

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

**Tuesday, June 28, 2016**

President Rachel Dresbeck called the regular meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:36 pm Central on Tuesday, June 28, 2016.

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

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

Gretchen Kiser moved (seconded by Terri Soelberg) to approve the minutes of the May 22 regular meeting as drafted. The motion passed unanimously.

**Action Items**

*Name Change for External Engagement Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.*

Dresbeck noted that the original purpose for the External Engagement Committee was to make NORDP known to external groups (including federal agencies, private sponsoring agencies, and other professional organizations). We've now done that successfully with the liaison program, and we're now looking for ways to make those relationships stronger. We're looking to move sponsor relationships under this committee, both because we're looking to have sponsors support more than just the annual conference, and also because these relationships require an ongoing commitment by more than just one person. It's also beneficial from a knowledge management perspective, so that we're not dependent on a single person's memory. The third leg of the stool is to ensure that past Board members remain engaged with NORDP. We've seen people feel burnt out, and while there's been some informal outreach by individuals on an ad hoc basis, we want to make sure that our past Board members and officers are good ambassadors for NORDP. For those reasons, we want to change the name to Strategic Alliances.

Peggy Sundermeyer moved (seconded by Gretchen Kiser) to change the name of the External Engagement Committee to the Strategic Alliances Committee. Michael Spires offered a friendly amendment to include a change in the committee's scope, adding both sponsor relationships and relationships with past Board members to the committee's charge. Sundermeyer seconded the motion as amended, which passed unanimously.

*Approval of Budget Estimate for 2016 Board Leadership Retreat – Terri Soelberg*

Soelberg noted that she had posted a revised draft budget to Basecamp, reflecting information from Keith Osterhage that Jacob Levin and Marjorie Piechowski would not be attending, and that Karen Fletcher would Skype in rather than travel. The revised estimate, developed on the higher side per guidance from the Treasurer to allow for flexibility, is \$14,678. Rachel Dresbeck asked what the per diem rate for Boise was. Soelberg replied that she wasn't sure whether to budget on the basis of actual reimbursements or estimates. Dresbeck answered that for draft purposes, estimates were fine—but looking at the estimate for travel meals, she couldn't imagine spending \$80 on meals for travel days. Michael Spires noted that there is no GSA locality rate for Boise specifically, so the general Idaho rate of \$51 per day for meals and incidentals applies. Soelberg added that she was thinking of a partial travel day to get to the location, and another partial travel day to get home when making the estimate. Spires

noted that GSA allows 75% of the locality rate for meals and incidentals on the first and last days of travel, or \$38 per day. So an estimate of \$80 for meals across those two days would be in line with the federal per diem allowances. Dresbeck added that NORDP does reimburse for actual expenses, and asks that Board members be reasonable in their choices. Peggy Sundermeyer also noted that there will be a financial policy coming before the Board shortly that will address some of these same questions and issues. She suggested that we might make the GSA per diem rates at least a guideline both for estimation purposes and for reimbursements. Gretchen Kiser asked what the cost was for last year's leadership retreat. Dresbeck replied that the costs have been in the range of \$12,000-\$13,000 each year for the last couple of years. Sundermeyer replied that the actual cost for last year's retreat was \$13,841. The previous year the cost was \$12,600 with fewer attendees and a more expensive venue.

Michael Spires moved (seconded by Rachel Dresbeck) to approve the revised draft budget of \$14,678 for the 2016 Board leadership retreat in Boise. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Committee Reports:**

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

The Executive Committee met June 14 and mostly discussed the development of a workplan for the executive director.

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

Designing Events is still working on narrowing down the list of potential locations in the Washington, DC area for the 2018 meeting. Even though we're planning two years in the future, it looks like we may have to accept a less-than-ideally situated hotel and the costs will still be expensive. Keith Osterhage added that Dianne Norcutt has already winnowed the list down to five or six properties from 21 prospects initially identified. They did a site visit recently at the Hyatt Regency Reston which was very nice, and another is scheduled for the Grand Hyatt in DC on July 6. As a DC resident, Osterhage feels that the locations still under consideration are all good ones: the tradeoff will be location versus price, with a downtown location coming in at a higher cost than a location that is less central. Dresbeck said that we've never been downtown and don't need to be. Michael Spires added that as long as the location chosen is easily accessible to the Metro or a reasonable cab ride from one of the area airports, we should be OK.

#### *2016 Conference Committee – Gretchen Kiser*

The committee continues tying up loose ends. One item of note concerns the A/V budget. The original conference budget had allocated approximately \$34,000 toward that cost, but the actual invoice we received from the vendor was for a little more than \$40,000, which will impact the overall conference budget. Kiser would prefer to wait until the Treasurer has paid the final invoices to present the final conference report. Peggy Sundermeyer replied that she had received most of those invoices, and had uploaded a report to Basecamp for today's meeting.

Sundermeyer noted that the report she posted shows both the original budget and the actual costs (although not all of those checks have cleared the bank as yet). The operating budget doesn't include those expenses yet, although the report does show those for which the check has been written but has not yet cleared. The conference did well and we didn't need all of the sponsorship funds to break even. The participation was lower than we had anticipated, but this may represent a plateau for attendance when the conference is situated outside the Washington DC region. There are a few items, highlighted in yellow, that may change somewhat once the final invoices have been paid and the checks have posted. The expenses for keynote speakers and the hotel were less than budgeted, even with the higher costs

for catering. The expenses, with the exception of the A/V category, were all less than budgeted; however, the number of attendees was lower than what was forecast, so the revenues were less than budgeted. Designing Events has not yet charged us for the electronic guidebook (line 56 in the report), which is the highest remaining expense. There are probably still some loose ends such as local travel that we cover for Designing Events staff during the conference, but these are likely to be minor. On line 18 for A/V equipment, we did spend quite a bit on shipping costs, both to get NORDP's equipment to the conference site and then to get them from the conference site to the executive director's office where they will be stored. In light of that expense, we may want to revisit whether it is cost-effective for NORDP to have its own projectors outside the DC area. The overage in the budgeted amount likely represents a last-minute change as the conference was approaching. Designing Events should have alerted us to the change and did not, but Dianne Norcutt is aware of the problem and they have indicated that they will review the process to ensure that this issue does not recur in the future. Keith Osterhage added that for the site visits currently under way in the DC area, Designing Events is having the A/V consultant on-site as part of the site visits, to ensure that they're in the loop from the beginning. Sundermeyer added that for the size of the NORDP conference in terms of attendees, it is very demanding of space: we use a lot of breakout rooms, and this necessarily impacts the A/V costs for the meeting.

Kiser added that she is also in the process of cleaning up the records in the committee's files before officially turning them over to Michael Spires, so he won't have to go through 25 drafts of something to know which was the one that wound up being used. Sundermeyer noted that the budget report is also included in the conference's Dropbox folder.

Michael Spires reported, moving ahead to the 2017 meeting that his two conference co-chairs had confirmed their availability and willingness to participate. They will be Kellie Dyslin from Northern Illinois University and Karen Eck from Old Dominion University.

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

Soelberg posted a written report to Basecamp. One point of discussion she wanted to bring forward was whether the list of people who received a membership as part of their non-member conference registrations had been finalized, so the committee can move forward and begin the welcome process. Keith Osterhage replied that discussions between the President, the President-Elect, and Designing Events had crystallized around the position that we would treat the date of payment of the fee as the date of enrollment for determining the membership term. Gretchen Kiser suggested reaching out to Dianne Norcutt to get an updated list of those who had responded to the inquiry about whether or not they wanted to activate their memberships and then either the committee or Designing Events could move forward and coordinate efforts to contact those who paid the non-member fee but did not respond to the inquiry about activating the membership included in that fee.

Kiser added that a wrinkle in this is that we do have employees of our sponsors who are also NORDP members—they're not just working for one of our sponsors, they're research development professionals in their own right. The list of people who registered as sponsors for the conference, while they should definitely be grouped together as such on a list, there may also be individuals on that list that we want to follow up with.

Soelberg added that her more fundamental question was why we needed to follow up and ask about activating memberships at all when individuals registered for the conference and included a membership in their registration fee? Kiser replied that was because the process had been a passive one: the cost of the annual membership was simply included in the registration fee, without giving

individuals the opportunity to indicate whether or not they wanted to activate the membership. She suggested revisiting this for next year's meeting. Soelberg will follow up with Denise Smith to get the updated list, and the committee will get to work welcoming those new members.

Peggy Sundermeyer asked whether, when someone registers as a non-member for the conference, there is sufficient information on the registration form that they could be registered as a member, or would the individual then have to go back to the membership application form later on and fill in missing information? Kiser replied that she was not certain, but that probably some information would need to be supplied (e.g., institutional information that isn't required as part of the conference registration form). Michael Spires replied that it should be possible, at least in theory, to update the conference registration form to collect at least some of that missing information, which would streamline the process for new members joining as part of their conference registrations. Kiser demurred, noting that doing so would make the conference registration form much more cumbersome than it is now, and expressed a preference for having the Member Services Committee continue to do outreach to those individuals expressing a desire to join the organization as part of their conference registration. Sundermeyer added that she had asked the question because she knew there were people interested in analyzing our membership data, and Denise Smith would have the ability to move those people into the membership database even though their applications weren't fully complete. One of the rationales behind sending people an email asking whether they were interested in joining the organization was to induce them to log in and complete their member profiles. Soelberg will follow up with Denise to see what messaging was sent to these individuals, and if it did not include information about updating their member profiles, the committee will add that information to their welcome materials.

Soelberg also announced that the committee will have a new co-chair after Marjorie Piechowski's term is up, Kay Tindle from Texas Tech. Soelberg will be actively mentoring Tindle, and asked that if other Board members who had been through the process of mentoring a new co-chair in the past had good guidance on best practices for doing so, please share that information with her.

Soelberg also discussed her draft committee budget, which was included in the committee report. She indicated it would likely need to be revised during or after the annual Board leadership retreat, since there were some items that have been discussed as part of the Executive Director's workplan and elsewhere (e.g., the membership drive, or another survey of the NORDP membership) that would fall under the committee's purview and might result in additional expenses. She also noted that if the committee is formally tasked with the selection of award recipients (other than for the Holly Falk-Krzesinski Award, which remains a Board decision), that would also entail some additional expenses (\$700, per information provided by the Scholarships and Awards Subcommittee).

#### *Strategic Alliances – Peggy Sundermeyer*

There was a great turnout at the committee meeting during the conference, and the committee's mailing list has been updated to reflect the new members. A more formal report has been posted to Basecamp. We are in the early stages of exploring a more formal strategic alliance with NACRO (Network of Academic Corporate Relations Officers), so Sundermeyer will be attending their conference in August. There is also considerable interest from CARA (Canadian Association of Research Administrators), the Canadian equivalent of NCURA. They would first like to explore a webinar about what NORDP is for their membership.

The chairs are trying to develop a few working groups within the committee, so that it can do more to support the liaison positions. Rachel Dresbeck is working with Keith Osterhage to compile a list of

potential sponsors that the committee can approach. Also under way is a revision of the travel scholarship procedures. Dresbeck added that a formal proposal will be forthcoming for review once it is ready, but effectively they want to manage expectations for the travel scholarships and make them something that will support members' ability to travel to make connections on behalf of NORDP but preclude the possibility of someone being able to secure funding year after year for the same meetings. Recipients would also be required to report back after they've traveled to a meeting and explain what they did, whom they met, and file a formal written report with the committee.

*Enhancing Collaboration – Karen Eck*

No report. Gretchen Kiser noted that there had been some discussion about where this committee might go in the future. Rachel Dresbeck replied that the question is to understand whether the collaboration continuum is a project or a committee. Kiser added that if Enhancing Collaboration is considered a regular committee, its goals need to be clarified.

David Stone noted that the original idea for Enhancing Collaboration was the proto-version of NORD. It was, "If we're the professional organization for the kinds of things research development people do, we should be on the cutting edge of developing best practices in those areas, theories, trying things out, and doing studies on them." Enhancing collaboration was seen, very early on, as something that research development professionals did, but that research administrators did not. It was originally formed as a working group, back when our use and understanding of terms like working group, committee, and standing committee was considerably looser than it is today. The working group spent about two years looking at the ways in which collaborations could be enhanced and also trying to put together the centers document. It's not clear how that document came to be assigned to the working group, but centers were somehow thought of as places where collaboration happened.

Whether in our current incarnation we still want to call this a committee or not is not clear, and this can be discussed at the retreat. It may be that we can fold it somehow into NORD. Where NORD goes is also something that we should be talking about at the retreat, because right now it doesn't have an organizational home. We need to discuss both where these kinds of activities go, but also how the ones that exist only within NORDP are supported. Right now, NORD doesn't have a budget, which it probably needs, and it could potentially also handle separate sponsorships. Dresbeck replied that there is also potential for collaboration with Strategic Alliances, and that one of the items in the current draft work plan for the Executive Director is to identify potential in-kind services.

Kiser added that an item for the leadership retreat might be to assess the current specific goals and tasks that are assigned to each committee. At the moment, we have a lot of things that are assigned to EPPD, some of which are tactical and some of which are strategic (such as the body of knowledge). We need to be more deliberate in assigning tasks to committees, and having an understanding of what things are where, and why they were assigned that way originally, will help.

*Effective Practices and Professional Development – Ioannis Konstantinidis*

No report.

*Revenue/Finance Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer*

The third-quarter operating budget was posted to Basecamp. The operating budget is current through the end of May, which means that not all of the conference expenses (or revenues) have come through yet. It looks like the membership dues will come in close to the \$80,000 that was budgeted. We have a large number of renewals that hit in August. Sponsorship is \$43,620, which is different from the revenues listed on the conference budget, because we deduct from the income the fees that we're

charged as an operating expense. Since the operating budget is tied to the NORDP checking account, those fees are never deposited there, which explains the discrepancy. That's roughly \$1,350 in fees, which is roughly 3%, the PayPal transaction fees we pay to them for handling funds on our behalf. The operating income, including sponsorship, would amount to just over \$100,000 for the year. Conference fees come up to around \$208,000, so we've taken in, three-quarters of the way through our fiscal year, \$309,000.

Under expenses, the association management budget, which is a monthly fee, is right on target. The Board expenses, which is mostly travel-related costs for the in-person meeting at the annual conference and also the annual leadership retreat, is likely to be a little under the budgeted amount this year. The costs for the August leadership retreat in Boise will primarily hit the books in our next fiscal year, which was why we asked the Board to approve the draft budget at the start of the meeting, to give us authority to incur those obligations in lieu of an annual operating budget. Travel scholarships will probably not use the full amount budgeted, leaving at least a couple thousand dollars unspent. There's approximately \$7,000 between the Revenue/Finance and the communication lines, since it seems unlikely that we will have the chance to design and print a new brochure before the end of the current fiscal year. The accountant's costs came in toward the high end (\$7,000) of the estimate because of additional work necessitated by our annual audit, but the bookkeeper's costs will likely be less than estimated. Election services will be on budget, we were just billed today for the balance of the cost. The other expensive item is the teleconferencing. Sundermeyer and Jeff Agnoli have already indicated to the Executive Director that this should be one of the first of our infrastructure platforms that we evaluate to see if a more economical (and versatile) option can be found. The costs are rising because we're using it more than before, not because of any price increase on the vendor's part, but this is probably not the least expensive vendor available.

Bottom line, we're probably under budget by about \$12,000. That does not include the costs for our new Executive Director, which were not known at the time the budget was drafted last autumn. Thanks to the income from sponsorships, we will likely wind up with a deficit of about \$20,000, which would leave our overall financial position approximately where it was at the start of the last fiscal year, with slightly less than \$200,000 in the bank.

#### *Governance Committee – David Stone*

The committee has made suggestions for edits on two of the four draft policies submitted by Jeff Agnoli. Those are now back with him, and once he's got a final version, those two policies should be ready for review and possible action by the Board. Stone plans to continue serving on this committee when his new term starts in July. Gretchen Kiser suggested that the committee might also want to recruit one of the other new Board members and begin mentoring that person to take on a leadership role in the future. Michael Spires added that since the Secretary is an *ex officio* member of the Governance Committee, it will automatically gain a new member once Ioannis Konstantinidis starts his term in office. Spires himself is not planning to step off the committee unless directed to by the Board. Rachel Dresbeck pointed out that the conference will take up quite a bit of time, but Spires responded that the Governance Committee doesn't require a huge time commitment to begin with, and that it's an area he has experience with and enjoys. Further, if we add both Konstantinidis and another new member to the committee, that would leave sufficient personnel to handle committee business in the event that Spires needed to scale back his involvement due to other time commitments. Dresbeck also noted that we should probably encourage Konstantinidis to identify an assistant to the Secretary, who could also serve on the Governance Committee ahead of assuming the duties of Secretary and becoming that *ex officio* member.

### *Nominating Committee – Michael Spires*

The committee report was formally submitted to the Board. At some point, the Nominating Committee will need to meet to go over the feedback we got from members during the voting process. As with last year, most of the feedback was extremely positive. We had fewer than 10 people express even moderate levels of dissatisfaction with the process. Some were upset by the fact that they were forced to vote for four candidates; the majority were upset because that requirement was not communicated as clearly as it should have been on the ballot materials. That is a note Spires has made for next year's process already: if we are going to ask people to vote for one candidate for each open position, then the ballot needs to state clearly "Vote for X," and not "Vote for up to X."

Peggy Sundermeyer asked whether the election platform would allow people to vote for fewer candidates than the number of open slots. Spires responded that it would, if we set up the election process in that way. It is an available option from the provider, but for the two years we've been doing membership elections, we have chosen not to allow that option. Gretchen Kiser suggested that we should allow the option to vote for fewer candidates than the number of open slots. Spires disagreed, but that is a matter that the Board can discuss in the run-up to next year's election process.

### **Additional Business**

#### **Other Business**

##### *Transferability of Memberships when Paid by Institutions – Alicia Knoedler*

Rachel Dresbeck asked Knoedler to give a brief summary of Oklahoma's institutional policy and what they need us to do to work within that policy framework. Knoedler replied that part of the issue was institutional policy, and part was increased scrutiny due to state budget constraints. The institution will not pay for memberships that go to an individual, but will pay for institutional memberships. The sign of an institutional membership, according to the university, is transferability between or among individuals. Knoedler spoke to the budget person in Kelvin Droegemeier's office about the other institutional memberships they pay for (such as COGR, ORAU, etc.), and most of them seem to involve what we were discussing for NORDP's institutional membership category but then tabled when it became apparent that we didn't have what we needed in the way of a value proposition to make it attractive. What Knoedler would like is some language acknowledging that if OU purchases eight memberships in NORDP on behalf of employees of the university, if one or more of those employees leaves the university, then that membership could be transferred to the original member's replacement or another employee of the university. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that NORDP has done this for OU (and other institutions) in the past when the need has arisen.

Gretchen Kiser noted that we needed to have a larger discussion about institutional memberships at some point, to determine if it makes fiscal sense to offer them or if we still need to wait until there is more of a value proposition to make the option attractive. But this incremental step in that direction, allowing institutions that have paid the fee for their employees to transfer the membership to another employee for a variety of possible reasons, is a good idea. We should change our Bylaws to allow that for members.

Michael Spires replied that the language in the current Bylaws leaves us in a bit of a gray area. As currently in force, the Bylaws state that individual memberships are not transferable, while institutional membership are. When we rewrote the Bylaws last year, we were thinking of institutional memberships very much along the lines of what Knoedler described with regard to COGR, where an institution pays a flat fee per year and any number of people can then join the organization, but that was not deemed feasible for NORDP at the time. However, we might look at other meanings of that phrase, given that

even for the individual memberships, most of us have our institutions pay for them. Maybe we call it an institutional membership because the funds come from the institution, and potentially give a price break or a discount once an institution has paid for a certain number of memberships for its employees. Kiser asked whether doing so would potentially create problems for us later on. Spires responded that it should not, since institutional memberships are expressly allowed under the Bylaws, but not defined, all we would need to do would be to approve a policy and it could go directly into effect without needing to change the Bylaws at all. Kiser replied that her worry was that if we started calling memberships for individuals that were paid by their institutions “institutional memberships,” if at some future time we then decided we could implement what we originally meant by that term, we would have broadened the meaning to the point where we might have difficulty convincing institutions it was worth their while.

Keith Osterhage pointed out that in an email on this point, he had suggested a policy whereby if an individual’s membership is paid or reimbursed by their institution, we would allow it to be transferred in accordance with that institution’s own internal policies. This would allow us the flexibility to address situations like Knoedler’s without having to create two categories of institutional membership. Spires responded that the Bylaws would have to be changed to allow such a policy. Sundermeyer and others argued that we could make an *ad hoc* decision for OU and then change the Bylaws at a convenient time.

Dresbeck moved (seconded by Gretchen Kiser) to provide a written assurance to the University of Oklahoma that memberships paid by the institution are transferable to other employees. The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.

Spires suggested that we should make the necessary change to the Bylaws sooner rather than later, both since the change would be a simple one and would affect only the one section, but also because without that change, the Board would have to vote on each case where a similar situation had arisen. Terri Soelberg added that it should be made clear that such a vote would be taken in any similar situation, whether or not one of the individuals affected was a member of the Board. Sundermeyer replied that we have done so in several other instances, none of which involved Board members. Knoedler will prepare a draft of the statement for review by the Board, to ensure that the institutional and state requirements that apply in her situation are appropriately addressed.

#### *Work Plan for Executive Director – Rachel Dresbeck*

Both the Executive Committee and the transition team (which have most, but not all, of their members in common) have been working on a way of working effectively with our Executive Director and bringing him on board with the organization. The two groups, together with Osterhage, have been developing a list of priorities for him to focus on in the first six months or so of his term. There is a good working draft, and once all the parties have had the chance to review it and make any changes they feel are necessary or desirable, that plan will be circulated to the full Board for review and approval. There are currently four priorities identified, three of which have to do with revenue generation:

- Increase sponsorships by at least 20%
- Increase the number of members by at least 100 per year
- Monetizing NORDP’s webinars
- Supporting the work of the Board

Dresbeck had asked Osterhage to work with the incoming Treasurer, Jeff Agnoli, to provide some budget context for these priorities. We need to be at a point where we can support, prudently, both the compensation for the Executive Director, and also meet the ongoing needs of the organization. While Agnoli is out on vacation at the moment, it will be important to bring this up to the Board for discussion as soon as possible. Osterhage added that for the three priorities relating to revenues (sponsorships,



memberships, and webinars), he will not be working in isolation on those issues, but will coordinate his efforts with the respective committees. Kiser added that while the work plan sets out the priorities, she would still like to have some time for discussing it at the leadership retreat, because obviously there may be impacts on or connections to work that the committees themselves are doing or have already done. Also, discussion at the leadership retreat offers an opportunity for the whole Board to engage in some thought and brainstorming around these ideas, which could address one or more of those issues and which might also add additional priorities to the work plan.

Spires added that the work plan was never designed to be immutably set in stone. It was always the intent to develop a document that gave the Executive Director a starting point, pointing him to work on those issues and areas that the Board felt were most strategically or otherwise important for that initial focus. Then, as tasks are completed, others can be added, and priorities can be reassessed and re-ordered (for example, if something we initially thought would take six months only requires six days, or vice versa). Kiser responded that while we are looking at this work plan as an initial draft of a work that will always be in progress, that's not the same thing as saying that all tasks are inherently flexible and don't have deadlines or due dates. But we should use the substantive discussions at the leadership retreat to drive the plans for what NORDP and the committees will be working on, and what we ask Keith to do on our behalf.

Terri Soelberg noted that whenever two or more groups or units share responsibilities for the same work, the goals and aims of one are often not the same as the goals and aims of another, which leads to conflicting views about which is most important, or who is responsible for which part(s) of the process. Certainly there are some areas in the work plan that need to be coordinated with the respective NORDP committees. But there are also other areas outlined in the plan that Osterhage can work on in the time between now and the retreat independently. Kiser agreed, but noted that she still wanted the freedom to brainstorm, especially in regard to revenue generation, at the leadership retreat, as that is also the opportunity to lay out the overall direction of the organization (and its various parts) and get buy-in from the leadership as a whole. Sundermeyer commented that she had seen the work plan and felt that everything on it was something that Osterhage could take up now and make some progress on by the time of the leadership retreat. The leadership retreat is an opportunity to engage in the broader visioning about where we would want NORDP to go over the next several years. That would necessarily impact the work of the organization as a whole, but it might not have as great an impact on the ED's work plan for the shorter term.

#### *Leadership Retreat Agenda – Gretchen Kiser*

Kiser stated that she will be working with Rachel Dresbeck and David Stone to put together a draft agenda for the leadership retreat in Boise. However, if other Board members have ideas or items that they would like considered for inclusion, please forward those to her.

#### *Onboarding of New Board Members – Keith Osterhage*

Osterhage has been working with Matt Dunn to update the NORDP website, and with Denise Smith at Talley to make sure that the incoming Board members are set up in Memberclicks and other NORDP platforms. Is there a list or a package of other materials that we can provide to the new Board members to help get them set? Gretchen Kiser replied that she and Michael Spires had been putting something together. It is an open question at this time whether it's worth the time and money to pay for a dedicated Memberclicks trainer to provide training to the new Board members. Kiser noted that \$75 an hour is not a lot of money, but given that most Board members don't do that much work on the back end of Memberclicks and the many excellent tutorials that Memberclicks already provides for free, perhaps it's best to proceed on a need-to-know basis for now. Rachel Dresbeck suggested that perhaps

some time could be set aside during the leadership retreat to walk the new members through the basics of Memberclicks, Basecamp, and the other platforms we use, so that if they have questions they can ask them while we're all in the room.

*August Board Meeting – Michael Spires*

When the question was raised in the Executive Committee about the possibility of moving the August Board meeting from the regular fourth Tuesday of the month slot (August 23) to have it during the leadership retreat in Boise, no one objected. Spires asked whether we still wanted to consider making the change, since we now know that Jacob Levin won't be there, and that Karen Fletcher can only participate via Skype? Gretchen Kiser replied that we should go forward and have the Board meeting during the leadership retreat, and Levin and Fletcher can call in for that part of the day. The consensus of the Board was to hold the August meeting during the leadership retreat.

*NORDP Affiliation for a Book Quote – Michael Spires*

Michael Spires advised that an NSF contractor had reached out to him recently, seeking permission to use a quote from an article he'd written for the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in a book on proposal writing that she's revising for a new edition. She planned to source the quotation to his institution, but Spires wondered if it would be appropriate to ask her to include his affiliation with NORDP as well, and possibly to encourage her to write about NORDP, and the resources and assistance it can provide to researchers, in the book as well. The consensus of the Board was that he should ask the contractor to include "Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals" in his affiliations, and to offer to put her in touch with Rachel Dresbeck for additional information about NORDP.

There being no further business, Michael Spires moved to adjourn (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) at 2:59 p.m. Central. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,  
Michael Spires, Secretary

**Note:** The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 26, 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).