

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

June 23, 2015

President David Stone called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:36 pm Central on Tuesday, June 23, 2015.

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

Approval of Draft May 26 Board Meeting Minutes – David Stone

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

Committee Reports:

Effective Practices and Professional Development Committee – Ioannis Konstantinidis

A detailed report has been posted to Basecamp. There were seven new volunteers at the annual meeting; they have all been contacted and are being integrated into the working groups. There are about 14 people now that are actively involved with the committee. Anna Brailovsky (University of Minnesota) has taken over the reorganization process for the mentoring program. Hopefully there will be further details about the reorganization to report next month.

The committee hosted a webinar on funding for the arts, humanities, and social sciences on June 4, for which more than a hundred people registered (60-70 actually attended). Feedback suggested that the webinar was a success. The presenters wanted to add a number of source materials (in addition to the presentation slides) on the website, so this will be a rich resource for reference.

The online professional development working group will be working to come up with ideas to support both the NORD and the leadership development (LDRD) initiatives. Hope to be able to produce some good ideas to run past the Board. One thing that came up was having an archive of past job descriptions, which could be useful information to have for many purposes. They would take all of the job postings that have come through the listserv and put them into some kind of an archive. Konstantinidis has been in discussions with Matt Dunn to determine what our easiest options are for doing so. We have access to pretty much every job that has come through the listserv: if Matt doesn't have a copy of the posting, Holly Falk-Krzesinski does.

The conference workshops had close to full enrollment and were in the black this year. There were a couple of comments from the evaluations that are included in the report for reference. Overall, we have a pretty good setup. Kari Whittenberger-Keith will be in charge of the process again next year, and Konstantinidis hopes it will be even better. If anyone has heard feedback about the workshops, or has ideas for next year, please let the committee know.

Peggy Sundermeyer asked whether we had sent the evaluations from the pre-conference workshops back to the speakers. Konstantinidis believes that we did, but can't be sure since he wasn't copied on

the email. He will confirm with Kari. Sundermeyer suggested publicizing the success of the webinar to the membership, and also thanking the presenters on behalf of NORDP. David Stone suggested making the announcement an advertisement for future webinars, and thanking the presenters at the end of it.

Member Services – Ann McGuigan. Gretchen Kiser stated that she will be ready to post the salary survey reports tomorrow. David Stone asked about what’s happening with the regional liaisons. McGuigan responded that the committee has been moving slowly during the summer vacation season (which has impacted the meeting schedule). Jennifer Woods has been in contact with McGuigan, but since she is rotating off the board and her job responsibilities are taking up all of her time, there will need to be someone to step up and take leadership of the committee from the Board for next year. McGuigan is happy to continue serving on the committee and be a resource when she can. Peggy Sundermeyer asked if McGuigan had a recommendation for the co-chair, someone who has been on the committee for a while and might be willing to serve. McGuigan replied that the committee had morphed a bit, with a smaller cohort of people that have gotten involved. There is a bigger group of people who have been working on the survey sub-committee, so there could be people there who might be appropriate. Gretchen Kiser suggested that Terri Soelberg might be willing to take on the role when she joins the Board. Stone mentioned that both Terri Soelberg and Karen Eck had been mentioned in the discussion of possible co-chairs for Member Services at the meeting of the Executive Committee, each for different reasons, and that one of them ought to be asked to take McGuigan’s place. He would like to see the report from Member Services each month include information such as the number of new members who have joined, the number of members lost, and so forth. McGuigan responded that the committee is getting to a point where it can provide that kind of information, but in small increments. They simply need someone who has the time to devote to pulling it together, which her job commitments have prevented her from doing. Rachel Dresbeck suggested that we should try to get a co-chair for the committee from outside the Board, such as Dianne Nagy from South Dakota, or Jennifer Woods from Chicago, and asked Kiser and McGuigan to suggest good candidates for that role to the Board. Stone added that perhaps Soelberg or Eck, whoever takes on the committee, would also have suggestions.

Enhancing Collaborations – Michael Spires. Karen Eck has agreed to take over leadership of the Enhancing Collaborations Committee (though she may also have time and be willing to play a role on Member Services). Quyen Wickham could easily serve as the non-Board co-chair of this committee if Eck wanted to take on both roles. Ioannis Konstantinidis added that the working group that’s developing the collaboration tool want to do a survey about collaboration (for which they are in the process of getting IRB approval), which is their next step. Gretchen Kiser added that Eck had contacted her about the survey, since the group would like to pilot it first on a select group, and then expand it to the full membership through the listserv. Kiser is providing the list of metadata parameters that they used for the salary survey to the working group, so we have some kind of consistency of the metadata across surveys done for or by NORDP.

Peggy Sundermeyer asked whether we have a policy posted on the web as to how we handle the data that’s in our membership records. Spires replied that we don’t. Kiser asked for clarification. Sundermeyer noted that when people join NORDP, they provide quite a bit of personally identifying information (and some that might be confidential). There is a statement on the website that perhaps these surveys are in conflict with. Kiser replied that all of the surveys have gone through the IRB process and include a statement at the outset about data privacy, and she assumes that Eck will do the same with the collaboration survey her group is developing. Sundermeyer said that although data collected in the surveys was properly addressed, we still need to make sure that people understand that we are not selling their email addresses, and that anyone who wanted to do a survey of the NORDP membership

should first review the web statement—and if necessary, the Board should consider changing it to reflect current practices and procedures. Spires replied that he could not find any such statement on the NORDP website. Ann McGuigan and Sundermeyer both replied that there was one once. Kiser added that she didn't remember whether there was anything that was sent out when a new member joined the organization, and Sundermeyer said she had been wondering if there was such a statement, sent out either with the application for membership or sent out afterward. McGuigan added that the letter new members receive may not refer to a privacy statement, but it does refer to the webpage. Stone said that as long as NORDP is doing the surveys itself, we are using the listserv in the manner in which it was intended, to further understanding and professional development around research development. Whatever the statement says, as long as we're doing the survey internally, we're OK. It would only be if we invited an external entity to use even email addresses that we got from the listserv that we might get into trouble. Kiser agreed, and said that her recollection of the language that might exist, even if it doesn't exist in the form Sundermeyer is thinking of, is that any information provided by members when they join will only be used for NORDP purposes, and that should be sufficient.

Dresbeck asked whether the situation would be changed if someone wanted to write a research paper using data collected from one of these surveys. Kiser replied that the actual participation in a survey carries with it a different set of eligibility requirements and disclaimers, and that would trump the website statement language.

Revenue/Finance Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer. As mentioned at last month's meeting, the committee has split into a Revenue subcommittee and a Finance subcommittee. Sundermeyer asked Board members for nominees to join her and Jeff Agnoli on the infrastructure review panel, but no nominations were forthcoming. If Board members have ideas, the group will be glad to invite them, but otherwise the task force will recruit additional members on its own. Sundermeyer added that it is important that there be someone from Member Services on this task force, and this should be kept in mind when conversations take place with Karen Eck and/or Terri Soelberg about taking over leadership of that committee. Gretchen Kiser added that Soelberg has a background in accounting and is good with numbers, so she might be a good person to have for this working group. Ioannis Konstantinidis added that if we are discussing infrastructure and replacing Memberclicks, he would volunteer to help, as he is very invested in finding alternatives. Rachel Dresbeck, although hesitant to get heavily involved given her duties as incoming president, she purchases systems regularly and feels she should also be involved. Sundermeyer said that they would need many hands to do the work, so Board members wishing to join the working group would need to bring a non-Board member along with them.

Konstantinidis remarked that we have regional groups that are forming. The Southeast regional group had previously asked to have a website set up: can we get them to be laboratories for infrastructure? Sundermeyer has no objections to asking them to participate, as long as they actually do contribute to getting the work done. We wouldn't want to ask an entire region to participate, we'd want to ask individuals. Dresbeck added that she was emailing Karen Scarpinato from Southeast to see if she would be interested in participating, and Kiser suggested adding Soelberg as well. The working group will identify options to take the place of Memberclicks, which would also dictate, in some sense, our third-party payment options. They will also look at teleconference options. As soon as the working group is fully staffed, they will begin looking at options.

No significant changes from the last conference finance report, which has been posted to Basecamp. There are still a few expense items outstanding from Designing Events, but these shouldn't amount to more than a few hundred dollars, so the bottom line isn't likely to change much.

Stone added that the Revenue subcommittee will take on the question of how we restructure sponsorships so that we can do things like take advantage of the fact that a sponsor has a product that NORDP might want to use. The subcommittee will develop language, which it will circulate to the current sponsors and other individuals and groups for feedback.

Task Force on Emeritus Board Members – Peggy Sundermeyer

The task force (Ioannis Konstantinidis, Michael Spires, Rachel Dresbeck, and Sundermeyer) has met a couple of times. Discussions have focused on what we might want an emeritus Board member to be doing, and have four different proposals:

1. Historically, the Holly Falk-Krzesinski Award has been restricted to Board members only. The task force recommends opening up eligibility for the award so that anyone who has been providing exemplary service to NORDP could be nominated.
2. NORDP Fellows. As part of discussion around what an emeritus Board member might look like, the task force research identified two somewhat different possibilities, both of which seemed like good ideas. Based on this research, Spires has drawn up a draft describing a NORDP Fellow, who would be most likely a Board member, but could be anyone who has made significant contributions to NORDP over a substantial period of time. These individuals could apply to become NORDP Fellows. They would not receive a stipend, but would have to give a brief outline of a project they hope to accomplish. The appointment would be up to three years in length, depending on the nature of the proposed project, and could be renewed for up to another three years, but there would be a definite endpoint. NORDP Fellows would not be compensated and would not represent NORDP or the Board in any official way. However, if their projects incurred expenses, they could apply to have those expenses covered by NORDP.
3. Emeritus Board Members. This would be done by nominations; individuals could not apply themselves. Both Board service and some substantial contributions to, or work on behalf of, the Board and NORDP would be required to be eligible for nomination. This designation would be restricted to Board members, which is why the task force is proposing to open up the HFK award to all NORDP members: we want to avoid the perception that all the awards are just the Board patting itself and its members on the back, and ignoring the contributions made by NORDP members who aren't on the Board. This designation would be purely honorary, and would not have an end date associated with it. Emeriti would not be required to work on projects (though they could do so if they wanted to).
4. Rising Star Award. This would be a new award, designated for someone who is a newer member of NORDP (within two or three years of joining) and who does something, or makes a series of contributions to the organization.

The task force hopes to have something in writing for the next Board meeting.

Gretchen Kiser asked what the potential role of the emeritus Board members would be. Dresbeck and Spires replied that it would be purely honorary. Kiser asked whether there would be an advisory function or something similar. Sundermeyer replied that there would not be a formal expectation for such a role, but it could develop if both sides were interested. The problem the task force was trying to solve was that we seem to be losing involvement from our former Board members. We wanted to find ways for them to continue participating in some way, and that was where the idea of the NORDP Fellow came up. When the task force began discussing the emeritus role, it is more of an honorary designation that doesn't carry any associated duties with it.

Dresbeck added that the task force had done a considerable amount of research before coming up with its proposals: from Board Source, from other professional and scholarly associations, etc. What we found was that all of these organizations were looking for ways to keep people involved, engaged, and not waste their expertise, as NORDP is. On the other hand, we don't want to give the impression that we're simply self-replicating the Board and having Board members for life. There needs to be some kind of transparency in what we do to avoid conflicts of interest. Calling the position a NORDP Fellow would give interested individuals the ability to define their own roles, and also allow the Board the opportunity to consider how those proposals tied in with problems and priorities that the Board had identified. The emeritus designation would be purely honorary. Anyone in such a position would have influence of some kind. Kiser felt that designation as an emeritus Board member, without there being some kind of stated advisory role, would be little different from simply being called a former Board member. Sundermeyer replied that not everyone who had served on the Board would be considered eligible for designation as an emeritus member. The task force had discussed this question themselves, and has drafted some language that addresses the distinctions to be made. We don't want to create an advisory council of emeriti, because that would actually imply that they had some kind of role or influence over the current Board.

Spires added that one of the things the task force had looked at was what universities do with faculty when they retire. Some (though not many), as soon as faculty members draw their last paycheck, they get to put emeritus/emmerita after their name: and that's really all it means, they used to be a faculty member at that institution. Some places, emeriti might get an office, they might still be able to do research if they have money for it. But it's becoming more common that faculty members have to apply for, and be granted, emeritus status: but again, all it really means is that they've had a long and distinguished career at their institution, and the institution wants to hang on to that status in some way. Emeriti may still show up at graduations, they may be asked to help woo donors, but there's really no expectation of regular duties: they aren't still working for the university in any normal sense of the word. Whatever they choose to do they can do, but it's really just an honorary designation for them to put on their vita, and that's how we were looking at the designation for NORDP.

David Stone argued that this definition of an emeritus doesn't really seem to meet the stated goal of keeping people who have lots of historical information about the organization involved. Spires and Sundermeyer replied that this is what the role of the NORDP Fellow was intended to be. Kiser replied that not all former Board members that we might want to keep involved would necessarily have a project in mind that they wanted to do, and could potentially be interested mainly in providing advice and counsel. Stone added that we were looking for ways to keep such individuals informed and engaged with the organization, but without giving them any actual authority. We shouldn't be overly concerned about designating an advisory body that makes it clear these individuals have no power, but they are a resource that the Board and the organization can draw on. Kiser concurred. Stone provided several examples of past Board members who, since leaving the Board, have not contacted us again. Sundermeyer replied that the individuals named had all left the Board under difficult circumstances. The goal of the task force, however, was to help find ways for people who have had a positive experience on the Board, and want to continue to work with it and with NORDP, but who for whatever reason are no longer eligible to serve on the Board (because they're term-limited, for example). They may not want to commit to regular monthly meetings, but they want to do some kind of project and stay engaged. The project would not have to be something big.

Stone asked the task force to continue to hone its recommendations, and added that there is at least some interest in finding a way to keep everyone who was once involved, to give them the capacity to be regularly connected, whether or not they choose to reach back. Spires referenced Article X of the

Bylaws: “The Board of Directors may from time to time appoint advisory boards or special councils for specific purposes that do not require corporate action.” Stone noted that this gave us the capability to do it, and suggested the task force take it into account in its thinking.

Stone asked if there had ever been any discussion, around the HFK award, of giving one to a Board member and one to a non-Board member? Sundermeyer replied that there is very little written guidance about the parameters of the award, just historical practice. Spires added that Anne Windham is working to document that. Stone replied that if we try to identify a contribution that rises to the level of the HFK award, it would be difficult to imagine a circumstance in which a non-Board member could meet the criterion, given the number of hours the Board spends, and the work it does, on behalf of NORDP. The criteria could perhaps be written in such a way that there would always be a Board recipient of the award, but in circumstances when a non-Board member had made contributions that rose to something like the same level, they could receive an award as well. This would be separate from the Rising Star award, which should be to recognize the contributions of a newer member.

Dresbeck asked what the role of the Rising Star award would be, if non-Board members were eligible under at least some circumstances for consideration for an HFK award. Stone replied that it would recognize someone who accomplishes a lot in their first couple of years of membership. Spires added that it could go to someone who comes up with a really brilliant idea that they want to run with, or that percolates up to the Board, who then decide to run with it. He quoted Jacob Levin’s frequently repeated point that by the time someone gets on the Board, they’ve been in the business awhile, having worked and slogged their way along, and it’s difficult to feel like you’ve been able to make much of a contribution. Anything we can do to encourage people to step up, to try something could help. They may get a small check and a nice plaque or something, but at least they can put it on their vita, put it in their annual performance evaluation, hang it on their office wall—it’s a little bit of validation for asking them to go above and beyond being a member who participates on the listserv and goes to the conference, but little else. Stone agreed, noting that this would be completely different from the HFK award, which is intended to recognize someone who has had a lasting influence on the organization. He encouraged the task force to consider additional possibilities for such recognition. Given that NORDP is looking at around 700 members, even if we gave out four or five recognition awards in a year, we wouldn’t run the risk of diluting the recognition.

Dresbeck added that we’re really good at coming up with ideas. Then we have to implement them, and imagining five times as much work as goes into the HFK award (which we can barely get people to do anyway), we need to think about follow-through as we’re developing these ideas.

Additional Business

Board Retreat – Rachel Dresbeck

We have tentatively agreed to have the retreat in Boulder. Dresbeck will send out a Doodle poll for times in August or possibly early September, for a Sunday-Monday-Tuesday framework. The invitation will be extended to new and current Board members and any departing Board members. We think we can reduce costs by borrowing a meeting room at Boulder. Michael Spires added that he has reached out to the CU conference planners with basic parameters—somewhere between 12 and 20 people, for a couple of days, a meeting room and some catering—and asked them for at least a back-of-the-envelope estimate of the costs. He has not yet heard back from the conference office staff, but the request was only sent yesterday. If we look at early August, the Colorado Shakespeare Festival on campus closes

August 9, so we could also take in a nice play after dinner if we scheduled it for a weekend when the festival is still running.

Formation of a Governance Committee – David Stone

This question was discussed at length in yesterday's Executive Committee meeting. It grows out of the need and the desire to change the Bylaws soon. Peggy Sundermeyer has one change that is going to go forward regardless of other changes we may eventually make, and if we need a vote on that we should do that. Sundermeyer replied that she had to provide notice to the Board, so we'll have the vote next month. Stone continued that we need to amend the Bylaws for a number of other reasons, and we will likely always have a need to amend the Bylaws. There should be a committee that does the work of combing through the Bylaws and coming up with recommended language for the changes, rather than leaving that job to the Secretary (who got stuck with it this time because he had written down all the notes). From his experience on the Bylaws Committee at the Council on Undergraduate Research, it is very helpful to have a committee to draw on for this work rather than putting it all on one person, even given that the job may be more burdensome this year when we are looking at a lot of potential changes, whereas in some years we may only have one or a few. The proposed Governance Committee would also play a role as we get more involved with Board Source and begin to look at Board development and the professional development of our Board members. Stone and Spires have agreed to serve on the committee, and will need two additional Board members to have a committee of reasonable size to carry on the work.

Spires added that this is an area where he has previous experience, having served for 10 years as co-chair of the Constitution and Elections Committee of the Supportive Professional Staff Council at NIU. During his time on that committee he worked through a complete rewrite of the organization's Constitution and Bylaws—a considerably more involved task than what we're looking at, and which took more than a year to complete. He added that the proposed Governance Committee should also look at the dozen or so places in the Bylaws where we make reference to the NORDP Policies document—which does not currently exist.

Peggy Sundermeyer moved that the Board form the Governance Committee, seconded by Rachel Dresbeck. The motion carried unanimously.

Sundermeyer also moved that the Secretary be designated as a member of the Governance Committee. David Stone seconded the motion, and offered a friendly amendment to make the Secretary an *ex officio* voting member of the Governance Committee. The amended motion carried unanimously.

Election Guidelines – Michael Spires

Spires circulated some draft revisions of the NORDP election policies and procedures document to the Nominating Committee, taking into account feedback we had gotten from the membership on the election process this year, and some of the issues that surfaced while the committee was working on the election (e.g., who would contact members who had applied to be on the ballot but who were not selected). The draft is circulating; only two members so far have commented on it, but their comments were universally positive. Once the committee has weighed in, Spires will report the draft back to the Board for consideration, and then once we have signed off the election policies work, at least, is done for the year.

Job Postings – Gretchen Kiser

Kiser asked about the link for posting items to the job bulletin board. In the last year, she had tried to use it twice without success, and noted that everyone seems to use the listserv to post job notices. She would prefer to keep job postings off the listserv and have them collected someplace specifically devoted to those listings, with perhaps a weekly email sent out from the bulletin board. Ann McGuigan replied that there was a volunteer who was interested in taking on this responsibility, Lynn Stearney, director of research development at the University of Oregon. Rachel Dresbeck added that her recollection was that Jeff Anderson had originally coordinated this task, but was not sure what had happened since he left the Board. She will investigate to see where the jobs email link directs to, and will follow up with Kiser and McGuigan about why it isn't working.

Keynote Speakers for 2016 Conference – Rachel Dresbeck

We need to begin thinking about potential keynote speakers for next year's conference. Gretchen Kiser has some names in mind. Michael Spires asked whether we needed a conference committee and a theme before we tried to identify speakers. David Stone replied that we have a conference chair who has a list, so that's a starting point at least. Peggy Sundermeyer asked whether Kiser had spoken to Jennifer Lyon. She has reached out, but has not yet heard back. Kiser hopes that the conference team will be her, Lyon, and Karen Scarpinato as the regional representative.

NORDP Website Updates – Rachel Dresbeck

The NORDP website still has as its main front-page item a large banner with cherry trees, advertising the 2015 conference, which should be updated. David Stone replied that he had planned to leave that for her when she takes over as president, since she will need to write a new president's message to go on the site as well and then we could simply send a single set of changes to Matt Dunn. Dresbeck will ask Matt to change the order of the links, so we're making the save-the-date notice about the Orlando conference next year more prominent than the link to this year's conference, which we do want to keep on the homepage, since that's where all the conference presentations are archived.

Michael Spires noted that he had just sent some proposed changes to Matt, to add the new Board members to the listing of directors, and moving those whose terms are ending to the list of former members. He also updated the officers list.

There being no further business, Peggy Sundermeyer moved to adjourn (Michael Spires seconded) at 2:45 p.m. Central. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 28, 2015, from 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central Time (2:30-4pm Eastern, 11:30am- 1pm Pacific and 12:30-2pm Mountain)

Approved by the NORDP Board of Directors at its meeting on July 28, 2015.