

Minutes, NAFA Board Meeting
Friday, April 25, 2008, 1:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
The Kreeger Room, Hotel Palomar
2121 P Street, Washington, D.C.

Board Members Present: John Bader-Johns Hopkins University, Joanne Brzinski-Emory University, Doug Cutchins-Grinnell College, Amy Eckhardt-University of Pittsburg, Beth Fiori-Cornell University, Paula Goldsmid-Pomona College (via Telephone), Jane Morris-Villanova University, Ruth Ost-Temple University, Linna Place-University of Missouri at Kansas City, Mona Pitre-Collins-University of Washington, John Richardson-University of Louisville, Camille Stillwell-formally University of Maryland, Alex Trayford-Wheaton College, Tara Yglesias-Harry S. Truman Foundation, Paula Warrick-American University.

Board Members not Present: Scott Henderson-Furman University

Non-Board Members Present: none

Quorum Present: Yes

Materials Distributed:

Proceedings:

Meeting called to order at 11:03 p.m. by NAFA President Paula Warrick, American University

Paula Warrick opened the meeting with a welcome to Tara Yglesias as the newest member serving as the Foundation Liaison.

Motion to Accept Minutes from Last Meeting: Correction to the Board Members Present – John Bader and Joanne Brzinski were present and added. [Scott Henderson via a latter email confirmed that he was not present.] Minutes passed.

Treasurer's Report by NAFA Treasurer John Richardson, Louisville University – Details will be forthcoming at the April Meeting. As of December 4, 2007, there were 192 members who have paid with 100 outstanding. 15 Foundation have also paid. John will send reminders out. Current balance is \$175K. Keep in mind that we have not spent that much as of this date. There will be bills coming from the work of various committees.

Paula Warrick added an item – scheduling the spring in-person board meeting.

COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Strategic Planning by Jane Morris, Villanova University – Committee members are John Richardson, John Bader, Doug Cutchins, Mona Pitre-Collins, Scott Henderson, and Tara Yglesias. Suzanne McCray also joined the Committee. There was a telephone conference meeting December 12, 2007. (Minutes of the strategic planning meeting are available.) Basic items were around the development of a NAFA Strategic Plan with a look at some of the important component parts: reviewing the mission statement, timeline for completion (about nine to ten months so tentatively the beginning of the 2008/09 academic year), and hiring a facilitator to help us through the process.

Sub-committees were created to gather information: Jane Morris and Suzanne McCray will look at NAFA goals in conjunction with a survey of members' office goals. Paula Warrick and Tara Yglesias will look at NAFA goals from the foundations perspective so that could be factored into the development of the strategic plan – what they perceive as the role of the university representative and what they see as their role within NAFA.

Questions: Doug Cutchins inquired about the suggestions of using the services of Steve L. as a possible facilitator. Paula Warrick indicated that it would be important to do a cost analysis and to also look into the possibility of using someone who would be in close proximity of the April in-person board meeting which would eliminate travel, accommodation cost on top a consultant's fee.

Biennial Conference Report by Mona Pitre-Collins, University of Washington – Logistics: Jane Morris, John Richardson and Paula Warrick joined Mona in Seattle to review various hotels sites for the 2009 Conference. Choices would be narrowed down looking at the following criterion: 1) site should be able to accommodate all of the membership in rooms on site, 2) good flow of the layout of the meeting rooms, and 3) will NAFA be the primary conference or will we need to share space with another group. Hotel room rates vary from \$209 to \$179 per night. Possible dates for the 2009 Conference would be June 23 at the earliest to week of July 26 at the very latest. Note we would be coming to Seattle during the peak season so hotel rates will reflect this. We are hoping to make a decision by February 2007. Mona is beginning to work with a group of local university and college representatives who have indicated an interest in working in various capacities.

Program: We are looking at possible themes with a current working draft as '*Building Foundation, Building Partnerships: Paving Avenues for Success.*' There are a number of philanthropic organizations in the Seattle area so are creating a way to connect that to the conference theme. We will do a 'Call for Papers' combined with invitations for presentations and panel presentations from foundations. Currently considering two pre-conference workshops on Wednesday morning, a Boot Camp for new advisors along with a professional development piece for veterans. Start time in the early afternoon on Wednesday and the final dinner event on Saturday pm.

Questions: Amy Eckhardt voiced concern around the hotel room rate and if there would be a possibility of a reduction as a result of further negotiations? Paula Warrick indicated that this is the first conference venue held during peak season (end of June through September) – the tourist season in Seattle. Also, the trend for conference room rates shows an increase of about 20-24% for each conference. However, the goal is to keep it affordable for all members.

Linna Place questioned the merit of placing the UK Scholarship Foundations at one time and towards the end of the conference. Would it be possible to have individual foundation presentation placed across the schedule? John Richardson brought up the financial penalties that accrue when meeting room goals are not met. The strategy has been to hold the UK Foundation presentations until the end to keep members throughout the totals days. Jane Morris also indicated there is a challenge getting everything covered in the days allotted. Having a block helps with the organization of the schedule.

Scott Henderson added that most conferences he has attended have the culminating event the last night which keeps the hotel booked. Why not a Saturday night event for NAFA? Paula clarified that the 2007 was, she believed, the only conference scheduled this way. The objective was to give members an opportunity to get more flexible travel arrangements, which in hindsight, was contrary to our aforementioned goals. John Richardson noted that although we asked for guarantees for Saturday night at the Louisville Conference in 2005, we still had 20% no shows.

NAFA International Study Trip to Germany and the UK Report by Amy Eckhardt, University of Pittsburg – There are some constraints for this upcoming trip. The major one is financial, impacted greatly by the descent of the dollar. The planning committee wanted to see what additional things they could do to round out their experiences so that participants would be a bit more active in visits to the colleges and universities in both the UK and Germany. Much like previous international trips, they created two stand alone trips to make it financially manageable for the membership. They would try their best to keep the cost of each trip to \$1700. Participants can choose to go only to Germany or only to the UK.

The Germany Study Trip is a bit longer than the UK trip, about 10 days (May 31st to June 10th). The rationale is that it's the first time in Germany. Also the planning committee received a large grant of \$20,000 from DAAD and Fulbright to underwrite some of the cost of the trip, which was really wonderful. Participants will need to arrange their own travel from Germany to the UK. The UK Study Trip (June 10th to June 17th) follows the model of the 2004 with extended time in London (about 4 days). There then be two days each scheduled at Oxford and Cambridge. One of the main emphases would be to have as much informal student interaction built into the program. Also they are working with the colleges to see if participants could have accommodation at the residential colleges similar to the experience at Wolfson College at Cambridge. It's one of the big questions that students have about the residential colleges. Participants could create a report from those experiences for dissemination to the membership. They are in contact with Mary Denyer who would be an important player and will contact the Gates Cambridge Commission. Peter Patrikis, with the Churchill Foundation, is working to arrange free meeting rooms in Churchill College at Cambridge. The Planning Committee, in reviewing the budget, is looking at ways to cut costs as much as possible. So looking to the possibility of getting free meeting rooms at both Cambridge and Oxford

To save on the cost of printing materials as well as being environmentally friendly the planning committee is looking to provide compact discs for participants and to post things onto a blog site. There would be programs. Participants would be able to print what they want. This will also save on the shipping costs for all that paper. One new thing is the creation of a reading list to go with the trip related to culture, history, education, policy – things related to the countries and the universities we would be visiting.

The committee will meet in the middle of February to finalize plans. We would like to get out a call for applications by the end of February with a relatively tight deadline to provide enough time but not so much that it's forgotten. There are things that need to be finalized once numbers are secure.

Questions: Concerns about the indemnity issues were addressed to John Richardson. The trip is unique so it would have to be separate. Jane Morris had suggested to the group that it was something that needed to be addressed. Paula suggested that the Exec Board would work with Amy on this concern.

Joanne Brzinski noted how stunned she was by the hotel costs in London due to the falling dollar. Given that it might make more sense to spend fewer days in London and shift the meeting elsewhere. They are looking at accommodations at the Goodenough Club and asking if participants could have single rooms as a result of feedback from previous trips. Because the British Counsel and the Marshall are based there, we thought it was worthwhile to spend a few days, along with the fact that there are a number of schools located in London. Thought it was a cost effective way to see a number of different schools.

Paula commended Amy and her committee for the excellent work and for getting a substantial donation from DAAD and the Fulbright was really quite impressive.

2008 Regional Workshop Report by Joanne Brzinski, Emory University – This is a work in progress. They had a committee meeting on December 14, 2007 and has just a preliminary report, however, Joanne believe they will have something more definite by the end of February. They are looking at developing three workshops, one for new advisors and two on different topics for veterans. Potentially there would be workshops developed for veterans in the New York and in Oregon, and one workshop for new advisors in Arkansas.

The planning committee is composed of previous regional workshop organizers and there are things they would like NAFA to provide for those who are planning these regional workshops.

1. A centralized registration process so that participants can use credit cards. Paula indicated that we are currently investigating possible groups like Ticket Master and Cvent who set up an online registration process that would allow us to handle all of our programs – trips, summer workshops, conferences. They take a fee per registrant. We need to explore in depth to see if this is cost effective.
2. Moving forward, we need to put together a notebook of best practices, challenges, a how-to that we can give planners. The thought is that these workshops will be smaller, about a maximum of about 40 to 50 participants.
3. They would like to have plans in place for the 2010 regional workshops that can be presented at the 2009 conference. Their proposal is that at the end of spring 2008, they would send out a call for proposal due August 1 for 2010 and get some volunteers who would have time to work on the workshops, develop a good structure with dates.

There were conversations about connecting with working 2008 regional conference committees to give them the go-ahead to begin their planning process in earnest. There may be current individuals with an interest. Joanne has agreed to create a more permanent structure for the development of proposal for workshops during the off conference years.

John Richardson indicated that NAFA should provide seed money to groups doing regional workshops to provide upfront funds prior to the registration process.

Amy Eckhardt motioned that NAFA provide seed money for groups doing workshops. It was seconded by Jane Morris. The motion was passed by the board.

Ethics Committee Report by Paula Warrick, American University – Suzanne McCray and Beth Powers as our past presidents are heading the Ethics Committee. They have plans to meet with the total committee during the summer. NAFA will be funding that get together for those individuals.

Suzanne was placed on the Strategic Planning Committee with Jane Morris, partly because of all of us, she has the most experience with strategic planning and because ethics is so closely related to the overall strategic planning process. We felt it was important to have a tie-in with those two committees. The goal is to have ethics filtered into the revised mission statement that we develop for NAFA. More on that to come.

NAFA Publications Report by Amy Eckhardt, University of Pittsburgh – The theme being ‘passing the torch.’ At the last board meeting, Amy indicated that the current team was ready to pass the torch. Judy Zang has drafted an email but the question is how to proceed. Should there be a general call for volunteers or would members have possible suggestions for a chair of the committee with a call for additional volunteers. Amy’s concerns were that this is an important position and it is critical to have a strong chair to make sure that the work is in secure hands. The Journal is a big job with lots of responsibility. With a chair in place, it would be possible to solicit volunteers to work on the committee.

Consensus was that a chair should be selected first. Paula suggested that board members think about who might be appropriate for this role. The present format, a publication committee of three, would not necessarily need to continue although it seemed to work well for the present group.

The 3:00 hour – Paula polled the group to see if we could continue for another half hour. There was consensus and the meeting continued.

NEW BUSINESS

Paula Warrick indicated that, as a result of conversations with Tara Yglesias, looking to add a second foundation liaison. The rationale is that the foundation voice is so important to the functioning of the board and to our relationships with the foundations; this would provide more coverage on the board. It would also provide Paula and Tara with a partner on a project to cultivate relationships with local foundations in Washington D.C. who have come to our conferences but have stayed peripherally involved. Paula suggested that we add Liz Veatch as the second foundation liaison. Both Paula and Tara work well with her. Also, she has been the one foundation representative who has come to them with the most creative ideas and has demonstrated the strongest interest in the work that the board does. She now is the director of the Critical Language Scholarship Program and is now in a director role with a scholarship foundation. Consensus was that adding a second liaison with Liz Veatch in that role was a very good idea.

Jane motioned to add Liz Veatch as the second Foundation Liaison and was seconded by Linna Place. The motion passed. Paula will contact Liz to see if she were in fact willing to assume the position.

Paula's second item was on the focus of her presidency for the next two years. Much of the committee work is headed by other members and Paula would like to play a more active role in pursuing the NAFA mission. Paula proposed the creation of a few new committees. The first would look at the development of professional development for NAFA. This would involve taking some of the data that Amy Eckhardt has developed through her surveys and using that to look at ways that we can lobby for ourselves as a profession. This would involve helping the membership look at what we do in higher education as part of a career trajectory and devising techniques to help members lobby for resources within their institutions, looking at salary standards and negotiation processes. What are the best practices for lobbying for resources for our offices within the organization? This might be implemented as a Boot camp on professional development to coincide with the boot camp for new advisors at the 2009 conference. Another is to look at these issues to see how they might fit into the strategic planning process and might there be resources that we would place on the website or bulletin board. Consensus was that this was a good idea and Beth F, Amy Eckhardt and Camille Stillwell volunteered to work with Paula.

Paula's third item involved the fact that this is the first time that we have had a NAFA president located in Washington D.C. and a vice president in Philadelphia close to the New York foundations. This provides the opportunity to cement relationships with foundations who have only participated peripherally with NAFA like the NSF, Javits or the State Department, who come to our conferences. If we did some site visits to provide additional information, how we see them being involved, essentially raising awareness of NAFA as an organization, it might be easier to have some traction with these groups as we plan for our conferences. The challenge is getting the foundations to give more than generic information sessions which become less interesting the longer you have been involved with NAFA. This might facilitate more creative ways that foundations can share their expertise with our group. Tara, Jane and Paula would develop strategies for connecting with foundation. Consensus was very positive. Paula suggested that if there were ideas or topics that they should address with foundations, they should be sent directly to her.

Paula's final item was researching how fellowship offices recognize faculty who devote themselves to this work in support of our offices. There are institutions who fail to clarify to faculty if they consider this teaching or service and there are strong implications as to how they get recognized in the merit review process. Propose to research the best practices across the country on offices that recognize faculty who support their work – counting their work as teaching, providing stipends for the work they do or developing creative ways in the office to acknowledge faculty work. This would be something that could be presented to upper administration. Would there be general interest on the board. Amy suggested that Karina Walters had an interest and Linna Place also volunteered. Initial thoughts were to do an anonymous survey to get some general information.

Other thoughts – Amy suggested thinking about travel two years out for 2010. Joanne suggested that as a young organization it was more in line to do things quickly, 'on the fly.' However as we have begun to mature, it is important that things occur more thoughtfully and carefully which takes planning on a longer timeline. It is important to begin to develop permanent structures to help with the planning process. Amy is very interested in staying connected with the Travel Committee to do long range planning and will check with existing members to see where their interest would be in

continuing. Amy also expressed interest in bringing Chris Powers with NSEP-David L Boren. This is also a good time as we are marketing the 2009 conference to also request bids for the 2011.

Next item dates for the in person board meeting – Planning meeting for mid to the third week of April. NAFA would cover the cost of travel and accommodations.

Any other items -- None

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.