



NSRF Centers Meeting Recommendations

December 6, 2008 • Chicago, Illinois

This document has been prepared to reflect the thinking of an *ad hoc* group of about 20 NSRF leaders (Centers of Activity representatives and National Facilitators) who had the time, resources, and inclination to spend a day together in Chicago on December 6, 2008 learning about the current state of NSRF in as unfiltered a way as possible.

NSRF Director, Steven Strull, presented on the current conditions of four areas of concern to centers of activity, national facilitators, and the NSRF community at large. The four areas were: 1) Corporate Structure and NSRF role within Corporate Structure; 2) NSRF Budget; 3) Current NSRF Governance Structure; and 4) NSRF Centers of Activity.

The recommendations presented here are context-based and represent the thinking generated in the early part of our day together by all participants at the *ad hoc* meeting.

This is not intended to be a *complete* document – its purpose is to let folks in the NSRF community know the areas the Accountability Council will be considering based on the recommendations generated by the group in Chicago.

As with all documents of this nature, context is important and we urge anyone who has questions, concerns, comments, or suggestions to check-in with someone who was at the meeting.

Present: Susan Adams, Daniel Baron, Fred Bay, Mark Cosand, Susan Dreyer-Leon, Kevin Fahey, Mary Hastings, Frances Hensley, Sue Horan, Marjorie Larner, Margaret MacLean, Tim Martindell, Joe McDonald, Tina Muncy, Carol Myers, Ross Peterson-Veach, Peggy Silva, Stephen Spring, Steven Strull, Heidi Vosekas, Diana Watson

Corporate Structure and NSRF Role

1. Form an exploratory team of the Accountability Council to investigate the best future home for NSRF. Possibilities include:
 - Negotiated agreement with HEC – outline in writing the responsibilities of both NSRF and HEC as the host organization including decision-making structures, financial relationships, and how NSRF will be managed and operated (similar to bullet point above, but staying with HEC as host organization).
 - Independent 501 C3 status – meaning NSRF would become an independent organization.
 - Alliance with another organization – essentially this would mean that we would move NSRF to another host organization and negotiate an agreement with that organization for how NSRF would be managed and operated.

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

2. If AC reaches conclusion that NSRF will either need to be an independent organization or partner with a different host organization, the AC will create a mechanism to support the transition and will negotiate with HEC for a smooth transition including financial transition.
 - Increased membership support will be likely once organizational issues are resolved.

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

Budget

1. NSRF budget needs to be broken out and sorted so that:
 - It's clear what it really costs to run NSRF in all categories
 - Funding to support program development, research and evaluation, financial development, marketing

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

2. Establish an accounting system with consistent processes that allow for more sophisticated planning and evaluation (e.g. connects income directly to expenditures, specifically as it relates to foundation support).

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

Current Governance Structure

1. NSRF have a center-based transparent governance structure with either a strong advisory board (as an autonomous division of a currently existing NFP corp.) or a corporate board structure as an independent 501c3; in either case with non-NSRF affiliated critical friends on the board
 - Definitional work we need to do: what is a center, how do independent facilitators fit, what the role of AC.

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

NSRF Centers of Activity

1. Re-establish centers council and charge them with discussion/recommending things on A and B:
 - A. Set of agreements (standardized and written between National and COAs – a mutual agreement to support the work)
 - B. Define COA- inductive process at beginning and principles as 2nd step (ex. Must have one NF member)

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

2. Part of the work of the center is responsibility to and participation in the governance of the organization.

*Unanimous support both individually and center**

**Those of us present felt we should acknowledge the fact that we were hardly a representational group, but in fact an ad hoc group of those who had the inclination, time and resources to attend. Additionally, although we all represented Centers of Activity, we all felt those present should have the opportunity to say that we were speaking for*

ourselves only, rather than representing the voice of our Center without first discussing the issue with our Center.

Therefore, we wished to allow a way of indicating the level of consent or disagreement within each recommendation. After each recommendation was presented, a show of hands was conducted to get a measure of the level of consensus, first as individual, and then as representative of a center.

To our collective surprise, we reached universal unanimity.