

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

Tuesday, November 24, 2015

President Rachel Dresbeck called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:30 pm Central on Tuesday, November 24, 2015.

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

Approval of Draft October 27 Board Meeting Minutes – Rachel Dresbeck

Marjorie Piechowski moved (seconded by Karen Eck) to approve the minutes as drafted. The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items:

Approval of Conference Expenditure for Keynote Speaker – Gretchen Kiser.

We have engaged an outside figure, Julie Burstein, a public radio host, as a potential keynote speaker. Burstein is a little outside our normal realm, she's had extensive experience in interviewing and then communicating on the process of creativity. She is interested in speaking at the meeting, and would be willing to give both a keynote and a workshop on topics related to innovation and creativity. Her speaking fee is normally \$7,500 for nonprofits, but she would consider reducing it to \$6,000 for NORDP. There will be a fee charged for her workshop which will help to offset the cost of her speaking fee. In order to get the contract signed in the absence of an approved conference budget, Kiser is requesting permission to proceed with negotiating the contract. The workshop fee and a small increase in the conference fee will help to offset the cost of this contract (and several other offerings that will expand the professional development opportunities available at the conference). Michael Spires moved (Jacob Levin seconded) to approve the expense. The motion carried unanimously. Kiser will finalize the contract and send it to Dresbeck for signature.

Committee Reports:

Executive Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.

The Executive Committee met November 10 and discussed the position description for the executive director, considered proposals for NORDP revenues and membership dues, and heard updates on the preconference workshops for the 2016 annual meeting. The revenue proposal was posted to Basecamp and will be voted on at the next meeting of the full Board.

Executive Conference Committee – Rachel Dresbeck

Dresbeck has asked Anne Windham to forward the position description for the conference site manager, so it can be referenced in the message Dresbeck will send to the listserv soliciting input on possible sites in the Midwest/Mountain Region for the 2017 annual meeting. Denver and Salt Lake City are currently under consideration, but we are open to other sites if there is a local NORDP member that will be available to help as a site manager. Designing Events is moving forward with vetting sites in those two cities, and has also asked about the possibility of hosting the meeting at one of the local ski resorts such as Snowmass or Alta, since they can often be very reasonable for meetings as long as they are relatively easy to get to for conference attendees.

Member Services – Marjorie Piechowski/Terri Soelberg

Terri Soelberg summarized the committee report that was posted to Basecamp. The committee has posted some frequently asked questions to the page, and also has established a Dropbox that they can use to share resources for committee use and also to provide some institutional history and memory as the committee's membership changes over time. Regions are now searchable in the Memberclicks database. Four items for discussion:

1. Awareness of the blog. Members report not being aware of the blog. When we post material there, no one comments. Is there a way that people can subscribe to the blog, so they are notified when something new is posted? Rachel Dresbeck replied that some posts get a great deal of traffic, but others do not. She will look into the matter and report back.
2. Outreach to research-active institutions with no NORDP members. Have we ever done mailers, or would there be interest in developing one that could be sent to such institutions as a way of promoting awareness of NORDP and potentially generating interest in becoming members? This would allow regional liaisons to reach out, and would help the committee develop a strategy for marketing NORDP to such institutions. Jacob Levin asked where these would be sent, and whether they would be hard-copy or electronic. Soelberg replied that either format could be used, and that they would be targeted to select individuals at such institutions. One possible advantage to a hard-copy mailer would be that these have become relatively rare, and might attract more attention than just another email. Levin suggested that individual approaches from regional liaisons or groups might be more effective than stock information through email or postal mail. Soelberg replied that this was the approach they were planning to use, and that the mailer would be more of a follow-up after such a meeting. She added that the regional groups do seem to be taking an active role in reaching out to potential members, as they are asking for more information about who is a member in their region and who is not. David Stone asked Gretchen Kiser whether the committee had produced a one-page PDF for the annual meeting yet, which would be a good addition to the kind of publicity materials Levin was discussing. This would be a way of promoting the conference to new and potential members. Kiser replied that we can probably put something together even now, though without names and full details. Soelberg asked that Kiser send the conference flyer to her once it's ready, so it can be distributed to the regional liaisons.
3. Increasing participation on NORDP committees. Has there ever been a committee fair at the conference, or some kind of way for conference attendees to come and interact with members of more than one committee? Gretchen Kiser replied that there has always been a meeting of the committees. Ioannis Konstantinidis agreed, but noted that it was the opposite of a fair, since all of the committees meet at the same time and in different rooms, so attendees must pick one without the ability to hear from others. Further, the committee meetings have often been scheduled very early in the morning, which is not effective in attracting potential volunteers to attend. Kiser asked for clarification about what might be a better scenario. Jacob Levin suggested, given that NORDP committees represent a substantial amount of the work that we do, that the committee meetings should be front and center at the conference, with sessions scheduled in the middle of the day or after lunch. Michael Spires added that at the conference in Austin in 2013, we had sessions that were called "Networking Breaks," where a reasonably large room would have several tables set up, each with one or more facilitators to discuss a particular topic, and people could either go to the one that interested them, or browse the room and take in several. Perhaps something similar could be done for the committees? Kiser suggested a refinement, by having a representative from each committee give a short "lightning-talk" presentation on what the committee is working on, plans for the future, etc., and then attendees could go talk to the representatives at the forum for more information.

Levin agreed with Kiser's refinement. Konstantinidis also concurred, and suggested that each committee should commit to producing a one-page flyer that could be handed out at the forum (and an electronic version could be posted on the conference website—and the committee's NORDP website) with further information, so attendees would not have to rely on memory once they're back in their offices. The flyers could also be provided to committee members in attendance, who could pass them out in the course of their interactions with other attendees. Spires added that they should also have a supply at the registration desk for people to browse while waiting in line. Related to this, Konstantinidis suggested that we should provide some form of recognition to the volunteers: a certificate of appreciation that could be signed by the president in recognition of an individual's volunteer activities in support of the organization. This could be then factored into an annual review or used in other ways, but would formalize the relationship as volunteers. Kiser asked if it would be the responsibility of the committee chairs to forward the names of those to be recognized, and Konstantinidis agreed that it would be. Spires added that he'd just gotten such a certificate from SRA for being a presenter at their annual meeting. It's not something he's likely to hang on his office wall, but it will serve as documentation for maintaining his CRA designation, if he's asked to prove he gave those presentations, and can also be included as part of his portfolio when it's time for annual reviews. He added that SRA did not mail the certificate; when he registered for the meeting, it was in his packet—so while we would be out the cost of paper and printing, we could handle a large number of these certificates at the conference, and would only have to mail those for people who didn't attend the annual meeting. Kiser asked Spires to send her a copy of the materials, which he did.

4. Questions for survey to be sent to individuals whose NORDP membership expires or lapses. Soelberg asked the Board to review the questions in the committee report and provide any feedback by email.

A request was received from the Great Lakes region just before the Board meeting, about a survey they would like to do. They are interested in finding out what other organizations NORDP members belong to, and are canvassing interest in having (and potential locations for) a regional meeting. Member Services would like guidance from the Board about how best to leverage the information that regional groups are collecting. If the regions are conducting surveys, do we want to stipulate that the results from those surveys must be shared with Member Services or with the Board generally? Would there be specific questions about site preferences for regional meetings, for example, that could be leveraged by the Executive Conference Committee for making decisions about national meetings? Spires and Rachel Dresbeck concurred that regional groups doing surveys should be asked to share their data with us. Kiser added that it would be interesting to have this information, though we would want to develop a way of holding that information and maintaining it so that it is useful. Soelberg asked whether the Board would like any specific questions to be included in such surveys in future, or if there were questions proposed by the Great Lakes region that pose problems? Spires replied that the survey from Great Lakes looked OK. Konstantinidis concurred. Soelberg will ask the regional representatives to share data when the survey is completed and will report back.

External Engagement – Jacob Levin

No report. The committee needs some additional support, preferably from another Board member. A call to the membership needs to go out for the committee and its leadership. Dresbeck will be sending out a message to the listserv, and can include a request for volunteers to work on the committee. Even a commitment of a couple of weeks to send some emails and get processes moving again would be helpful. Levin would like to recruit another co-chair from outside the Board, by preference someone newer in research development who could benefit from serving in a leadership role for a national

organization. Dresbeck will include that request in her message to the listserv. Board members that would be interested in helping can also email Levin after the meeting.

Enhancing Collaboration – Karen Eck

The survey has completed review by the IRB at Old Dominion, and classified as exempt under Category 2. The committee considered sending the survey out before Thanksgiving, but will decide at its meeting on Monday about the timing post-Thanksgiving. Eck will be sending a notice to the listserv about the forthcoming survey and some other activities the committee is working on, and hopes to do a blog post as well. A pre-conference workshop based on the survey has also been proposed for the annual meeting. If Board members have suggestions about how to incentivize participation in the survey, please let Eck or the committee know. Gretchen Kiser asked what the end result of the survey would be. Eck responded that the collected data would be used to develop a tool or toolkit based on members' experiences and expertise at different institutions, responding to real-world problems. The tool or toolkit would be posted on the NORDP website and presented at conferences. If the quality of the data warrant, results may also be published. The hope is that this tool will help make research development a discipline. Kiser replied that speaking to those outcomes is likely to be a motivator for NORDP members to participate: if they know their participation will lead to good outcomes (and especially if it's something they can themselves use and benefit from), they're more than willing to contribute. Eck will incorporate those themes in her communication to the membership, and questioned whether the blog would be a good way of sparking interest or participation, given that it doesn't get sent directly to members the way communications on the listserv do. Rachel Dresbeck pointed out that the blog is a public communications tool, but that it also provides a bit of permanence. If something is posted to the listserv, it has a short shelf life and eventually fades from members' awareness. Postings to the blog are stable, and people can bookmark and come back to them when needed. But the blog is public: it is accessible to anyone, not just NORDP members. It's really more of a marketing tool than communications per se. A good strategy is to put something on the blog and then send a note to the listserv to drive traffic to the blog post (which is essentially how most modern communications campaigns operate). We could also post information within the Memberclicks environment (i.e., one of the Circles), where it would be restricted to NORDP members. Ioannis Konstantinidis asked whether it would be possible to get the regional liaisons involved in recruiting or encouraging participation. For example, if in a month we can see that one region has little or no participation, that regional liaison could reach out and encourage participation. Eck agreed that this would be a good idea, except that the survey will be anonymous and so there would not be a way to see which regions were participating or at what level. Konstantinidis asked whether it made sense to collect some geographic information, regardless of whether it is used to track participation. Eck replied that there is no need for geographic data for the tool per se; having it would only be useful as a means of boosting participation in regions where it was lagging.

Jeff Agnoli asked whether we were planning to send the survey request to any outside groups or just to NORDP's membership, given that some of our liaison partners might also be interested in the tool. Eck responded that the survey would only be sent to NORDP members. Kiser added that if survey participants were asked to provide their NORDP member number, that would connect certain metadata with their responses that could be utilized in future if desired. Eck noted that the approved protocol did not allow for the collection of any identifying information. In order to be approved as exempt, the survey must be anonymous. It might be possible, however, to ask survey participants to identify their NORDP region as part of the survey, which would not be enough information to identify them. Eck added that people may not know which region they're located in. For example, Virginia had originally been in one region and has since been moved to another. Are the members really tuned in to which region they are associated with? Agnoli asked whether the committee was interested in asking for funds

to incentivize participation in some way. Eck replied that they had not thought of that, but that doing so would again mean that survey participants would not be anonymous.

David Stone asked if we had a response rate of 25-30%, would that be too low to allow publication? Eck responded that the rate would be acceptable, but since the tool is looking at a continuum, they would like to see reasonable numbers of examples at each stage along it, and that's the real issue in terms of adequate participation for the tool to be viable in a published paper. Stone added that the way to ensure robustness of the data is to present the survey as a way of building NORDP's database or knowledge base on collaboration mechanisms, and doing so in ways that allow the committee to track, encourage, and incentivize participation. If the survey produces sufficient data to warrant publication, the committee can then go back to the IRB for approval of procedures to publish with de-identified information when they will already know the kinds of information received and whether any of it is in fact identifiable. Eck replied that the protocol already submitted did indicate an intention to publish or disseminate. Stone responded that the committee could still conclude, given the constraints of the protocol and the requirement to keep the survey anonymous, that proceeding under those conditions would not produce either a response rate or sufficiently robust data to be useful. Since the real goal of this project is to provide information and support to the NORDP membership about how collaboration is done and what effective mechanisms are for doing that, this is really an internal quality thing for the membership—which is why we're doing the survey through NORDP and disseminating it only to NORDP members—publishing would be a secondary benefit, and then only if the data are sufficiently robust. If we want this to work, and want to use Konstantinidis's strategy, or Agnoli's strategy, or any other way of boosting participation and garnering quality data, then treat it as an internal quality mechanism, gather as much data as you can and then go back to the IRB after the fact. As long as there isn't anything bordering on any of the protected categories, and as long as there isn't anything particularly identifying in the data, the IRB will likely approve the data collection protocols and allow publication, since any publications would only be based on aggregated data anyway. This is a professional organization trying to collect information, from its membership, about their practice. We're asking the practitioners about things they do. Eck suggested that asking members for their region would be acceptable, but asking for a membership number would go against the protocol that's been approved. Stone replied that the committee should withdraw the IRB proposal on the grounds that the approved study design is unlikely to result in sufficient data to warrant going forward. Instead, the committee should treat the survey as an internal quality improvement exercise in the context of a professional organization and not primarily as a research effort. Then do the survey with all the bells and whistles you can think of to incentivize participation, get as much information as you can and then, if there's anything there, go back to the IRB after the fact and say you're now thinking about publishing because you've got significant findings you weren't sure you'd get at the outset.

Jacob Levin asked how what Stone described was different from the protocol that the committee has already gotten approved. If it's just a matter of giving prizes or incentives for participation, there are ways of doing that which don't compromise the anonymity of participants. Each participant who completed the survey, for example, could be assigned a number. If they wanted to be eligible for a prize drawing, they could then go to a different website and enter that number, which would in no way be associated with the survey responses they gave. Stone replied that it seems simpler up front to allow the committee to use every means at its disposal, including Kiser's suggestion of getting the actual ID number and being able to follow up directly with participants who've had the survey for three weeks and haven't yet responded, so they have every tool at their disposal if they waive the IRB at this point and then go back. There will be nothing in the results that would give an IRB any kind of concern. No identifiable data will be reported at the end of the study—just aggregate results that line up with the continuum, and what practices are done where along that continuum. That's not identifiable. The fact

that you need identifiable data at the outset, as part of the recruitment process for participants, just means to waive the IRB at this point and then go back. What we really want is national data on the questions, and we should use the resources we have to get that information. Eck replied that participants would be telling the committee about things that have gone on at their institutions, and with faculty, and so the committee wants to be careful not to put them in jeopardy. There is some potential for professional harm if they tell negative stories about things that have gone on and name people—which the survey instructs them not to do, to use pseudonyms instead. Stone agreed, but noted that any publications that would result from the survey will not use names even if they were provided in the raw responses: the names would be changed to protect the innocent. As with all qualitative studies, respondents would be given aliases, and their situations would be slightly modified so that no one would know the exact institution, you put the institution in a slightly different place. No one would be likely to figure out the identity of a respondent from that kind of information, so the risk of professional harm to respondents is minimal. Further, this only becomes a problem if and when the committee reports out its findings. No one not on the committee will see the raw response data that includes identifiers. Eck will talk to the IRB director at ODU and see if it's possible to get the protocol amended to allow the collection of identifiable data as a means of enhancing recruitment of participants. Stone recommended simply withdrawing the proposal and going ahead with the study as an effort done by a professional organization to understand best practices among its practitioners. If it then turns out afterward that there are results that would be useful to the world outside of NORDP, the committee can go back to the IRB and resubmit. The intent of the survey was not to find those results about collaboration, it was intended to discover information relating to research development and of interest to research development professionals. But having found this generalizable result, we would now like to publish and need to get approval for the study protocol after the fact. Eck should speak to the head of the IRB and see if they can get the amendments approved in time to get the survey out and if not, then go ahead with the study and seek retroactive approval if the results warrant. She will speak to the committee and the IRB director and report back.

Effective Practices and Professional Development – Ioannis Konstantinidis

No formal report. The committee is continuing with the projects outlined in the last EPPD report to the Board, and will have a number of developing issues to report in December. The pre-conference workshop committee has reached a decision, but has not yet notified the people who submitted abstracts, so the committee will wait to announce the successful candidates until those notifications have been made. There were 11 proposals submitted. With the new budget breakdown, we need about 20 people in each workshop to break even—but since evaluations indicated participants were looking for smaller workshops anyway, the committee would like to have smaller workshops and provide more of them to meet the revenue targets. There will be five workshops offered, and we will see if they fill up. In both of the last two years we had more than 100 people register for the preconference workshops that were offered, so the committee is confident that we can meet that enrollment target this year even with smaller workshops.

Revenue/Finance Committee – Rachel Dresbeck

In the absence of the Treasurer, the president gave the report. The final balance sheet for 2015 has been updated. We had revenues of \$326,555.24 for fiscal 2014. The profit and loss statement was also posted to Basecamp, which gives a good picture of the budget right now and the major categories of spending. Jeff Agnoli added that they are considering investing some of our reserve funds. Given the likelihood that the Federal Reserve is likely to raise interest rates in December, it might make sense to propose doing so at the December meeting and then proceed some time in 2016. If the market responds as expected to the rate hike, there could be an opportunity for good returns on our investments even over the short term. The Finance subcommittee will draw up a proposal and present it to the Board for

consideration early in 2016. In preliminary discussions with the Treasurer, the amount to be invested would be somewhere in the range of \$25,000 to \$50,000 initially. If people have thoughts, they should email Agnoli. Dresbeck encouraged the Board to look at the proposal for the new membership fee structure, so we can discuss it and vote on it at the December meeting.

Governance Committee – David Stone

Stone noted that we have passed the date for comments from the membership on the draft of the proposed changes. Michael Spires replied that the deadline for responses is Friday, November 27, and that in the communication to the membership we indicated we would vote on the proposed changes at the December 22 meeting of the Board. Stone noted that we had only one substantive comment on the proposed changes, and inquired whether it would be possible for the Board to approve the draft ahead of schedule. Spires replied that according to the timeline we laid out in our communication with the membership, we can't vote until next month.

Nominating Committee – Michael Spires

The committee did send out a notice to the listserv asking for volunteers to serve on the committee for 2016. Spires has not communicated with Jerilyn Hansen to see how many responses have been received, but will do so. Rachel Dresbeck expressed a willingness to help recruit members if needed, and asked what the timeline was. Spires responded that the committee needs to be constituted and begin looking over the materials sometime in the October-to-December timeframe, according to the election procedures, so we're on schedule at the moment.

Conference Committee – Rachel Dresbeck

Gretchen Kiser had to leave the call early, so the president provided an update. Two speakers, Carl Herndl and Julie Burstein, have confirmed. Dresbeck asked David Stone if he had heard back from Molly Broad. Stone replied that he has been in daily contact with her office, but they have not yet given a reply. He thinks she's trying to make it work and her staff are trying to coordinate schedules so they don't say no until they absolutely have to. He will give them a little more time to make it happen. Dresbeck noted that the conference committee has been discussing whether we need three keynote speakers. As was discussed earlier, we've already had more ideas about things to include on the conference program, and given the amount that is already on the draft program, if one lunch becomes a committee update to the members instead of a keynote speaker, that should be fine. If we can't find a time that's convenient for Molly Broad, we'll still have a great conference lineup. Obviously the hope is that she can come, but if not, we still have a full schedule. Stone will give her office a deadline and see what the response is.

Terri Soelberg asked whether there is a specific time before or after the conference that Board members need to extend their trips. Dresbeck replied that we usually have a Board meeting the night before the conference starts. So if the conference begins on Monday, the Board would meet Sunday night. There is also some Board business during the conference. There is a president's reception after the first keynote on Monday night, and there are expectations about being at committee meetings. We now also have the candidates' forum and a breakfast with Board members, where members have the opportunity to meet with us for informal discussions. Board members should try to be as available as possible during the meeting, as this is our best chance to interact directly with the membership. David Stone noted that we had also talked about having a chance for sponsors to interact with the Board. Dresbeck added that we had combined that with the president's reception last year, and Stone replied that it had not worked as well as we might have liked, so we should explore other options for this year. Jeff Agnoli added that there will be no-host dinners on both nights of the conference, and asked whether Board members should try to keep one of those nights free for other obligations. Dresbeck replied that Board members

should keep the first night free, since that is when the president's reception takes place. Michael Spires added that Board members should plan to arrive on May 22nd. Soelberg asked whether Board members also needed to plan to stay after the meeting, but Agnoli replied that while the conference chairs usually meet for a debriefing session once the meeting has ended, the Board does not participate in that meeting unless a Board member was also involved with the conference. Agnoli asked whether the Board was going to plan chairs for the next conference, so they could be announced at the conference. Dresbeck replied that this is part of the charge for the Executive Conference Committee. Karen Eck asked for clarification: Board members should plan to arrive by the evening of Sunday, May 22, and plan to stay through the evening of Wednesday, May 25. Dresbeck replied that Board members who will not be involved with the conference this year or next can leave once the conference ends. Only those members with conference involvement need to stay for the evening of Wednesday the 25th. Stone added that Board members should plan to arrive by mid-day on Sunday, which will leave time for the Board meeting and a dinner afterward. Dresbeck added that NORDP pays for Board members' rooms for the night before the meeting since it will be primarily devoted to NORDP business.

Additional Business

Executive Director Search Update – Rachel Dresbeck

The job has been posted to the NORDP website and to the listserv, but has not been submitted elsewhere. Dresbeck asked for suggestions of alternative posting opportunities. Jacob Levin will email her a list of places that he advertises when hiring for RD professionals. Dresbeck would like to give the position a soft launch so members can think about it. Members have reached out to her; all of them want to know what the job will pay. Levin asked if a decision had been reached about compensation. Dresbeck replied that we did not agree on a set figure, but opinions had coalesced around a base pay of \$75,000-\$80,000, with incentives or bonuses for performance so as not to appear like a boondoggle to membership. Michael Spires replied that he is not as concerned about pegging the ED's salary to what our members make. As David Stone pointed out at last month's meeting, the ED is not doing what we do: the ED is running the organization and needs to be paid on that basis. Dresbeck responded and said that a non-profit director in Oregon would make around \$50,000-\$60,000. Stone replied that the person we hire will have to understand what we do, and would therefore be coming from a research development background, and would expect to be paid on that basis, not based on what another non-profit director makes with a completely different skill set.

Policy on Groups Within NORDP – Rachel Dresbeck

Dresbeck asked to table this discussion until next month so Gretchen and other Board members could be present. There is currently no policy around this question, and the Board should consider both whether one is needed and, if so, what that policy should be. Board members should please think about this question in the interim before the next meeting. Michael Spires noted that this is a question that logically falls within the purview of the Governance Committee. Dresbeck agreed, since the revision to the bylaws is more or less complete at this point.

Systems – Rachel Dresbeck

Peggy Sundermeyer convened a group to look at systems that NORDP uses (primarily Memberclicks, though the plan was also to look at Free Conference and other systems, but the working group did not actually get to those). The plan for now is to table this discussion until we have some new people who can assist the working group. The group that was convened was mainly drawn from the NORDP membership, who feel that Memberclicks works just fine. This led the working group conveners to the realization that the difficulties with Memberclicks are all on our side, particularly as regards the blog platform. The problem is that if we create a WordPress site, it will take some work to tie it to the NORDP

site. Nevertheless, it may be worth doing, since it would give us much more flexibility than we have with the Memberclicks platform. Memberclicks is designed to manage membership, and it does that well. Our issue is that we want it to do more than what it is designed for. For now, we don't want to upset the apple cart. Jeff Agnoli added that this would be a place where an executive director having experience with multiple platforms could be helpful in exploring options and reaching a decision. Dresbeck replied that the working group had already come to that conclusion. Agnoli asked whether it would be possible to host a blog on another platform and embed it into the Memberclicks site. Dresbeck said that might be possible, but will check with Matt Dunn and report back. Agnoli asked whether David Stone had made any progress with Trellis, and Stone replied that a Trellis site has been set up for NORD. Eventually Trellis might be an avenue that we can use for other things as well.

Communications With Membership – Gretchen Kiser

Since Kiser had to leave the call early, this item will be tabled until the December meeting.

Other Business

David Stone asked whether there was an October communication from the Board to the NORDP membership. Rachel Dresbeck replied that there had been, from Terri Soelberg. Karen Eck is scheduled for November, and she is working on it. She does plan to talk about the survey, so will hold off on publishing until she's had time to discuss revisions to the survey with the Enhancing Collaborations committee on Monday. Dresbeck is scheduled for December, and will be sending a note to the listserv today as well.

There being no further business, Rachel Dresbeck moved to adjourn (Michael Spires seconded) at 3:12 p.m. Central. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 22, 2015, from 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central Time (2:30-4pm Eastern, 11:30am- 1pm Pacific and 12:30-2pm Mountain).

Approved by the Board of Directors at its meeting Tuesday, December 22, 2015