where they can try things out and get experience (and confidence) that will bolster their performance on the national level. But even for SRA, they've struggled with the ways that membership goes to regional versus national meetings, and that's a concern we should take seriously. We need to get a policy together on this question.

Rachel Dresbeck agreed, but also noted the need to be diplomatic about it. She suggested we invite Anne Windham to share her knowledge of best practices with us, since she was one of the driving forces behind the way that Northeast organized. They invite the NORDP president to present at their meetings,

and they're careful. Kiser would like to see data on who is going to their regional meetings, and then see what kind of participation we get at the national level. Is it really driving people to the national level, or is there really even a need to have regional groups under our brand? Peggy Sundermeyer noted that, complicating the matter somewhat is the question of affinity groups (e.g., the "Ivy Plus" group that is meeting today). This was just a group that contacted us unexpectedly and asked if they could have space for a meeting at the conference. Kiser noted that we didn't want to put them in conflict with anything on our already full schedule, so at least they moved the meeting to the day before the conference opened. But again, this underscores the need to have a policy in place: without one, we're making all ad hoc decisions. Keith Osterhage noted that affinity groups are likely to develop in any organization over time, and that's not necessarily a bad thing. Kiser agreed, but wondered what the rationale would be for keeping them under the national umbrella.

Stone noted that thus far, our unwritten policy about the regions has been to allow them to develop organically, without insisting that every region be exactly alike in terms of what it does and how it does that. But all we control is the NORDP name and the content that we create under that banner and using our budget. Beyond that, we have no control over anything. So if someone wants to form an affinity group of research development professionals in the southeast that's totally separate from us they can have that, and we can't say no. What we need to figure out is what is the benefit to them of having the NORDP name attached to it, and what other benefits can we offer them so that they will work with us and not against us?

Kiser noted that there are also revenue implications in some cases. If we're trying to monetize our webinars, for example, and we invite someone in Florida to present a webinar on a certain topic, if they then go and give the same presentation at a regional meeting where it's free, what's the incentive for someone to pay to watch the webinar? We really do need to think about what the benefits to us are for the regional groups. Dresbeck added that we need to think about what the purpose of having regions is supposed to be. One possible reason, from a research development perspective, would be to promote networking and collaboration that would be useful on large center projects, regional projects, and the like. National funding agencies like to see that kind of inter-institutional collaboration in proposals. Stone added that it is also valuable for lower-level training. However, it raises the IP problem. It's not clear which committee that issue belongs to most logically, but we need to own our IP.

Soelberg summarized the discussion by noting that there are the regional liaisons who work through Member Services and whose primary role is to recruit and welcome new members. We then have the formal and less formal regional groups, and the question is whether these two areas need to merge, or possibly the regional groups need to be handled separately outside of Member Services. We have the metrics subcommittee, which has produced a very useful product in the salary survey. But now that's done, Soelberg would like to help collect and analyze the kinds of data we need to help drive NORD and LDRD forward. Spires added that he would like to work with them on collecting some information related to certification. Kiser added that Karen Eck and the Enhancing Collaboration committee should also consider routing any follow-on work they do regarding the collaboration continuum through this committee, so that we're coordinating the various surveys we do of the membership through a common group. This gives them access to all the relevant data, and also helps to guard against possible survey fatigue. Eck replied that their only follow-on will be with the participants in the workshop, who will be learning techniques and working with information, and the follow-up survey will be for those participants only (not the membership as a whole), to see what they've learned and how they've implemented it after six months or so have passed. They're doing an educational intervention, and want to follow up to measure its impact. Then, between the original survey, the workshop, and the follow-up

with the workshop participants, the hope is that the committee will be able to develop a tool or some best practices, or at least an understanding of the major issues in collaborating teams are.

Kiser noted that this kind of work, where a research question driven by data collected from the NORDP membership, and also a pre-conference workshop, is definitely something that we want to encourage for the future, and which will be important for both NORD and LDRD. However, they're not as easy to understand from an organizational perspective, and we need to do a better job of communicating about the motivation behind them. Any kind of research that people would want to do and using the organization to help them, is great. But it's different from the kinds of research that we do ourselves through Member Services, which is really more of a snapshot of the profession: here's who we are at this point in time. Those kinds of research are also important for NORD and LDRD, but in a different way. They're providing evidence moving forward: who's in the profession, what are the kinds of skills and education needed to be successful, and so forth. But if we aren't careful in explaining what's behind these surveys, they do seem to fly in out of left field for most of the membership, who aren't privy to the behind-the-scenes discussion that led up to them.

Returning to the regional question, Stone said that the development of a policy on regional groups is something that the Governance Committee should rightly take on. The job of Member Services is to be the national-level membership group, and they should do whatever they need to do to fulfill that task. Not all of the regions will be the same, and we should use the national liaisons in places where they make sense (e.g., Northeast, where the states are close enough together that one person can easily get around to them all). But we don't want to let that wag the dog if it doesn't need to. Soelberg agreed, and noted that the national membership tasks are quite enough of a job to work on. For next year, the committee has gotten some clarity around retention issues that have been problematic in the past and has the welcoming functions pretty well in hand. She would like some priorities for the committee to work on in the coming months: targeted national recruiting, for example, or there was some discussion at the last Board meeting about moving at least some awards and recognition functions over to the committee. The work on the resources page will be tabled until after there's been a site audit and some overhaul of the NORDP website.

#### *External Engagement – Rachel Dresbeck/Peggy Sundermeyer*

Sundermeyer noted that some months ago, she and Dresbeck noticed that External Engagement hadn't made as much progress this year as the other committees. Sundermeyer contacted Cassandra Rauner to discuss the possibility of a change in the leadership of the committee, since both Rauser and Jacob Levin have less time available than previously for running the committee. Sundermeyer has already contacted all of the NORDP liaisons to determine their interest in continuing in that role. She added that external engagement is really more about strategic alliances. A number of those who agreed to serve as liaisons did so in the expectation that it would benefit them personally in their job roles—which is true—but perhaps NORDP did not adequately convey to the liaisons as a group its expectations of the benefits that would accrue to NORDP. It is best to think of this program as an organization-to-organization communication of goals and interests and initiatives, and perhaps it would be better to describe the program as "Partnerships" to better reflect what it is intended to do.

In conversations that Sundermeyer had with Dresbeck, it emerged that perhaps sponsorships belong under the heading of strategic alliances as well, although in a different "column," if you will. It would not be a formal partnership in the way that we are working with APLU, AAAS and other organizations, but relations with sponsors are still in the nature of a strategic alliance. We will be meeting with the half-dozen people from the current External Engagement committee who will be attending the conference,

and of course the committee meeting will be open to all conference attendees who want to participate or to learn more about the committee.

Jeff Agnoli asked whether the committee had already begun to reach out to sponsors, but Dresbeck replied that she did not want to start that process yet, and that the conference should be about the members and their needs. The sponsorship work done by Strategic Alliances would be at arm's length from the other work the committee does, so there won't be any confusion about roles and responsibilities, or about access that sponsors get to the NORDP members. Agnoli also asked if there was a policy around external engagement, or if it had just been left to the committee. Sundermeyer replied that the committee does administer the travel scholarship that allows NORDP members to be reimbursed by the organization when they travel to a conference or a meeting and speak on NORDP's behalf. A policy around that aspect of the committee's work is in development, but not around other work that the committee does. Dresbeck added that we do want to develop a consistent policy about these travel funds, because if we don't we run the risk of leaving everything to an ad hoc decision without any kind of guidelines or limits, and no way to ensure consistency from year to year or case to case. Having that policy also allows NORDP to spell out its expectations about the roles and responsibilities of those receiving the travel funding to report back to NORDP (or at least to the committee) about the substance of the discussions they had, whom they met, etc.

Gretchen Kiser added that anyone who receives any kind of travel subsidy from NORDP should be an individual we try to connect with: both from the perspective of including them among the pool of potential leaders for the future, but more importantly, to ensure that they are able to present NORDP as accurately and factually as possible when in conversation with colleagues and counterparts at another organization. We don't want people being seen as speaking for NORDP who don't understand the organization's purpose, strategy, and goals. Agnoli noted that the conference scholarship subcommittee added a requirement this year that if a member was granted a conference scholarship, they would be expected to serve on a committee next year. Dresbeck suggested that perhaps a similar policy could be implemented for the travel scholarship: if NORDP pays for someone's travel, part of their responsibilities would include presenting—even if it's just a poster—at the next conference about the meeting they attended. Sundermeyer replied that there had always been a requirement for recipients of travel funding to report back after the trip was over, but those reports were effectively filed away and not shared with the Board or with the membership.

#### *Enhancing Collaboration – Karen Eck*

Eck noted that she had already shared most of what the committee has been working on this past year and some of its plans for next year, and didn't have much to add to that. Rachel Dresbeck raised, as a point for discussion during the leadership meeting and for consideration between now and then, whether it might make sense to have Enhancing Collaboration, since it is a small committee at the moment, operate as a working group under the umbrella of Strategic Alliances. She added that we do not have a mechanism defined for sunseting committees once they have completed the tasks they set out to accomplish.

David Stone pointed out that one of the goals we set last year but did not have the time or resources to accomplish was to institutionalize NORD (which will be the subject of his presentation on Wednesday). However, if we are going to institutionalize NORD and define research development as a field of study, one important piece of that is our work in interdisciplinarity—which was what Enhancing Collaboration was set up to do when he created the committee. We don't (or at least haven't historically) communicate this kind of thing well across disciplines, across institutions, and across international borders. The role of the committee was to set out to learn what could be learned about what we're

doing as regards fostering and enhancing collaboration that works well, and to build from there. As we think about institutionalizing NORD, and recognizing that we want to do this in collaboration with EARMA and the Japanese, and don't want to have to do it five times around the world, we want to do this once, with as many people providing input as possible, and be done with it. Whether that's as a task force, a committee, or a working group isn't the important point. Dresbeck concurred, noting that her comments were only intended as a point for discussion and not as a suggestion that there was nothing left for the committee to do. However, this may be an opportunity to change focus, change a name, or change the way the work fits within the overall structure of NORDP if that's appropriate and would help move the work forward.

#### *Effective Practices and Professional Development – Ioannis Konstantinidis*

Rachel Dresbeck noted that Konstantinidis's previous remarks about aligning the mission and goals of the committee with the work of the executive director is a good start. Konstantinidis added that the committee will work to clarify its strategic mission and goals, work to support NORD and LDRD and build off the work that they do. The committee then needs to decide what things it can do, as a group, and present proposals to the Board for approval and prioritization, which will then guide the work of the committee. Currently, the committee has several subcommittees or working groups. There is the pre-conference workshops, led by Kari Whittenberger-Keith; the mentoring program, where Anna Brailovsky has not only put together the pairs of mentors and mentees, but also developed these new communities of practice. David Stone asked whether the NORDP Review program, where NORDP members would travel to a campus and evaluate policies and procedures, was under EPPD. Michael Spires remarked that he had found a couple of strategic plans for that program in the historical documents file. Konstantinidis replied that he didn't think it had ever been part of EPPD. Peggy Sundermeyer responded that she had been the Board member involved with the process, together with Holly Falk-Krzesinski and Jennifer Eardley of the University of Illinois. They've both been unable to continue working on the project, so it is currently in limbo.

Konstantinidis continued with the third working group, online professional development (OPD), which is in charge of the webinars right now. A fourth working group had been inactive, but is now starting up again to look at the certification process, a body of knowledge, etc. That is Michael Spires, and Andrea Buford and Kellie Dyslin from Northern Illinois University, with assistance from Konstantinidis and Whittenberger-Keith. This group is really starting from ground zero, and that's the purpose of the panel presentation for this year's conference: to provide information about what the options might be and to solicit volunteers to work on it. Now that the mentoring program is back up and running again, it's time to do the same for the certification group.

Related to the certification group is the archive of job postings. We have some that are archived from the NORDP website, and Holly Falk-Krzesinski has additional historical data. The problem has been getting the two data sources combined, and finding someone to do the necessary data and metadata analysis so that the information contained in the job postings could help inform the development of a body of knowledge (in addition to other uses, such as helping people write position descriptions for new RD jobs). There are 12 previous webinars, 9 workshops, and the slides from most of the presentations at the last eight conferences: all of that information can also inform the development of a body of knowledge, but we need to get it organized and categorized thematically, not just chronologically. Once we have that codified and coded and organized, we can then start working on how we want to tier or scaffold it, what constitutes basic knowledge versus intermediate versus advanced, what we want to put out for free to the public or to members, and what we want to put behind a paywall or charge for: but that work will not happen overnight. Sundermeyer noted that this would be a perfect job for a graduate student in education. Konstantinidis replied that he would be open to bringing on a graduate student

from the University of Houston now that he's on campus, but this is still the sort of work that is likely to occupy the committee or some part of it for the next year or two. Also, the mentoring program group had to develop something like a body of knowledge so it could come up with questions to ask potential mentees and mentors to answer to identify people with comparable interests and background, which they did using the 2013 focus group report from NORDP Northeast. Agnoli added that a data curation librarian might also provide some useful or helpful insights in the process. Konstantinidis replied that he had been working with such a person from Ohio State a couple of years ago, and would be open to doing so again. However, working with the legacy system (WebEx) he inherited for webinars, Konstantinidis questioned whether that system would interface with Memberclicks in a way that would allow us to track access or require payment for downloading or viewing archived content. Dresbeck replied that it should be possible to do so, and will touch base with Konstantinidis at a later date to discuss the matter.

### **Treasurer's Report – Peggy Sundermeyer**

Sundermeyer passed around copies of the summary budget for the conference. Although there is the possibility that the conference expenses might slightly exceed the conference revenues, if that happens the amount in arrears should not be more than about \$2,000, and Sundermeyer is confident that it may be even less than that if there is an arrears at all. She added that each conference is slightly different from the others: future conference chairs would do well to look at a variety of conference budgets across several years to cover all the possibilities. Michael Spire inquired about a note on line 15 about the president's reception being excluded from the conference budget, since the Board had decided last year that it should be included as part of the conference budget. Sundermeyer replied that the note was from last year and should have been replaced by the subsequent note that the Board of Directors dinner is separate from the president's reception and not included as part of the conference budget.

Sundermeyer then passed around copies of the operating budget which was passed in August and amended at the 2015 leadership meeting in Boulder. There are some new expense categories associated with the executive director position; these are highlighted in red. There is an additional column with estimated figures as of the end of May, and a third column with projections through the end of the fiscal year. The number of members renewing their memberships is slightly higher than expected, so even without the added revenues from the dues increase approved last December, we should do at least a little better than expected in terms of revenues. Sponsorships to date are somewhat less than anticipated, but since these are no longer necessarily tied to the conference, we could break even or do better in this category as well. Rachel Dresbeck added that two sponsors, Hanover and Thompson Reuters, declined to renew their sponsorships this year. Thompson Reuters is going through a big shift in its business model, so they may be back at some point. There were also some new sponsors this year, and we now have the ED to help recruit and retain sponsors, so this category could well grow for next year.

We extended the Talley contract for another year at the same price. It's on a month-to-month basis, however, so if after reviewing options we decide we would like a different management company, we can cancel it with 30 days' notice. Expenses for the Board include the leadership meeting last year in Boulder, expenses for the Board meeting this month at the conference, some travel reimbursements for meetings with partner organizations, and expenses related to the executive director. If we have this year's leadership meeting in August as planned, those expenses would also hit this fiscal year's budget, so we might go over the remaining funds in this line by about \$6,000. Legal fees this year were the lowest they've ever been, and while we under-budgeted for the first-ever audit this year, we over-budgeted for the bookkeeper's time, so that should all come out even in the end.

Sundermeyer then passed around copies of the presentation she will make at the annual business meeting, which is effectively the same presentation she has given every year, just with updated numbers. Dresbeck asked whether the projections included the increase in membership fees, and Sundermeyer replied that they do not at this time. Sixty-three percent of our membership attends the conference. Dresbeck noted that we're slightly down this year in the number of registrants for the conference, at 392 as of this morning, but that's to be expected since we're not in Washington. In future, conference chairs should plan on a target of approximately 400 in years when the meeting is held outside of DC. The DC conferences could be bigger, maybe 450. Gretchen Kiser suggested that perhaps we should plan to provide more coordinated effort to help members interact with funding agencies in DC, which would help to boost registrations in those years. Marjorie Piechowski added that we may just have reached our plateau: when we're in DC the registration is at this level, and when we're not, it's at some slightly lower level.

Sundermeyer noted that in the slide on "Financial health," she did not include net revenue figures for this year, since they have not yet been calculated and there is the possibility, with the additional expenses now that we've hired an executive director, that the net revenue may be negative this year. If asked at the business meeting, she will reply that they have not been calculated at this point.

#### **Election of Board Officers – Rachel Dresbeck**

Dresbeck noted that we have candidates for Treasurer (Jeff Agnoli) and Vice President/President-Elect (Michael Spires), but we do not currently have a candidate for Secretary. Spires put forward the possibility, acknowledging that he was not sure he would have the bandwidth to do so, of continuing to serve as both Secretary and Vice President, should the Board consider that acceptable. The Bylaws allow Board members to hold two or more offices at the same time, except that one cannot serve simultaneously as President and Secretary. The consensus of the Board was that such an arrangement would not be workable, especially with Spires serving as conference chair for 2017.

Dresbeck added that she had spoken to Karen Eck about eventually stepping into a leadership role on the Board, especially since she has already been named as conference chair for 2018. Ordinarily, Dresbeck wouldn't want to encourage Eck to take on the Secretary role, since it is technically a two-year term (although we have had secretaries serve shorter terms in the past). But given that precedent, it might be possible for Eck to take on the role for a year, and work with a designated assistant (as allowed under the Bylaws for both the Secretary and the Treasurer), either from among the current Board members or one of the incoming members who might be interested in the job, who would then be ready to step into the role on a full-time basis at the end of that year.

Peggy Sundermeyer remarked that when the terms for the Secretary and the Treasurer were set up for two years apiece, she and Anne Windham (the Secretary at the time) felt that alternating those two offices would work best for the Board, so that there would not normally be a new Secretary and a new Treasurer in the same year. She urged the Board to take that into consideration, since we will have a new Treasurer starting July 1. If Agnoli chooses to run for a second term as Treasurer the point would be mooted, but otherwise with a new Secretary and a new Treasurer both starting two-year terms in July, we would be in a situation where the planned alternation could not happen.

Dresbeck invited Spires to explain the Secretary's duties. Spires replied that the main duty is to keep the minutes of the Board meetings. The Secretary also keeps NORDP's books, in the sense of downloading committee reports, officer reports, and other files that we load onto Basecamp, and filing them in the appropriate folder to constitute part of the historical record of NORDP's business. Anne Windham passed on a fantastically organized set of files to him when he took over as Secretary, and he has done



his best to maintain it since then. The Secretary also prepares agendas for meetings of the Board after the Executive Committee has met to set the agenda. Agendas are fairly simple: we usually start with a draft based off the agenda from the previous month's meeting.

Agnoli asked if there were rules about transcribing the minutes: i.e., could someone other than the Secretary be assigned to do the transcription? Spires replied that there isn't a formal rule against it, but argued that, given the sensitive and sometimes confidential nature of the information discussed in meetings of the Board, the responsibility for transcribing the minutes should rest with the Secretary. Spires added that the time needed to transcribe the minutes depends on the length of the meeting and the level of the discussion involved. For a normal meeting lasting an hour and 40 minutes or so, it probably takes four to five hours to listen to the recording, capture the substantive discussions and transcribe them accurately, plus occasionally moving items related to the same point to bring them closer together in the minutes and supplying information that was implicit in something that was said but which might not make sense to anyone who was not part of the original discussion (e.g., if someone not on the Board is mentioned only by their first or last name).

Dresbeck offered to take on the position of Secretary for a year, in addition to serving as immediate past president (which would be allowable under the Bylaws). David Stone asked how long Dresbeck has in her current Board term, and she replied that she has a year left. Spires noted that the drawback would be that the Executive Committee would then only have four voting members instead of five. Dresbeck stated that she would recruit another Board member as an assistant, who would then step into the role after a year. Stone added that this would be another way of qualifying for the presidency: running, in the second year of one's term, for Secretary and serving the two years in that office, then running for president in one's second term. Alicia Knoedler suggested that having Dresbeck combine the roles of immediate past president and Secretary could be viewed from outside the Board as denying other people the opportunity to serve in an officer role and thus position themselves to run for President at some later date.

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (seconded by Gretchen Kiser) to elect Rachel Dresbeck as Secretary *pro tempore*, with the understanding that a new Board member will be recruited to serve as her assistant, with the understanding that the person so recruited would assume the duties of Secretary in the following year. The motion failed by a vote of 3 in favor, 5 opposed, and two abstentions.

Ioannis Konstantinidis offered to run for Secretary, on the understanding that doing so would mean he would need to step down as chair of EPPD and find a replacement. Rachel Dresbeck moved (seconded by Peggy Sundermeyer) to elect Konstantinidis Secretary. The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

Dresbeck moved (seconded by Gretchen Kiser) to elect Jeff Agnoli as Treasurer. The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

Gretchen Kiser moved (seconded by Rachel Dresbeck) to elect Michael Spires as Vice President/President-Elect. The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

### **Other Business**

Rachel Dresbeck commented that this is a demonstration of why this is a great Board. While agreeing with David Stone's comment that we need to be recruiting members to run for office, it takes our collective intelligence to make that work. Solving one problem often brings up others that must then be solved. She thanked the members of the Board for their willingness to step up for the organization.

Terri Soelberg volunteered to be a mentor for one of the incoming Board members.

There being no further business, Michael Spires moved to adjourn (Peggy Sundermeyer seconded) at 7:02 p.m. Eastern. The motion carried unanimously.

By email on June 8, 2016, Rachel Dresbeck moved (seconded by Terri Soelberg) to change the effective date of the 2016 dues increase approved by the Board of Directors on December 22, 2015 from July 1, 2016 to September 10, 2016. The motion carried by a vote of 10-0, with two directors not voting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Michael Spires, Secretary

**Note:** The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 28, 2016, 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 on Tuesday, June 28, 2016.*