

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

Tuesday, December 22, 2015

President Rachel Dresbeck called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:34 pm Central on Tuesday, December 22, 2015.

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

Approval of Draft November 24 Board Meeting Minutes – Rachel Dresbeck

Jeff Agnoli moved (seconded by Michael Spires) to approve the minutes as drafted. The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items:

Approval of 2016 Membership Dues – Rachel Dresbeck.

The Revenue subcommittee presented a plan to the Executive Committee for raising the NORDP membership dues. After discussion by the Executive Committee, the plan was revised. It is proposed to raise dues for current members, effective for renewals after July 1, to \$189. For new members only, there will be an additional \$30 processing fee (making the fee for new members \$219). Renewals will not incur the processing fee, so after one year at the higher rate, new members would receive the \$189 rate, as will all current members who renew on or before their due dates. Gretchen Kiser asked what the projected rise in revenues would be from the change. Dresbeck replied that the last calculation the subcommittee made was based on a membership count of 536, though the membership has grown since that figure was reached. At 536 members, the change would bring in an additional \$21,000 per year, much of which would go to support the salary for the executive director.

The subcommittee also recommends that, effective with the 2017 annual meeting (so not for this year's conference in Orlando), the conference registration rate for non-members be set at whatever the member rate is, plus the cost of a new membership (\$219). Non-members registering for the conference would then be receiving a year of membership in the conference cost. Michael Spires moved (seconded by Gretchen Kiser) to approve the dues increase. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of 2016 Conference Budget – Gretchen Kiser.

The final numbers are awaiting verification from Designing Events. Dresbeck asked whether the numbers were significantly off, and Kiser responded that they are on a rough par with last year's. Even the additional cost for Julie Burstein's keynote is offset in part by the \$50 fee for her special session. Costs for Designing Events are largely the same. Before presenting to the Board, Kiser would like to make sure the numbers in the draft are accurate, and that she understands what all the line items mean. For example, there is a line in the draft budget that is described as "General." Without knowing what is included in that cost, Kiser feels uncomfortable presenting it to the Board for approval.

The document posted to Basecamp on proposed conference fees and revenues gives one side of the equation. For members, early registration will be \$470 (up from \$450), regular pre-conference will be \$500, and on-site registration will be \$670. Non-member fees begin at \$620, which amounts to the member rate plus \$150, or slightly above the current membership fee of \$149, with that same

difference at each registration level. Pre-conference workshops, according to information from Kari Whittenberger-Keith, will be \$160 each. The total number of registrants for each workshop will be capped at 40, according to Ioannis Konstantinidis. Jeff Agnoli added that each workshop leader gets to set the registration cap. Kiser budgeted on the assumption of 50 for each workshop. Peggy Sundermeyer suggested that 50 would be too high, and a budgeting assumption of 40 per workshop would be more realistic. Konstantinidis added that there will be more pre-conference workshops this year than last, so even if the numbers for some of them don't make it to 40, the total number of registrants for the workshops will likely be 150-200. Kiser will set it to 165. The pre-conference workshops are meant to break even in terms of overall meeting costs. The special interactive session is \$50, with a cap of 50 registrants. That will bring in an extra \$2,500 to offset the \$6,000 speaking fee for Julie Burstein. The committee is budgeting for a slight increase in registrants over last year, which will also help address the increased costs for keynote speakers. Kiser will email the final budget to Board members after she has had a chance to discuss it with Designing Events. In response to a question from Michael Spires, Kiser noted that she would like the Board to vote on the proposed registration fees, so the conference committee could include them in publicity materials for the conference.

Michael Spires moved (seconded by Jeff Agnoli) to approve the proposed conference registration fees:

Registration Type	Member Fee	Non-Member Fee
Early Bird	\$470	\$620
Regular	\$500	\$650
On-site	\$670	\$820
Pre-conference workshops	\$160 per workshop	\$160 per workshop
Special interactive session	\$50	\$50

The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Revised NORDP Bylaws – Michael Spires.

Michael Spires moved (seconded by Peggy Sundermeyer) to approve the revised Bylaws as drafted by the Governance Committee and posted to the Bylaws Circle last month. The motion carried unanimously.

Terri Soelberg noted that the Bylaws repeatedly reference a policy document on the NORDP website. She has looked for this document and been unable to find it. Spires replied that the current policy document only covers elections. The Governance Committee and the Board are still developing other policies that will eventually be added to that document.

Spires will make sure the new Bylaws document is posted to the NORDP website, and will also send out a notice to the listserv announcing their adoption and giving the location where members can find the new document. Peggy Sundermeyer added that if the Governance Committee can identify the various policies that need developing, the Board can help craft those policies, rather than leaving everything up to the Governance Committee. Spires replied that he has a document in his notes that details the various items the Bylaws require to be addressed in the policy document. Rachel Dresbeck asked to have an item added to the agenda for the next meeting of the Executive Committee to keep forward momentum on getting the policy document updated.

Committee Reports:

Executive Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.

The Executive Committee met December 8 and discussed the membership fee proposal, the Bylaws revisions, and then the meeting was cut short because of a system glitch with the conference call provider.

Executive Conference Committee – Rachel Dresbeck

Dresbeck uploaded a document to Basecamp with a progress report, and will convene a meeting of the committee early in January. We have designated the Midwest-Mountain region to host the 2017 annual meeting, and have received some good proposals from the membership for potential sites. We are concentrating on Salt Lake City and Denver, but we have widened the scope to additional cities, and have received a competitive proposal from Omaha. A proposal had been put forward to consider Boise, but Designing Events reports that there are no hotels in the Boise area that are large enough to host NORDP's annual meeting. Peggy Sundermeyer added that "big enough," in context of the annual meeting, covers not just the number of hotel rooms available for conference attendees, but also the ability to accommodate the large number of concurrent sessions that we feature, which requires a very large conference facility. The committee's next step will be to prioritize the proposals that we have received and then begin planning for site visits.

Dresbeck added that, once we formally begin including a year's membership in the non-member conference registration fee in 2017, we will need to figure out a way to welcome the new members to NORDP, and for them to activate their membership if they so desire. She will reach out to Terri Soelberg and the Member Services Committee to discuss ways of doing so, and any additional steps that will be needed to ensure they receive a welcome letter.

2016 Conference Committee – Gretchen Kiser

The deadline for submission of abstracts was originally yesterday. Kiser received at least 20 emails because of a system glitch. Since she was unable to reach anyone at Designing Events, she reassured all the people who inquired that the deadline had already been extended to January 6. Apparently the issue was that some people had begun to enter information for an abstract, which they saved to come back to at a later date—but were then not able to access the saved abstract, and the system would not allow them to begin a new one while the old one was still in process. At last count, last Thursday, we only had 11 abstracts submitted, so the flurry of inquiries yesterday was reassuring.

The Planning Committee has been tasked to reach out to contacts they may have on agency program staffs to inquire about speakers. Kiser has reached out to two people, and expects that we will be able to get speakers from DARPA and NCI. A question to the listserv about arts and humanities funders produced a number of good possibilities, but no one indicated that they had a contact at the agency or volunteered to reach out to the funders that were identified. Peggy Sundermeyer suggested, and Kiser agreed, that the listserv members who recommended the agencies might be willing to reach out to the one(s) they nominated, if asked. Kiser plans to ask them to do so.

Topics for General Session. There is a slot, about 45 minutes long, on the conference agenda that is reserved for some kind of communication from the NORDP leadership on a topic of general interest to the conference attendees. The thought was to have something about NORD or LDRD, but the committee wanted to hear discussion from the Board on what they felt an appropriate topic for discussion at this session might be.

Ioannis Konstantinidis mentioned that the topic had come up at a recent meeting of an EPPD working group that is looking at ways of moving toward a certificate program. Michael Spires, who is one of the members of the working group, added that one of the things they have been discussing is that the working group would not like to get too far down the road without first checking in with the membership about what they want (or expect) out of a certificate program: there's little sense in building something if it isn't going to be responsive to the members' needs. The working group is planning to put in a panel proposal for the conference to discuss its work to date, and will also suggest a roundtable for the same purpose. But the idea was also floated to use this general session slot for two things: first, lightning talks on what the working group has been considering, and then a more open forum where attendees could offer comments, ask questions, or make suggestions about the working group's plans or as an alternative to those plans. The members are concerned that a general session with 400 people in the room doesn't provide a great forum for discussion, so perhaps this isn't the best venue. If David Stone wanted to give a brief update on NORD and LDRD, the working group could present a follow-up or, if he's not yet ready to speak publicly about where NORD and LDRD are, we could pitch the certificate program as a stand-alone. Our thinking is that if the Board feels the certificate program would be a good fit for the general session, we'll withdraw our panel and roundtable proposals and make the presentation here instead. Alternatively, if the Board wants to hold this slot open for something else, then we'll move forward with the panel abstract.

Konstantinidis added that this working group is looking at curriculum as a whole, not just at a certificate program. There are a number of intermediate steps that have to happen before we can produce a certificate program, such as identifying and codifying a body of knowledge, ways of scaffolding (whether content that we already have, or content that we identify through the development of the body of knowledge), etc., so this content is relevant in a discussion of NORD and LDRD. We're trying to jump-start the process of thinking about a certificate, and have been doing work along the lines of NORD. We have some starting points identified (e.g., the survey done by NORDP Northeast in 2013), and feedback about topics that have been featured in webinars and conference sessions. We would present material in terms of what we know from previous work and feedback, and identify the ways the committee thinks would be best to move forward, but ultimately the presentation is less about informing the membership about what we plan to do and more about acknowledging that we are planning, and asking for input about possible directions.

Kiser asked whether we're at a position with our leadership development discussions to start having a discussion on this stage about a certificate program? A roundtable forum or a panel would be good, but perhaps a podium presentation isn't the best venue. Spires responded that we don't want to start the discussion about a certificate program after it's been completely fleshed out by the working group: rather, we want to start the conversation by having a dialogue with the membership that can inform the working group's thinking. We need to know what members want the certificate to do for them. Kiser agreed, but still expressed concern that a podium presentation at the conference wasn't the best venue.

Jeff Agnoli said he didn't feel that the entire membership would likely be interested in NORD or LDRD or certification. A subset of the membership, yes, but not the membership as a whole. Jacob Levin countered that a large group of the members would likely be interested in a certificate program, whether as a way of providing training to new development staff, or to improve their own skills, or even to legitimize their professional development or training for seeking a job. Whatever level an individual member might be at, a certificate would likely be of interest. For new members, they would want to get the certificate to get hired and improve their skills. At a more senior level, you would look to hire individuals who had the certificate. At the very least, it should be easy to put together a presentation about what's already available from SRA and NCURA in research administration and pre-award

administration, the kinds of topics that qualify as classic research development and what might be termed research development that could start a discussion.

More broadly on the general session, Levin added that it would be a good chance to present the big picture. There have been a lot of changes in NORDP over the last year: new initiatives, we're looking to professionalize, bringing on an executive director. To present all of that from a high level to the entire membership would be valuable. Most NORDP members seem to feel they don't know what's going on in the organization beyond what they may be involved in personally, and having the Board or a spokesperson talk about the bigger picture would be a good way to bring the membership into the discussion.

Dresbeck asked about the possibility we might have an executive director by the time of the annual meeting. If we do, that person should probably say at least a few words at the session.

Peggy Sundermeyer agreed with Levin that there would likely be a good deal of interest in a certificate program, but that to do it well, we should first start with a needs assessment. There are a variety of ways to do that, including a panel at the conference, but it's difficult to get quality feedback from a mass meeting. Better to talk about where the board is going at the general session, and then have a separate panel on the certificate program. Spires responded that the working group had already discussed the need for a survey of some kind, which they would like to get into the field in time for the annual meeting, so there would be some foundation to get the discussion started. We don't want to go into the session totally blind, and neither do we want to make it look like we're only interested in hearing from people who can attend the annual meeting since not everyone is going to be able to travel in the prevailing situation of tightening travel budgets. The success of any kind of certification program depends on getting people involved in it, and we don't want to foreclose any potential interest. There are, indeed, multiple ways of getting at the information we need to get started, but we do want to have some kind of discussion at the annual meeting. As Jacob noted, doing so helps us underscore the importance we place on the conversation. Of course, if we announce the session and only get six people in the ballroom, that tells us something also.

Kiser noted that the discussion seemed to be settling around the idea of some kind of expanded presidential remarks on NORDP's progress to date and potential future developments and initiatives, and, if we've hired one by the time of the meeting, to introduce the new executive director and let him/her address the membership for 15 minutes or so about the ED's role in moving those developments and initiatives forward. Dresbeck suggested that it would be useful to do the survey and get feedback on what members want out of a certificate program: if available, those results could be included as part of the broader discussion of future NORDP developments, and we might even be able to present a draft outline of the program if work had progressed far enough to allow for that.

Spires asked, as a follow-up, whether it would be advisable to move the annual business meeting into some part of the general session slot. Doing so would then free up an additional slot for concurrent sessions, potentially boost attendance at the business meeting, and address some of the feedback we've gotten about having it at the very end of the conference as people have to leave to get to the airport. Kiser argued that it wouldn't be a good idea to put those two things together, and Dresbeck agreed, adding that talking about the business of the organization in a general session you want the topic to be uplifting and energizing—and that's just not the annual business meeting. You want people to leave the session with a bigger vision, not the nuts and bolts. Alicia Knoedler agreed that the general session, as the one time during the meeting other than keynote addresses where all the attendees come together—meaning there are new members in the audience, people who are new to the profession, as

well as the seasoned professionals and the members who've been to every meeting—to hear the same thing. We should take an inspirational approach to this, not just report out on different ideas and activities. Dresbeck and Kiser will have an offline discussion to flesh out the topic further.

Karen Eck noted that there are five pre-conference workshops scheduled this year, which is more than were ever offered in the past. Looking at the titles, some of the workshops seem to have similar topics, though it's difficult to be sure without having the abstracts as well. Was this a conscious decision, in the expectation that the demand would be high enough to fill all of the workshops? If so, careful delineation of the workshops' content will be needed to help registrants decide which workshop might be most appropriate for their interests. Kiser agreed that a lot of the titles did seem similar, but her information from the committee responsible for making the selection is that the selected workshops are not all on the same topic. Ioannis Konstantinidis replied that if the titles seem similar, then the titles need to be changed so that they better reflect the abstracts submitted, because the committee discussed the proposals at considerable length and felt there was sufficient variety among the selected applicants that they could all be viable. As to the number, we've offered workshops for two consecutive years and have gotten repeated comments in the evaluations suggesting that there were too many participants in each workshop to allow for the kind of interactivity participants wanted. By offering more workshops this year, the hope is that we can still attract the same total number of participants, but spread them across more offerings, making the workshop experience better for the participants. We have sufficient reason to believe that we'll get enough participants to make the workshops selected to go forward successful. The preconference working group will make every effort in the coming months to work with the presenters to stress the uniqueness of their content.

Jeff Agnoli asked whether there were plans to communicate to the membership some details about the creativity experience, perhaps a short video of the presenter, etc., to generate interest in the session? The announcement of the registration fees is a good time to start promoting the session and giving details about the speaker. Kiser agreed, and added that the committee plans to do so. The signed contract was just sent to Julie Burstein, and she will be sending back a biographical statement and a photo with her acceptance. Jacob Levin agreed that having a short video to advertise the presentation would be a good idea, if she has something available. Kiser replied that she does have a TED talk online, but Levin countered that it's an hour long. What he had in mind was a short clip that could play in the email, or something like NCURA's YouTube Tuesday videos, 2-3 minutes in length, describing what's coming at the meeting. Besides helping inform members about the conference offerings, it would also increase our technological standing relative to our counterparts in the profession who are already using video clips in this way. Kiser will discuss possibilities with Jennifer Lyon. Agnoli added that this might also be something we could do with the new blog, where we could just link to a video.

Member Services – Marjorie Piechowski/Terri Soelberg

Terri Soelberg noted that regional groups are becoming more prominent in discussions that the committee is having. The question came up as to whether regional groups could use our online virtual meeting platform to host virtual meetings, and the response from Ioannis Konstantinidis and EPPD was that they could. Soelberg will reach out to the leaders of the regional groups to get them involved in the committee meetings, so they can get a broader perspective on where things are going, that can then inform what they do with their own groups. Gretchen Kiser asked what regional groups we had that are active, other than NORDP Northeast and Southeast. Soelberg replied that those are the only two currently active; for various reasons, it appears the Midwest group will not be able to get a meeting together this year. Soelberg will work with the liaisons to have them investigate whether other regional groups have formed and would be interested in having access to the software.

The survey is ready to be sent out to NORDP members who have not renewed. Soelberg just needs access to the SurveyMonkey account to get the survey in the field. Konstantinidis replied that he had included the access information in his email to the committee; Soelberg will check to make sure that she has it. Michael Spires added that there's a master spreadsheet on Basecamp with the information for all of our organizational subscriptions. Rachel Dresbeck noted that she'd been looking for that spreadsheet, but hadn't been able to find it. Spires will send the link to the Board.

Soelberg had a question about the timing of the survey, knowing that the Enhancing Collaboration committee is getting ready to put the collaboration continuum survey in the field. While the Member Services survey is likely to be addressed to a much different population, there could be some overlap. Member Services was thinking about sometime in February. Karen Eck responded that a February release should be fine, since the collaboration continuum survey is scheduled for release the first week of January and will run for four weeks, so there would be little or no overlap with another survey in February. Rachel Dresbeck recommended that before the committee sends the survey out, the names of non-renewing members should be cross-checked against the membership list to ensure that individuals haven't simply changed jobs or names, so we aren't sending a survey about not renewing NORDP membership to people who are still on the members list.

Soelberg is looking, as a matter of succession planning and leadership development, to put together a document outlining the duties and responsibilities of the Member Services chair, and also for members of the committee as a whole. If other committees have similar documents, please share them with Member Services. Gretchen Kiser mentioned a draft on the website that covers the committee's duties, but Soelberg was looking for more specific information about expectations for members of the committee (e.g., attendance at a certain number of meetings). A working draft was included with the committee report posted to Basecamp. Dresbeck opined that this was a good idea, and that other committees should follow up.

External Engagement – Jacob Levin

No report. Two individuals responded to the call that was sent out to the listserv, but the committee still needs additional help. Dresbeck will continue putting out a call, and encouraged Board members to think about recruitment for the committees.

Enhancing Collaboration – Karen Eck

No report. Eck thanked the Board for approving funds for participant initiatives. The survey will go out the first week in January, probably around Jan. 4.

Effective Practices and Professional Development – Ioannis Konstantinidis

A full report was posted to Basecamp. Konstantinidis had no items for comment or discussion, but invited Board members to read the full report on Basecamp and contact him offline with questions or to discuss points raised in the report.

Revenue/Finance Committee – Rachel Dresbeck

Peggy Sundermeyer had to leave the call before this agenda item was brought up. Jeff Agnoli noted that the committee is soliciting recommendations for investment services. They have gotten a couple so far, and will look into those and any others that are received, and will make a recommendation to the Board at its next meeting. Michael Spires inquired whether the recommendation he sent in had been received, and Agnoli acknowledged that it had. Dresbeck reminded the Board that the request had been made for members to forward information about good investment service providers, mutual fund managers, etc., that they might be aware of to the committee for investigation.

Dresbeck also repeated the request she made previously by email for anyone with a contact at Thompson Reuters to please forward that person's information to her. They are a past sponsor, but the person who had been responsible for managing NORDP's relationship with the company has taken another job, and we have so far been unable to contact anyone at TR about renewing their sponsorship. Jeff Agnoli recommended that Dresbeck contact Lynda Hartell, director of Ohio State's health sciences library (who has colleagues at Dresbeck's institution). Hartell works very closely with Thompson Reuters. There is word out that TR is about to sell off portions of its holdings, which may be one reason for the difficulty in contacting our previous relationship managers, but Hartell should be able to help contact someone at the firm.

Governance Committee – Michael Spires

No report. As previously noted, the committee will need to begin working on the policies that the Bylaws require to be part of the NORDP Policies and Procedures Document, and will work with other committees and the Board to do so in a timely fashion.

Nominating Committee – Michael Spires

The committee got a very good response to its request on the listserv for expressions of interest in serving on the committee this year: seven or nine members expressed an interest in serving, in addition to several returning members from last year. The committee will evaluate the applications from new members and make selections, after which it will select the two members from the Board needed to complete the committee. Spires has already passed along the requests from several Board members not to be asked to serve this year because of other duties. By January the committee should be up and running, and will be able to start revising election materials on schedule.

Additional Business

Executive Director Search Update – Rachel Dresbeck

We have had about 15 applicants for the position, some of whom would be a good fit for the position. Dresbeck will forward applications to the search committee once we have a sufficiently large pool for consideration. We advertised on LinkedIn, which tends to result in a high volume of applications, though not always with good fit for the advertised qualifications. Some of the other ad placements are also beginning to produce results. Dresbeck encouraged Board members either to consider applying themselves or begin aggressively recruiting individuals that we know, who are more likely to be a good fit with our needs. Dresbeck had hoped we would get more applications from the membership than we have so far: only a couple have come in. It's true that NORDP is a little difficult to explain to people not familiar with the organization, which is where having Board members encouraging their contacts to apply would be helpful.

Policy on Groups Within NORDP – Rachel Dresbeck

Dresbeck asked to table this discussion until next month so it can be fully discussed with the full Board present.

Communications With Membership – Gretchen Kiser

This item will be removed from future agendas until circumstances require it to be raised again. Rachel Dresbeck added that we have a new blog format on WordPress that will relieve many of the bottlenecks we had experienced while trying to use the Memberclicks blog to communicate with membership.

Rising Star Award – Jeff Agnoli

There had been discussion in the past that there was a desire to provide recognition for members new to the profession (with 8 years or fewer of experience, according to Agnoli's recollection) who had nevertheless made substantial contributions to NORDP. The task force is proceeding on the assumption that Board members and current committee chairs would be ineligible for nomination for this award. Up to three individuals could be nominated each year, though fewer nominations or awards could be made. Nominations would come from the membership, and be considered by the conference subcommittee on scholarships, awards and recognition, which would review the nominations and then submit recommendations to the Board. The award would most likely be in the form of a plaque or some other token of recognition, rather than a monetary award, and the awards would be announced at the conference.

Dresbeck urged the task force not to be too prescriptive in its terms. If a rising star is defined as someone early in their career, but service as a committee chair would not be eligible for consideration, what would that person have done for the profession that would warrant recognition? Agnoli replied that the task force was operating on the idea that the committee chairs themselves might want to nominate someone who had served on their committee for recognition, even though the chair him/herself would not be eligible. The language in the working draft was adapted from similar awards language used by other professional organizations, but can certainly be modified if the Board feels it would be advisable to do so, perhaps excluding only current or past Board members from consideration. Dresbeck urged the task force to make that change, and Gretchen Kiser concurred. Jacob Levin demurred, urging that the award be open to Board members who met the other criteria. They would need to recuse themselves from voting on the recommendation, but if we encourage newer NORDP members to consider serving on the Board, we would then be unable to recognize that service even if they were still within the first eight years of their careers. Service on the Board would constitute service above and beyond the norm, and should be recognized. Kiser responded that service on the Board is recognized through a different award; the Rising Star award is meant to recognize other kinds of service. Agnoli added that his recollection was that the Holly Falk-Krzesinski Award had for several years only gone to members of the Board, so the thought was that the Rising Star Award would be different. Levin agreed that the new award shouldn't only go to Board members, but there should be a short, simple reason given for why anyone would not be eligible to receive the award. Agnoli asked Board members with questions or concerns to reach out to him offline and he would pass those on to the task force. Kiser added that three seems too many awards to make in a year: two should be ample. Agnoli replied that the draft criteria allowed for up to three, but with no expectation that all three possible awards would be made each year. The task force wanted to allow for the possibility that multiple committees might want to nominate members, and allowing for up to three awards would give flexibility in considering those nominations. Michael Spires said that three seemed like a reasonable number for a benchmark. We have the option to nominate up to three, but the Board makes the final selection, and would have the option to approve some, all, or none of the individuals nominated for recognition. Agnoli agreed, and added that he felt we should be doing more recognition of individuals for their work with the organization, especially early in their careers, as long as that work was in fact worthy of recognition. Dresbeck added that the award might, similar to the Holly Falk-Krzesinski award, carry a waiver of the conference registration fee as an additional benefit. Agnoli will revise the criteria and send them back out for additional feedback before making a recommendation to the Board next month.

Other Business

There being no further business, Michael Spires moved to adjourn (Gretchen Kiser seconded) at 3:03 p.m. Central. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 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).

Approved by the NORDP Board of Directors at its meeting Tuesday, January 26, 2016.