

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

Tuesday, January 26, 2016

President Rachel Dresbeck called the meeting of the Board of Directors, National Organization of Research Development Professionals (NORDP) to order at 1:33 pm Central on Tuesday, January 26, 2016.

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

Approval of Draft December 22 Board Meeting Minutes – Rachel Dresbeck

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

Committee Reports:

Executive Committee – Rachel Dresbeck.

The Executive Committee met January 12 and had no action items that will not be discussed elsewhere on the agenda for today.

Executive Conference Committee – Rachel Dresbeck

The committee met last week and evaluated proposals received by Designing Events for several cities in the Midwest/Mountain region (in Colorado: Denver, Keystone, Breckenridge, and Colorado Springs; in Utah, Salt Lake City; in Nebraska, Omaha). A number of these options were considered and found to be non-competitive, largely because of increased cost and difficulty of travel. Site visits are being organized for two sites in Salt Lake City and four sites in the Denver metropolitan area. Michael Spires added that the Denver site visits will be held next Wednesday (February 3). Dresbeck said she hopes to have a recommendation for the Board to consider by the next meeting.

Peggy Sundermeyer posted draft procedures for the Executive Conference Committee to Basecamp. Ioannis Konstantinidis asked whether these were for information only or if we needed to vote on them. Sundermeyer said that we would eventually need to approve them by a formal vote, though since they had not been cleared through the Governance Committee, perhaps that vote should wait until the next meeting. Michael Spires replied that as long as Board members had had the opportunity to read the procedures and were ready to discuss them, there was no reason not to go ahead with discussion and a possible vote. Sundermeyer reviewed the main points from the procedure as follows:

- A minimum of five members, at least two being from the Board, one of whom must be either a former conference chair or conference program chair;
- Continue using the services of a conference planning firm;
- The committee recommends the regional rotation for the conference;
- The committee solicits suggestions for sites from regional membership once the region has been decided on, and also volunteers for site visits and site managers;
- The committee should plan at least two years in advance; and
- The committee works to a defined set of site selection criteria, but has the opportunity each year to refine those criteria (e.g., to take advantage of unique opportunities that would enrich

the conference experience for membership, and also taking into consideration feedback received from previous conferences).

Konstantinidis asked about the Attachment B referenced in the document but which was not included with the file. (The attachment contained the prior site selection criteria, which were provided as an example.) Sundermeyer replied that the reference to Attachment B was left over from a previous draft, when the selection criteria would be provided separately. In the draft that was posted to Basecamp, those criteria are described in the section entitled "Operations of the Committee." Sundermeyer proposed amending the draft document by eliminating the reference to Attachment B. Konstantinidis also pointed out that in Attachment A we name Designing Events as the "event consultants" for NORDP. Sundermeyer replied that this reference should also be removed. Sundermeyer will make those changes and will email a revised document to Board members for consideration within a few weeks. Dresbeck suggested voting on the procedures at the next Board meeting.

2016 Conference Committee – Gretchen Kiser

The program committee is reviewing abstracts submitted for both oral and poster presentations. Kiser noted that initially she was concerned when, a week before the deadline for abstract submission, only 40 had been received. In the end, 84 were submitted, so half of the people submitted abstracts within the final week—and possibly the final day. Initially only 12 were identified as posters, with the rest being oral presentations. This will clearly have to be revisited, since there are only five concurrent sessions planned for the program, and the committee, trying to be responsive to critiques from previous conferences that there are too many concurrent talks, would like to keep the number of talks down to no more than eight at each session. This will allow a good number of the abstracts submitted as oral presentations to be given as talks. The committee will likely need at least one more meeting to finalize the selections.

There are a lot of very interesting topics that will serve the membership well. There are also some repeat proposals, and the committee is working on how best to deal with proposals for talks that are given by the same person each year. Some of those may be moved into the category of Fundamentals, but the program committee generally feels that proposals from the same presenter(s) for a talk that was given at last year's conference should generally not be accepted for oral presentation in the subsequent year. Kiser asked for the Board's input on that consensus of opinion. Ioannis Konstantinidis asked if the committee knew how those repeat talks were received the previous year. Kiser replied that she didn't know directly, but had the impression that they had been well-received, which strengthens the case for including them as a Fundamentals talk. Some of the repeat proposals, though, were less suitable for Fundamentals talks, either because they were not as broad as they needed to be, or were more advanced than might be suitable for an audience of members new to the field of research development. It's not that the talks aren't good, we just don't want to have the same talks by the same people every year. Konstantinidis replied that EPPD might be able to work with some of the presenters if a webinar would be a suitable vehicle for their presentations. Kiser noted that the committee had already suggested that as a possible option at its meeting yesterday. She added that while duplicates had been permitted in the past, in order to keep growing, it would be preferable to adopt a policy that while there would be certain slots for Fundamentals talks that could be the same each year, otherwise we would not encourage the same person to give the same talk every year. The consensus of the Board was that this would be a good policy. Michael Spires added that this is the rationale we want to stress going forward: we want to build our members' knowledge and capabilities. Certainly one part of professional development is presenting at meetings, and if we've always got the same handful of people giving the same talks, first, that freezes other people out of an opportunity to present, and second, we run the risk that people will come to the conference for two or three years and conclude that there's no point in

coming back, since they've already heard all the presentations before. Also, thinking ahead to next year, would we want to consider including a statement in the call for abstracts that proposals for repeat talks would be considered only after a lapse of at least one year, or two years? Moving forward, we'd want to have that in the call so we set up the expectation right from the start that new content is preferred. Kiser replied that her preference would be that no talk would ever be given twice, outside of the recognized Fundamentals topics—where we would usually proceed via invitation, rather than through considering abstracts submitted in response to the general call. Also, some of these talks would become part of our certification process, or folded into LDRD, as learning experiences related to a body of knowledge, rather than as fresh topics that would be given at the conference. Rachel Dresbeck concurred: there is some material that is truly fundamental to the profession, and those talks are always well-attended, especially when we have outstanding presenters for them. Wouldn't it be great if we could ask such people, not to give the same talk every year, but to put their talents into the certification program? Dresbeck counseled against writing language such as Spires suggested into the call for next year right away; rather, let's make a note of it as something to consider and evaluate when the time comes. By this time next year, we will have made progress on certification and other goals, and it would be preferable to write a call that reflected that progress.

Kiser added that the third keynote speaker has been identified and confirmed: Michelle Bennett, the director of research strategy for the National Cancer Institute. We now have three keynotes, with the exception of Molly Broad from ACE. She was supposed to get back to us about her availability by the end of January, but Kiser has not heard from her. If she comes back, there is a lunch slot where another keynote could work, but otherwise the keynotes are all set.

Kiser also uploaded the summary budget to Basecamp. Given that it was just posted today, Kiser will postpone discussions until the next meeting when Board members will have had the opportunity to read it over. Peggy Sundermeyer responded that she had read it, and that it looked in line with the Board's goal of having the conference be self-sustaining without consideration of sponsorship revenues. She recommends one change (which she has already emailed to Kiser): there has been discussion in the past about whether or not the president's reception was a legitimate cost for the conference budget, with the Board consistently arguing that it is a legitimate expense. Since the summary budget currently shows a surplus of approximately \$1,700, Sundermeyer recommends allocating that amount toward the president's reception, since it is an event for keynote speakers, sponsors, Board members, and other invited guests. Typically, it has cost approximately \$1,200 in recent years, so there would still be some cushion for other expenses if needed. Sundermeyer also added that the budget draft references the dinner for the Board of Directors meeting. That is not charged against the conference, it is a Board expense since we take advantage of the fact that we're all coming to the conference to have an in-person meeting. Kiser added that she had just received information from Kari Whittenberger-Keith that no travel costs would be needed for the pre-conference workshop speakers, and while they are planning to increase the honoraria for those speakers, there will still be some savings realized there as well, making it feasible to add the president's reception to the conference budget. Kiser suggested approving the budget via email or at next month's meeting once Board members have had the chance to review the updated version.

Dresbeck brought up the Board meeting at the conference, since members are beginning to make their travel plans. After discussion in the Executive Committee, the plan is to start the Board meeting between 2:30 and 3:00 p.m., and then continue it over dinner. Board members should plan to arrive in Orlando on Sunday, May 22 by roughly 2 p.m. if possible. Members traveling from the west coast may need to plan a Saturday arrival to be available on time, but the Board will cover the cost of the extra night's stay at the hotel since it is for Board business. Once Board members' travel plans are known,

please send them to the Secretary (with a copy to the President), and we will look at options: we may need to move the meeting time to accommodate, but we have flexibility.

Dresbeck also gave a sponsorship update. We currently have commitments of \$22,000 with more pending that should come through in the next several weeks, so we're on schedule. We have some new sponsors, and some previous sponsors who aren't sponsoring this year for reasons not related to NORDP. Dresbeck asked Kiser if she had an updated figure for registrations this year, and Kiser replied that her recollection from the most recent meeting was that we had 45.

Member Services – Marjorie Piechowski/Terri Soelberg

Terri Soelberg uploaded the meeting report to Basecamp. It is encouraging that the committee is starting to get a clearer picture of its roles and responsibilities, identifying projects, and people are beginning to volunteer to take on some of these new projects. A couple of things to highlight:

- A working group is engaging in a survey of best practices on membership drives, and the committee hopes to have a report ready for the full committee by next month's meeting.
- Two committee members volunteered to revisit our professional services directory. Marjorie Piechowski reported that while this list has historically been made up of people who self-selected, she and a colleague will begin developing a methodology and criteria for identifying and soliciting names to be added to the list, so it can provide a broader selection of options. Gretchen Kiser inquired what the methodology would be, and Piechowski replied that it was still to be determined. Kiser recommended that once a methodology and criteria have been drafted, they should be discussed by the Board before being implemented. Rachel Dresbeck concurred, and asked the working group to present a report with recommendations for both criteria and how to decide on the basis of criteria.
- Soelberg has gotten a list of NORDP members who did not renew, and has a five-question survey ready on Survey Monkey. She needs to go through the list and check that none of the non-renewals identified has since renewed, but once that has been done, the survey will be sent out within the next month.

External Engagement – Jacob Levin

No report in the absence of Jacob Levin. Peggy Sundermeyer remarked that External Engagement has been paying NORDP's memberships in APLU and Board Source, both of which are coming due soon. She suggested encouraging the committee to review those memberships and their costs and make a recommendation to the Board. Sundermeyer will provide the relevant information to Rachel Dresbeck for forwarding to the committee. Dresbeck added that the Board needs to begin thinking about how we want to handle external engagement. While all of us have full-time jobs and work on NORDP in our free time, we do need to keep this committee functioning. Succession planning is something that we should consider as a group and managing more actively than we have been.

Gretchen Kiser noted that she, together with Cassie Rauser and Peg AtKisson, will be presenting next month at AAAS on alternative careers with a focus on NORDP. Karen Eck added that she has been invited, along with Ken Gertz from Maryland, and two other NORDP members whose names she doesn't recall, by postdocs at NHLBI to speak about alternative careers in science in May just before the annual meeting. The invitation came after NHLBI contacted Sundermeyer, who provided Eck's information. Eck inquired whether funding support might be available to cover some of the costs for the trip to Maryland. Dresbeck replied that she should apply to the External Engagement Travel Scholarship program, which has about \$6,000 remaining in funds for this year. Sundermeyer noted that there were also funds available for Board travel related to NORDP. Eck indicated that her travel costs would be fairly minimal: a round-trip train ticket and a one-night hotel stay, probably not amounting to more than \$225.

Dresbeck suggested using the Board travel funds since the amount was small, which leaves the committee funds for supporting regular members who are appearing on NORDP's behalf. Eck asked about procedures, and Sundermeyer replied that she should send her expenditure report, with receipts, to Dresbeck and copy Sundermeyer. Dresbeck also asked Eck to write a short story about the presentation for the NORDP blog, and Eck agreed to do so.

Enhancing Collaboration – Karen Eck

The survey is ongoing. The third incentive recipient was just named, and the first two recipients have already claimed their prizes. Eck has receipts for those and will submit them through channels. The survey is open until midnight Saturday, and one further prize drawing will be held for those who complete the survey this week. Some members reported not receiving the survey link, but Eck has been providing it to those who have inquired. There have been 102 responses to date, and Eck thinks that more will come in during the final week of the survey. Quyen Wickham has begun downloading some of the responses and doing preliminary work developing rubrics for data analysis, which will begin formally in February after the survey closes. The hope is to have between 125 and 150 individual responses by the time the survey closes. Each individual response can have up to three or four anecdotes, so there will likely be more data points for analysis than the number of individual responses received.

Effective Practices and Professional Development – Ioannis Konstantinidis

Konstantinidis has not yet filed the full report: most of the working group meetings were late because of the holiday break. Briefly, some updates:

- Mentoring. The website will go live in mid-March, the plan being to put participants into small groups and provide some preliminary coaching before they are matched one-on-one with mentors. More details will be available shortly. The survey is ready to go live, and the working group is reviewing technical issues to make sure that the website will work once live.
- Webinars. There is a webinar scheduled for February 11. An announcement will be coming out soon for NORDP's first-ever online workshop, which will be a series of online presentations and homework assignments. The workshop will be limited to 25 participants. This is a pilot program to see how it plays with the membership; a meeting will be coming up this week, and Konstantinidis will have further updates next month.
- Pre-conference workshops. Kari Whittenberger-Keith will do an online training course for presenters.

Konstantinidis was approached by the mentoring group on Friday. They think they would like to have a networking event for program participants at the conference. They're still working on details, but wanted to know if there might be funding available to support such an event. EPPD does not have funds, and the function is not strictly a conference event, so it probably should not be funded from the conference budget. Konstantinidis would like to get a sense from the Board about supporting a networking event for the mentoring group from another source. Peggy Sundermeyer asked if the group had given any indication of how much funding would be needed, but Konstantinidis replied that they did not give any numbers at all. The group doesn't know what they want the event to be: some kind of a session that would require space at the hotel and catering, or perhaps an outside function at a restaurant. Konstantinidis wants feedback on the things we should be asking the mentoring group to consider before they get too deep in the planning for this event.

Rachel Dresbeck replied that we need to be extremely careful about promising space at the meeting: it's in short supply, we have a packed program, and a lot of people asking for space already for regional meetings and similar events. A catered function at the hotel is probably more than we can afford to support, but there might be a few hundred dollars for some kind of happy hour, possibly at a hotel bar

or restaurant. We want to support our members and their professional development, but we're an all-volunteer organization that gets most of its funding from members' dues—we need to be good stewards of those funds. While the mentoring program is extremely important, we do need to be careful about appearing to provide support to some groups but not to others. Peggy Sundermeyer concurred with the suggestion of perhaps providing a free drink for a happy hour in one of the hotel's public spaces. That would cost a couple hundred dollars, but would still demonstrate the support of the Board for the program. Gretchen Kiser inquired whether the mentoring program might want something more focused, and Konstantinidis replied that it would be by assigned groups. It could still be done in a hotel common area, as long as it was clearly by invitation for the members of the mentoring program. Assignments to the groups could be made ahead of time. Kiser suggested having the people planning this event keep in touch with her so she can coordinate planning for the event with Dianne Norcutt. We don't want to schedule the mentoring event at the same time as some other big draw, or at a time when it will be inconvenient for invitees to attend, so keeping her in the loop will be a big help. Konstantinidis agreed to do so.

Revenue/Finance Committee – Peggy Sundermeyer

Sundermeyer noted that the audit has stalled. Sundermeyer hoped to get it completed in the fall, but the auditors have asked for more documentation than Sundermeyer could provide before Thanksgiving, and the auditors were busy during December and have not had a chance to review all the materials. Moving ahead, Sundermeyer has sent most of the needed documents to the auditors a couple of weeks ago. We've had to file for an extension for filing our 990 while we wait for the audit to be completed, which was automatically granted. The audit has turned out to be quite a bit more work than originally anticipated, especially the time needed for retrieving records. Illinois requires annual audits, so this is likely to be an ongoing issue unless things will proceed more smoothly after we've established a baseline with this first one.

Rachel Dresbeck asked for thoughts on the timing of the announcement of the new member dues rates (approved by the Board at its meeting December 22, after discussion by the Executive Committee December 8). Gretchen Kiser had asked that we delay announcing the increase so as not to depress registration for the conference, but Dresbeck feels the announcement needs to be made in a timely way to prepare people. Kiser suggested waiting until after the early bird registration period has closed in early March, which should minimize the impact on conference registrations. Sundermeyer asked if the increase took effect July 1; Dresbeck replied that it would be for renewals after July 1. But announcing it now allows people to renew early if they want to avoid the increased fee. There will be some impact on NORDP's bottom line initially if people choose to renew early to avoid the increase, but since we aren't currently paying salary for an executive director and won't be for some time yet, the impact should be small. Sundermeyer suggested not delaying the announcement much beyond the end of the early registration period—we want to give no less than 90 days' notice, but more is better. The consensus of the Board was to announce the new rates after the end of early registration.

Jeff Agnoli provided an update on the ongoing research into investing a portion of NORDP's reserve funding. The working group (Agnoli, Sundermeyer, and Konstantinidis) has looked at four different options. Although the working group has not yet made a recommendation, Agnoli feels that engaging a community-based foundation may be the best option. A community foundation will have experience in managing funds for non-profit organizations, and would basically set up an endowed fund for NORDP and invest it at a very low cost (in comparison to other approaches we might consider). They also can set up a giving portal, where we could provide a direct link on our website for NORDP members to make donations that would be credited directly to the fund. At least the Columbus foundation that Agnoli spoke to for background would also provide information and education to the Board on how to manage

the process, market it to the membership, and invest the funds. Other options the working group considered were 401(k) and retirement providers who, while they don't have a lot of experience in managing funds for non-retirement savings, were willing to consider doing so—for some fairly considerable fees. Some for-fee organizations were also contacted. These would manage the funds for NORDP, but are not compensated by the funds they invest in, and so depend on the fees they charge their clients. Although the company approached by the working group was willing to offer NORDP a substantial discount on their fees, they are still not as affordable as the community foundation would be.

A question Agnoli proposed for the Board to consider is where we might want to invest the funds. If we go the community foundation route, almost all major cities have one. In Chicago, where we are incorporated, it's the Chicago Community Trust. There may be advantages and disadvantages with one provider over another. Between CCT and the Columbus Foundation, each has between \$1.7 and \$2 billion in assets, so neither is a small operation. The Columbus Foundation is more educationally oriented and provides more information on its website. Agnoli has uploaded some documents from the Foundation on Basecamp for the Board to review, and the working group will provide a formal recommendation for next month's meeting.

Rachel Dresbeck asked the working group to provide a spreadsheet that gives some detail about the various community foundations we might consider, and why we might (or might not) want to consider investing with them, before the Board makes a decision. This is consistent with our historical practice (e.g., when the decision was made to use Basecamp), and would give guidance for the Board to utilize in its consideration. Even if the decision has to be deferred to complete this research, we want to make the right decision. Recognizing that it will take a considerable amount of work to provide that spreadsheet, Dresbeck offered help from the Board to complete the research if needed. Agnoli replied that the working group will consider the information and develop a strategy to approach getting the research done. It may be possible to get benchmark information from some of the foundations, which would help to expedite the process. Dresbeck also noted that if we commit to creating an endowed fund, we are committing to an organization for the long haul. We will want to be careful and consider all of the rationales before we make such a commitment.

Governance Committee – Michael Spires

No report.

Nominating Committee – Michael Spires

The committee has been set for the 2016 cycle. This year there is at least one representative from every NORDP region, which the committee is happy about. The committee had its first meeting about a week ago to consider the draft of the call for the membership to apply (or nominate someone) for a ballot slot. The committee has made some changes to the wording from last year's call, removing the question about interest in an officer position, since that is not a criterion the Nominating Committee considers. In place of that question, we're going to add a question for members who are eligible for election to one of the designated seats asking them to describe how they plan to bring that experience, perspective, and expertise to the Board. In response to comments we received after last year's election process, we are also going to beef up the information in the call about how the designated seats work, since people indicated they didn't understand what those seats were or why they were important. Information from the questionnaire that applicants fill out is also what the committee uses to create the candidate's profile information that will appear on the actual ballot, so we wanted to include that for those candidates eligible for the designated seats. The committee will get the Memberclicks forms updated and hopes to have the call out to the listserv by the first week in February. The deadline for nominations

will be March 14, and applications will be due March 28. This gives the committee a couple of weeks to contact individuals who were nominated by someone else, verify that they are willing to run, and get them to complete the application so the committee can consider their application with the others. We're a little behind in terms of the standard timeline, but since the annual meeting is late this year, the committee will have ample time to complete the selection process, announce the candidates, and start voting on time before the conference. The committee opted for a slightly longer nomination period this year, in the hopes of avoiding the need to extend the period to drum up more candidates, as happened last year when we did not have a sufficient number of applicants for the open slots by the end of the nomination period.

Rachel Dresbeck asked Spires to lay some groundwork for the announcement of the call in his January blog post on behalf of the Board, which Spires agreed to do. Spires added that the committee wanted to include the names of the committee members in that posting, since the composition of the committee was not announced last year. Dresbeck suggested including some information on how the committee is formed and operates as well.

Additional Business

Executive Director Search Update – Rachel Dresbeck

The application process closes at the end of the month. The search committee has had some informal discussions via email, but has not yet had a formal meeting. Dresbeck will send out some information and set up a Doodle poll to schedule that first formal meeting later this week. We've had a lot of responses through LinkedIn (almost 60 applications), but only a handful of those applicants went on to complete the requested information (e.g., the values statement and the other documents that were discussed at the Board retreat last August). Dresbeck would like input from the Board on how to handle these incomplete applications. There are six that are complete, including several who look like viable candidates. Dresbeck is disinclined to consider people, at least initially, who did not complete all of the requested application materials by the deadline. If none of the candidates with complete applications turns out to be viable, then the search committee could go back and look at other candidates with incomplete applications and invite them to complete. There was agreement from Gretchen Kiser and Jeff Agnoli.

Michael Spires inquired about procedure: As applications have come in, have we contacted or communicated with applicants in any way? Dresbeck replied that she had been. Spires noted that the problem Dresbeck described is one that happened repeatedly in his experience managing faculty hiring processes. Where candidates can more or less automatically apply for positions, and if they are told what materials their application is still missing and do not provide the missing materials in time, then absolutely they should not be considered. But if we are telling candidates that their applications are missing required elements, then we should give them time to provide those missing pieces. If they do so before the closing date, then we should consider their applications on the same footing with those that were completed without being prompted. If they're still not willing to complete the application file, then clearly they're not sufficiently interested in the position to warrant being considered for it. Kiser expressed concern about the amount of work that doing so would require from Dresbeck, who replied that the candidate pool more or less falls into three categories: excellent fit, good fit, and no fit at all. Peggy Sundermeyer suggested focusing first on the candidates with complete files by the time the application period closes, without automatically rejecting those with incomplete files at that time. If the committee doesn't find a good fit from the pool of candidates with complete files, it can then revisit those with incomplete applications and invite them to submit additional documents. The consensus of the Board was to proceed as outlined by Sundermeyer.

Jeff Agnoli asked about the timeline for the search process. Dresbeck replied that ideally the committee will review applications in the next few weeks and will begin interviews. Some recommendations will be made for the Board to consider by the March meeting, after which negotiations will begin. The Board will be involved in the interview process as well, and Board members should expect to receive invitations for some kind of interview with each of the candidates, perhaps through a videoconference application such as what we use for webinars. Spires noted that discussion had taken place recently, either at the last Board meeting or in the Executive Committee, about the possibility of calling a special Board meeting just to discuss the executive director candidates since we will need a great deal of time for review and discussion—something we don't want to have to try to squeeze in around committee reports and other business. Dresbeck said she had meant to mention that special meeting, and thanked Spires for the reminder. Details will be forthcoming once the process is sufficiently far along to allow for scheduling to take place.

Policy on Groups Within NORDP – Rachel Dresbeck

This discussion will be tabled until next month's meeting.

Rising Star Award – Jeff Agnoli

A draft set of guidelines was posted to Basecamp, and feedback has since come in from Peggy Sundermeyer, Alicia Knoedler, and Gretchen Kiser. Would the Board care to take a vote on implementing this award today, and leave the working group to work out a final set of guidelines and procedures based on feedback received, or would Board members prefer to wait to vote until those guidelines and procedures have been finalized?

Kiser replied that her main concern lies with allowing for up to three awards. Her preference would be for no more than two. Michael Spires disagreed, recalling the discussion at last month's meeting where it was stated that the decision on the number of awards is entirely at the Board's discretion. People can nominate as many recipients as they want, and the Board has the option to accept some, all, or none of those nominations. We want to encourage members to get involved with the organization earlier in their careers, and this award recognizes that involvement, whereas limiting the award to two people in a given year tends to diminish its value as an incentive.

Rachel Dresbeck said that she had no strong feelings either way on this question, and invited Kiser to explain why she would prefer to keep it to no more than two awards. Kiser replied that, perhaps motivated by conference planning concerns, she was thinking about the problems we've had in the past just giving out one award at the awards luncheon in a way that made it at all impactful for the recipients. The more recipients we have, the harder it becomes to make that happen. Certainly we want to encourage participation, but perhaps there are other means of recognizing effort and participation, perhaps documentation for those who donate volunteer time or include in their evaluation portfolios. If we specify up to three awards in the guidelines, then we have to be open to the possibility of making three awards, and we would then have to purchase awards in whatever form is decided: plaques, statues, etc.

Agnoli replied that he liked the idea, as a young organization, of recognizing more people rather than fewer. Perhaps down the line, after we've been giving out this award for a while, we might want to adjust the number in some way. But at the beginning of the process, better to go bigger. He added that Knoedler's feedback contained a question that might be worth further consideration: do we want to ask people who have been nominated for the award to provide additional information to supplement what was provided in their nomination (a short CV, for example, or a personal statement)? Knoedler felt that doing so might be problematic, especially if the nominator didn't want the nominee to know s/he had

been nominated. Dresbeck agreed that asking for additional information was unnecessary if people are nominating individuals they know personally—and that asking for additional information from nominees could make them less inclined to accept their nomination in the first place. Kiser concurred, saying that the nominees were to be judged on their service to NORDP, not on their degree or other factors. Peggy Sundermeyer noted that if the Board doesn't agree to implement the award soon, we won't have time to solicit and consider nominations before the conference. We don't have to announce how many awards we're making, just that there will be an award, and the process for nominating and being considered. Once the nominations are in, the Board can consider how many awards it wants to make. Michael Spires moved (seconded by Jeff Agnoli), to implement the Rising Star Award as a pilot this year, and to allow the working group to refine the procedures so that a timely announcement can be made relative to the annual meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Agnoli also reminded Board members about the Holly Falk-Krzesinski award. Dresbeck asked Board members to consider potential nominees, since that process will also need to begin soon in order to make an award at the conference. Agnoli asked to be reminded about the procedure: does the Board make recommendations to the committee, which then reviews them and submits a recommendation back to the Board? Peggy Sundermeyer replied that individual Board members make nominations to the committee. Dresbeck added that the committee then forwards the nominations received to the Board for its consideration. Agnoli asked Board members to submit nominations to him directly, and he will pass them along to the committee. He will also send a communication to the Board members asking for nominations.

Dresbeck asked Agnoli to have the committee write up some information about the Rising Star Award. That can be posted to the blog and sent to the listserv to generate interest. Kiser added that the information can be added to the conference program.

Other Business

There being no further business, Michael Spires moved to adjourn (Rachel Dresbeck seconded) at 3:04 p.m. Central. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spires, Secretary

Note: The next Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 22, 2016, from 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central Time (2:30-4pm Eastern, 11:30am- 1pm Pacific and 12:30-2pm Mountain).

Approved by the Board of Directors at its meeting February 23, 2016