

NCME Board Meeting Minutes
January 31, 2014
San Francisco, CA

In attendance:

Wim Van der Linden, President
Laurens Wise, Vice President
Greg Cizek, Past President
Susan Brookhart, Board Member
Cindy Walker, Board Member
Amy Hendrickson, Board Member
Huafang Zhao, Board Member
Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee
Susan Rees, TRG
David Frisbie, Chair of Alternative Meeting Committee
Jennifer Kobrin, Recording Secretary

In attendance via phone:

Terry Ackerman, Chair of New Annual Meeting Committee
Mark Raymond, Chair of Publications Committee
Linda Hargrove, Chair of Fund Development Committee
Cathy Wendler, Member of Fund Development Committee
Sharyn Rosenberg, Chair of Membership Committee

Not present:

James Wollack, Board Member
Joseph Martineau, Board Member

Wim Van der Linden began the meeting at 9am.

Wim announced the election results. Richard Patz is incoming vice president. Won Chan-Lee and Kristen Huff are incoming board members. The changes in the bylaws were approved by the membership.

Linda Cook provided a memo summarizing the status of the NCME Breakfast Sponsor fund raising. She has been very successful in getting NCME sponsors.

Wim asked for any comments on the minutes from the October 2013 Board meeting.

VOTE: Susan Brookhart made a motion to accept the minutes. Laress Wise seconded the motion. All board members present voted in favor of accepting the minutes.

Discussion of Agreement between NCME and AERA for Provision of Meeting Services

The current agreement with AERA was extended with an increase in costs of 4%. AERA came back with a modified version of the agreement, which the Board discussed. NCME already had agreement for 2014, and AERA will honor that agreement. A separate agreement is being negotiated for 2015 and 2016. There are three issues that need additional discussion: cost of registration personnel, food and beverage guaranteed minimum of \$50k, and increase in cost of management services.

The first issue has been removed because NCME does not need AERA staff to help with registration. NCME countered with an offer to be responsible for \$30,000 food and beverage minimum, where AERA had \$50,000. Susan Rees expressed some discomfort with the wording of the contract because it is not clear whether NCME will pay the food and beverage fee to AERA, or directly to the hotel. Anne noted that NCME does not have the budget for an additional \$20k on food and beverage. For AERA's centennial in 2016, NCME will agree to 3 non-compete timeslots for the Presidential Address, the Awards Luncheon and the Opening Plenary. There will be no non-compete agreements for 2014 and 2015.

Wim agreed to increases in management services, but suggests that NCME take this opportunity to discuss current issues that need to be addressed with the system in lieu of these increased costs. These issues include the conflict resolution process, and enabling NCME to have more say in the choice of its headquarter hotel.

Publication Agreement for Standards

David Frisbie and Laress Wise gave an update on the publication agreement for the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. The joint management committee selected AERA as the publisher. While the three organizations (NCME, AERA, APA) are getting closer to an agreement, the remaining issue regards derivative products. In the event that derivative products are developed, these should not undermine or compromise the content or compete for sales with the *Standards*. The Board discussed whether the joint management committee should be in the position to make these decisions, and whether all three organizations should be involved in development of these products, and split the profits from these products. The Board felt that there should be an agreement for development of derivative products that needs to be signed by all three sponsoring organizations.

Laress recommended giving the management committee authorization to continue these negotiations. He recommended deferring to AERA because they are publisher and have most at stake.

Susan Rees noted that copyright and distribution rights are two separate issues, and that distribution rights are not spoken to in the current agreement. She suggested making it explicit that the three organizations should agree on distribution conditions. A legal review may be sought to ensure that individuals cannot distribute and get royalties on derivative products without unanimous agreement of management committee.

VOTE: Laress made a motion that the executive committee be delegated the responsibility to continue discussions of the agreement and take necessary steps to finalize it. Greg seconded the motion. All board members present voted in favor of the motion.

Ad Hoc Committee on the NCME Annual Meeting

Terry Ackerman joined the meeting via phone at 10:10 am.

The ad hoc committee on the NCME Annual Meeting developed a comprehensive report with options and suggestions for future annual meetings.

David Frisbie thanked Anne Fitzpatrick and Terry Ackerman for their work on the report. The report presented to the Board in October was updated and supplemented, and included the committee's recommendations. The report describes four different scenarios:

- 1) Renew current contract with AERA (done for 2014)
- 2) Renew contract but negotiate modifications
- 3) Don't sign contract but hold a separate meeting at the same time and place as AERA
- 4) Don't sign contract and hold a separate meeting at a different time and place as AERA

The committee recommended scenario 2 (extend AERA contract with modifications). All three committee members believe that it is in NCME's best interest to stay with AERA. There are persistent issues/obstacles but very few NCME members are aware of these. It is important to face these obstacles head on with AERA, and be more active in negotiations. If this doesn't work, the committee recommended scenario 3. David went over the pros and cons of scenario 1 and scenario 2 (detailed in the committee's report). Greg Cizek noted that we need to prime the membership that there may be a change coming.

The committee's second recommendation is to create a new standing committee, and discussed a proposed composition and charge for this committee, highlighting activities that could be addressed right away. The committee would lend some stability to program planning over time. Wim asked if this committee would be part of the negotiating process. It would be helpful to have some of the committee members involved in the negotiations with AERA. Laress asked the ad hoc committee to start structuring this committee and get it in place by the annual meeting in April. Terry Ackerman said he would be willing to lead this process. Susan Brookhart noted that it will be important to have someone with experience and skills in negotiating.

David noted that NCME should be doing marketing. The website can be better used to market to our own members. We don't try to attract others to our annual meeting by reaching out to other organizations. Anne mentioned that there has been money in the budget to do this but it hasn't been used in a consistent manner. Wim added that Susan Loomis agreed to oversee the communication process to advertise the annual meeting.

The ad hoc committee's fourth recommendation was to create a mobile app for the annual meeting. Ungerboeck has one as part of their software.

VOTE: Lauress made a two-part motion: 1) to accept all four of the ad hoc committee's recommendations. 2) to appoint a standing committee immediately with Terry Ackerman as the chair. Cindy Walker seconded the first motion. All board members present voted in favor of the motion. Cindy Walker seconded the second motion. All board members present voted in favor of the second motion.

The Board held additional discussion on the motion before voting:

Susan Brookhart cautioned that if NCME moved too quickly to separate from AERA, the membership composition could change and could risk losing members. She would like to see a strong effort to make scenario 2 work. Cindy added that if we did a better job at marketing we could attract new members. Keeping the meetings at separate times would allow members to attend both, since there is too much going on to be able to take full advantage of both meetings when they are held together. In scenario 3, NCME would most likely have access to a hotel that is located too far away from AERA sessions to make it easy for members to attend sessions from both organizations. If scenario 2 doesn't work, it may be best to consider scenario 4.

ACTION ITEM: Appoint Annual Meeting Committee and develop text for the handbook to describe the new committee (Wim, Laurie, Terry)

The Board discussed the timing of communication to the membership, a membership survey, and whether to ask the new Annual Meeting Committee to provide input on the survey. Greg, Cindy, and Susan drafted a membership survey. The Board provided suggestions for revising the survey. The Board agreed to wait until the NCME Breakfast to introduce the topic and survey to the membership. The survey will be administered after the Annual meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Email blast to membership that this committee has been formed and its charge.

Strategic Plan Update

Lauress Wise gave an update on thinking about NCME's strategic plan. He examined documents on NCME's mission, vision and goals, and looked at what was done in 2007 and 2010. Lauress suggested that every 4-5 years, the Board should revisit the strategic plan, and in the short-term give some thought to the metrics to evaluate progress towards goals. The Board will plan to spend time at the summer board meeting to discuss modifying the strategic plan to make it current.

The Board discussed the purpose of the strategic plan and how it can be used and implemented. Greg recommended that the Board think about the mechanism for translating the strategic plan into actual operation of the Board.

Fund Development Committee Update

Linda Hargrove and Cathy Wendler joined the meeting via phone at 1:04 pm.

The committee proposed a five-year plan. Linda gave an overview of the committee's background and recent work. In August, the Board approved the committee's request to meet in person. The committee met Nov. 16-17 for a day and a half. A consulting firm has been contracted to work through June 2014. The term "Mission Fund" has been adopted in place of development fund.

The committee proposed a five year plan, with three phases of implementation:

- Phase 1: Immediate short term
- Phase 2: Short term
- Phase 3: Long term

Three main planning areas are: (1) identifying major grant categories for Mission Fund support (graduate students, early career professionals, and outreach); (2) a donor solicitation plan; and (3) a communication plan. The three implementation phases were specified in each area.

The donor solicitation plan is represented by a three tiered pyramid organized by number of donations and gift sizes. There would be a very large number of lowest-level donors, a large number of mid-level donors, and a small number of lead donors. The bottom tier would be the focus in 2014-16, the middle tier in 2016-19, and the top tier in the long term.

The fundraising campaigns would include: a President's campaign launch (2/2014, goal \$15k); and a general membership launch (4/14-16, goal \$40k). The campaigns would continue through 2019, with a focus on increasing donations and developing other gifts (goal \$150k).

The committee drafted general text as a basis for communication which describes the purpose of the Mission Fund and why it is important. The messaging will be tailored to potential donor groups. Communication is planned for the upcoming annual meeting (e.g., flyers at the NCME Breakfast).

The committee suggested major categories for mission fund support – graduate students, early career professionals, and outreach. Funding is anticipated for specific activities in the short term, and other activities in the long term as funding permits. The committee will provide regular updates to the Board on the Mission Fund totals and recommend grant allocations. Selection subcommittees will be appointed for each grant category in July 2014.

The committee outlined a general application process that applies generally to the three fund categories. The objective is to demonstrate consistency and good stewardship through grants made to encourage continuing and increased donor support.

The committee recommended next steps and activities to occur by/before the April 2014 annual meeting, and by/before the January 2015 Board meeting.

Amy asked about the plan for soliciting and evaluating proposals. Linda noted that the subcommittee would develop this plan. Cindy asked about the continuity – whether the donations should be deposited into an account to accrue interest. Anne agreed that the goal is to develop something sustainable. Linda agreed that continuity is important and the committee will address this. Wim requested that the committee outline the financial arrangements when they are in place. Greg asked if the consultants could provide rules of thumb for the proportion of the campaign that should be set aside to sustain the program over the coming years.

Anne noted that a potential donor might want to know right away how the money will be used, and suggested giving the option for contributing multiple years in a row. Greg suggested writing this into the plan, and asked about equity for providing travel for graduate students who do not receive support. Perhaps this can be part of the “spirit” of the policy that equity should be taken into account.

Wim asked about ways to reach potential donors. He suggested developing a set of materials to describe the fund and make clear about its purposes and procedures. He also suggested revisiting the donation categories. He suggested thinking more broadly about funding categories, such as defending the measurement profession, supporting symposia, etc..

Greg asked the extent to which the current categories give flexibility to do these kinds of things. Could a school district apply to NCME to get a grant to try an innovative assessment? Perhaps add another category for special projects that advance the mission of NCME.

Wim would like to modify the category for early career scholars. Lauress pointed out the difference between early career scholars in testing companies and those in academia. Cathy Wendler clarified that the purpose of this category was for early career scholars in academia. Anne recommended not

precluding that the fund be used for operational costs, and to accept unrestricted donations. Amy asked why the outreach category excluded NCME initiatives.

Wim suggested that the committee continue to work on the report, with the help of the consultant. The committee can continue to plan for activities at the annual meeting. The committee was asked to work on the materials/documents to share with donors, and continue to plan for the President's Fund. Cindy noted that it is also important to think more broadly about potential donors, and who will be solicited.

Program Committee

The program committee submit a report providing an update. The newsletter has a summary of the highlights of the annual meeting. The program for the annual meeting is complete.

Susan Rees suggested changing the format of the newsletter with clickable links. TRG has templates that can be used.

Budget and Finance Committee Update

Anne asked the Board to review the audit of NCME's 2012 financial statements. The audit was consistent with our findings. Board approval was requested.

VOTE: Laress made a motion to accept the audit report. Amy seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Anne reviewed NCME's financial portfolio and reported revenues of 676K. Sponsorships have been supporting annual meeting costs. The net was about 156k, with about 113k in returns from investments.

Membership Committee Update

Sharyn Rosenberg joined the meeting via phone at 2:26 pm.

David Frisbie and Kris Waltman conducted a member retention study. They examined member data from 2006-2013. For each year, they formed a cohort of student members and regular members, and followed cohorts to examine retention. The report shows the percentage of members that retain membership in each year. About half of the student members are no longer an NCME member after two years.

There was some discussion about how long graduate students are registered as students, and whether there should be an imposed limit on the number of years one can register as a graduate student.

Since 2007, attrition of non-student members is about one-fifth after one year and about one-fourth after two years.

David recommended doing this analysis every year. The results suggest that NCME should give attention to decreasing the attrition of student members. He had several other recommendations to follow-up on the findings that are detailed in the report.

Lauress suggested surveying the members who don't renew to learn about their reasons for not renewing. Wim suggested adding a few questions to renewal email asking for information if a member doesn't renew.

Sharyn provided an update on the Membership Committee's activities. As of Dec. 1st, membership was back up to over 1,900. There was a change in policy in the call for proposals that the proposal submitter must be a NCME member, but that requirement was not checked. Sharyn was asked to contact submitters who were not members to join right away. These individuals were asked to join for 2014 even though the proposal submission was in 2013. Sharyn sent emails to 143 individuals in mid-December and early January. Of these, 98 people joined. The spreadsheet with the names of those who did not join were sent to the program chairs. Sharyn recommended that the membership requirements be checked earlier going forward. She suggested giving members their membership numbers that they can fill in when they submit a proposal.

Lauress suggested modifying the policy, such that every proposal needs to be either submitted or sponsored by a member, and every presenter needs to register for the conference. There also needs to be a check that individuals registering for the annual meeting are actually members.

Publications Committee Update

Mark Raymond joined the meeting via phone at 3:00pm.

The publications committee reviewed the NCME handbook and made editorial suggestions. Sue Brookhart noticed some inconsistencies that need to be addressed. The section on the ITEMS editorial board was removed because this does not exist. The newsletter editor gets less secretarial support than JEM or EM:IP. The website editor is not addressed. Anne clarified that the Board decided to give \$6000 support to all editors (p. 28).

The committee proposed a new grievance procedure, which would differentiate between a procedural and substantive appeal. The editor's decision should stand unless there is a compelling reason to overrule it. Regarding the procedural appeal, there were no comments. Susan does not agree with the need for a substantive review. She thinks the editor should have the discretion. She suggested revising the grievance procedure to only allow for procedural appeal. Greg suggested that the substantive appeal goes to the editor only, and suggested adding text that there is only one appeal and the final decision of the editor and publications committee is final.

The publications committee can serve as advisors if an editor encounters difficulties with appeals. Mark suggested that the role of the publications committee is to determine if there is any evidence that the editor's decision was unreasonable.

ACTION ITEM: Publications committee will review the text again and make it more precise.
--

ADA Policy

Susan Rees reported on the progress in developing an NCME accommodation policy. Such a policy includes two parts: access to facility and access to information. AERA is responsible for ensuring access to facility since they sign the contract with the hotel. NCME has a responsibility for providing a reasonable accommodation regarding access to information. The AERA registration form asks if the attendee has special needs, so NCME is covered. Susan has language that we can consider if we want to write up a formal policy. Wim asked if NCME should budget for accommodations. Anne thought it was not necessary since the requests are rare.

ACTION ITEM: Add text to the handbook regarding our ADA policy.

Update on Executive Director (ED)

TRG hired a new ED but they are still negotiating with the Psychonomic Society to determine if they need a full-time ED. If they need a part-time ED, the new hire will be assigned to NCME part-time.

The Board held an Executive Session.

Diversity and Testing Committee

Amy Hendrickson reported that Claudia Flowers, the chair of the Diversity and Testing Committee, is putting together a proposal for NCME affiliation with a new journal. The committee will be asked to describe what the affiliation would entail/look like. The publications committee will review this.

Awards Committees

Huafang Zhao reported that the winners of the NCME awards have been selected. The Annual Award committee had only three applicants, and the dissertation award only two applicants. Receiving nominations for committees is an ongoing concern. Board members discussed possible solutions, such as having monthly e-blasts to encourage nominations. Amy suggested asking for nominations at the NCME Breakfast. Wim suggested thinking about revisiting the award structure and potentially consolidating or modifying the awards (e.g., make the awards biannual). He suggested asking the chairs of individual awards committees to meet and consider these ideas.

The new Career Award committee completed their call for nominations and developed a new timeline that should be included in the NCME handbook.

ACTION ITEM: Revise text in handbook describing the Career Award committee

ACTION ITEM: TRG to reinstate process to collect information on committee volunteers as well as awards nominations.

ACTION ITEM: Chairs of award committees should meet and discuss ideas for increasing nominations and/or consolidating or decreasing the frequency of awards.

The Website committee requested software to add the Gala timeline to the website.

The Outreach committee asked the Board for input on whether the committee should do a survey of graduate programs in North America. The Board agreed that this should be done.

Wim concluded the meeting at 5:41pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin
NCME Recording Secretary

NCME Board Meeting Minutes
April 3, 2014
Philadelphia, PA

In attendance:

Wim Van der Linden, President
Lauress Wise, Vice President
Greg Cizek, Past President
Susan Brookhart, Board Member
Cindy Walker, Board Member
James Wollack, Board Member
Joseph Martineau, Board Member
Amy Hendrickson, Board Member
Huafang Zhao, Board Member
Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee
Susan Rees, TRG
Jennifer Kobrin, Recording Secretary
Terry Ackerman, Chair of Annual Meeting Committee
William Skorupski, Training Program Chair
Won Chan Lee, Incoming Board Member
Mark Raymond, Publications Committee

Wim Van der Linden called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Wim Van der Linden welcomed Won Chan Lee as a new incoming board member.

Wim Van der Linden asked the Board to review the minutes from the January meeting.

Cindy Walker moved to accept the minutes from the January 2014 Board meeting. Susan Brookhart seconded the motion. All board members present voted in favor.

Wim Van der Linden reviewed the action items from the January Board meeting.

There was discussion about the awards and lack of applicants over the last several years. Board members suggested potential new award categories: service to measurement, quality of manuscript reviews. Huafang Zhou and Won-Chan Lee will convene the current award committee chairs and propose ideas for addressing these needs.

Update on *Standards*

Lauress Wise gave an update on the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. The publication is delayed, primarily due to problems with the indexing. The Management Committee is

setting up a process to take orders. Greg Cizek noted that a copy of the 1999 standards was posted on the Internet; a lawsuit has been filed against the individual who posted them.

Update on Annual Meeting Committee

Terry Ackerman gave an update on the Annual Meeting Committee. The committee members include Andre Rupp, Ye Tong, April Zenisky, Jiao Liu, Jane Shepard, Susan Loomis, and Michael Rodriguez. Immediate tasks will include contract negotiations with AERA, and a survey of membership regarding options for future annual meetings.

Terry Ackerman drafted text for the handbook describing the committee; the text will be ready for review by the Board during the summer board meeting. Terry will announce the formation of the committee at the NCME Breakfast.

Update on Sponsorships

Anne Fitzpatrick gave the report on sponsorships on behalf of Linda Cook. This year, donors gave between \$1,000 and \$7,000, with a total of \$66,500 to date. This is a record amount and the number of sponsors has increased. The Fund Development Committee (FDC) recommended contacting organizations earlier in 2014 (June rather than September). Greg Cizek pointed out that all organizations get the same recognition no matter how much they donate. Anne will forward this comment to the FDC for their consideration of possibly distinguishing recognition in the future.

Lauress Wise noted the potential conflict in soliciting sponsors for the annual meeting and soliciting donors for the development fund. He suggested that the FDC address and clarify their strategies for soliciting sponsorships and donors for the development fund.

ACTION ITEM: Anne Fitzpatrick will ask FDC to address/clarify strategies for soliciting sponsorships and donors for the development fund.

Budget Update

Anne Fitzpatrick went over the timeline for developing NCME's 2015 budget. She noted that committees that need funding should work with TRG to get cost estimates.

Publications Committee Update

Mark Raymond provided an update on the revised grievance procedure for authors submitting manuscripts to NCME publications. The publications committee revisited the current appeals policy and made revisions, including feedback they received from the board in January. The board reviewed a new draft of the grievance policy text.

The text describes three categories for rejection of a manuscript, the first two of which warrant appeal: due process was not followed, technical error, and policy decision. Wim Van der Linden suggested providing an overview of these three categories at the outset.

Greg Cizek noted that the current policy specifies two adjudicators: one chosen by the author, and one chosen by the editor. He felt that this could be a conflict of interest, and could create an acceptance bias.

Joseph Martineau suggested that the author and editor could each submit three names but the publications committee can choose any three among the six. It should still be a double-blind review. Cindy Walker suggested that one adjudicator could be chosen by each of the parties: author, editor, and publications committee. The board agreed with this approach. Jim Wollack suggested adding a step where the editor and committee decide if the grievance falls into one of the categories.

Susan Brookhart commended the Publications committee for their effort.

ACTION ITEM: The Publications Committee will make final changes to the grievance policy text, and the Board will approve and vote via email.

Update on Recognition Committees

Huafang Zhao provided an update on the NCME award committees. She noted that there was a problem this year with some award winners not being current NCME members. The award selection process needs to include confirmation of membership before making final award decisions.

There was discussion among the board about whether a nominee should be required to be a member both the year they are nominated/considered and the year they are selected. Nominations come in November, are finalized in February (membership ends Dec. 31st). Jim Wollack asked whether nominees can be asked to become members for the following year (and get payment in advance at the time they are nominated). Susan Rees confirmed that this can be arranged. The Board agreed to remove the limitation that an award nominee cannot be considered for an AERA award, as well as the requirement of membership at the time of nominations.

ACTION ITEM: Huafang Zhao will make changes to the award nomination calls to clarify membership requirements.

Update on Training and Professional Development Committee

William Skorupski gave an update on the training and professional development committee. There were 19 training sessions this year: 9 full-day and 10 half-day sessions. Approximately 300 members participated in the sessions. Two sessions had less than 10 members; others had about 15. Next year's chair will look over the last few years of enrollment. If the goal is to maximize enrollment, members seem to be most interested in software training. The board agreed that the goal is not only to maximize enrollment but to serve our members.

Update on 2014 Program

Kathleen Scalise and Paul De Boeck presented the program committee report. There were some issues with the program software, which will be documented for the future program chairs. Kathleen noted a concern about attendance at the electronic board sessions. The original idea was to have lunch available during the session, but the costs were too prohibitive. Board members were asked to advocate for members to attend these sessions.

Nominations and Elections Committee

Anne Fitzpatrick went over proposed revisions of the text in the handbook pertaining to the nominations and elections committees.

Joseph Martineau suggesting adding an introduction stating that combining the nominations and elections committees is in conflict with the bylaws, and stating that a member cannot serve simultaneously on both committees.

Greg Cizek noted that all biographies of candidates should be reviewed before they are published.

The Board discussed the text about tabulating votes and agreed that this has to be defined, now that the vote is held electronically. Joseph Martineau would like a member of the elections committee to obtain the electronic data file and calculate the vote independently of TRG. Jim Wollack suggested not limiting the elections committee to individuals in close proximity to Madison, WI.

VOTE: Greg Cizek moved to accept the proposed nominations and elections committee text. Joseph Martineau seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor.

Wim Van der Linden expressed appreciation for Greg Cizek, Jim Wollack, and Joseph Martineau who are outgoing board members.

The Board held an Executive Session.

Wim Van der Linden adjourned the meeting at 7:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin, NCME Recording Secretary

NCME Board Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2014
Philadelphia, PA

In attendance:

Wim Van der Linden, Past President
Laureess Wise, President
Richard Patz, Vice President
Susan Brookhart, Board Member
Cindy Walker, Board Member
Amy Hendrickson, Board Member
Huafang Zhao, Board Member (joined at 5:48 pm)
Won-Chan Lee, Board Member
Kristen Huff, Board Member
Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee
Susan Rees, TRG
Jennifer Kobrin, Recording Secretary
Linda Hargrove, Chair of Fund Development Committee
Mark Shermis, Budget & Finance Committee
Ye Tong, 2015 Program Co-Chair
Jennifer Randall, 2015 Program Co-Chair
Rochelle Michel, Bradley Hanson Award Committee Chair
Susan Loomis, Fund Development Committee
Linda Cook, Fund Development Committee
Anne Davidson, Chair of Archive Committee

Laureess Wise called the meeting to order at 4:05pm.

Welcome/2014-15 Priorities

Those present at the meeting provided brief introductions. Laureess Wise stated that the Board will spend time at the July 2014 board meeting discussing NCME's strategic plan and updating our objectives for the next year or two.

Annual Meeting Evaluation

Susan Loomis discussed a survey about changes to the Annual Meeting. Susan asked the Board for feedback on the survey. Wim Van der Linden noted that the survey did not have any questions of the reviewers, and Laureess Wise stated that there will be a separate survey for the reviewers. Susan would like to send the survey by April 10th or 11th.

ACTION ITEM: Susan Loomis will add a question to the survey on whether NCME members attended the conference, and if not, why not?

2015 Annual Meeting

Caroline Wiley, the 2015 Training and Professional Development Chair was not able to attend the Board Meeting. Laress Wise indicated that she has been working closely with the past chair, William Skorupski.

The 2015 Program Co-Chairs are Ye Tong and Jennifer Randall. The potential theme for the 2015 program is "Expanding Innovation and Impact". Ye and Jennifer solicited informal feedback from this year's conference attendees. They will be meeting in May to discuss plans for the 2015 program. Ye shared thoughts about combining the electronic board session with a reception. Ye and Jennifer will discuss potential use of other conference rooms during the electronic board sessions. Laress Wise also asked Ye and Jennifer to think about whether invited addresses should compete against one other, and whether there should be a plenary session. Richard Patz noted the problem that very popular sessions were held in small rooms, and asked if there is any way for program chairs to predict the high volume sessions and plan for space accordingly.

Anne Fitzpatrick noted that the B&F committee will need cost estimates from the Program Committee in July.

Laress Wise noted that we don't have a contract with AERA and a priority is to finalize the contract. He talked with NCME past presidents about the general strategy of getting AERA to see NCME as more important. Terry Ackerman had a conversation with Lorrie Shepard, who suggested getting members who are active in AERA to help us in this strategy.

Fund Development Committee (FDC) Report

Linda Hargrove and Linda Cook gave a report on behalf on the FDC. The fund has gotten a few donations to date. Linda Hargrove talked about upcoming communications. The contract with consultants will end at the end of June. The brochure includes a few check-boxes for potential funders to indicate if they want to direct donations to a particular goal, or want information on legacy planning.

TRG can provide reports regularly on the contributions. The communications will involve outreach to past presidents. Linda Cook noted that the notion of a president's fund was well accepted by the past presidents. Linda Hargrove provided the Board with a copy of the letter that will be sent to past presidents. There will be a follow-up phone campaign, where five past presidents will each call about five others.

ACTION ITEM: Linda Hargrove will get comments from the board on the letter and send a draft to the Executive Committee by next week.
--

The members section of the website will have additional information on the development fund. The FDC will want to post a blurb on the main website page. Other publicity will include information in the newsletter, and possibly an advertisement in EM:IP.

Cindy Walker asked if there were plans for outreach to organizations outside of the membership. Linda Hargrove said that the FDC has discussed this for the long term, and will get input from the consultant.

Linda Hargrove discussed the major categories of funding, based on comments from the last board meeting. The FDC will continue to look at priority categories for funding, and will make recommendations at the next board meeting; they will also develop a policy that will outline reserve amounts. One of the two consultants for the FDC will make suggestions for a marketing plan, gift acceptance policies, starter and funding priorities, and stewardship aspects of the fund (spend-to-save ratio, restricted vs. unrestricted donations, etc.)

Lauress Wise emphasized the importance of having exemplars of the money doing some good. He would like to have something concrete (what the money will be used for, given certain amounts collected). Wim suggested offering several possibilities to suggest to potential donors (e.g., invited lecture series).

Anne Fitzpatrick asked if the plan is to allocate funds immediately or to pool the funds collected for use next year; and asked how this will be represented to potential donors. There is concern members would like to see the money being used. In July the FDC will present the Board with potential ideas for using the funds, and will then communicate this to the membership. They think they can use the money collected from the membership to fund some visibly attractive projects. Cindy asked about the feasibility of sustaining the fund. The FDC is hopeful that the membership will continue to donate so that the fund is sustained.

Lauress Wise suggested that the FDC focus on the mission fund, and have the Annual Meeting Committee handle the sponsorships. There needs to be coordination between these two solicitations. Linda Cook suggested keeping these separate.

Archive Committee

Anne Davidson presented the report on behalf of the Archive Committee. The committee was formed in 2012. Anne described the committee's charge and foci. The current focus is on digital archived materials that will be integrated with the website, and a searchable database that will begin with a paper repository from the 2015 annual meeting. After that, the committee will look to add on to the archive, with presentations and papers from the past. Beyond that, the committee can focus on physical archives and explore options for having these materials properly stored and inventoried, and scanned and digitized. The committee has categorized and sorted materials including: NCME organization resources, board documentation, annual meeting documentation, publications, biographical information, and other information. The abstracts from the 2014 meeting can be an immediate archive task.

The committee will need to develop ongoing funding plans, and will work closely with the website committee and TRG. Anne Davidson asked the Board for support of the committee's priorities, and requested the board to review implementation and cost options at the July 2014 meeting.

Lauress Wise asked the board whether they agreed about the priority of a paper repository for 2015. The Board was supportive of the Archive Committee moving forward in their plans. Lauress suggested that the Archive Committee become a standing NCME committee.

Rich Patz asked what happened to the NCME papers that were submitted to ERIC and the board agreed that the committee should contact Larry Rudner to discuss how to potentially link to the ERIC system. The committee will also contact AERA to learn about their process for archiving.

ACTION ITEM: Contact Larry Rudner to talk with the Archive Committee about ERIC.
--

The board discussed whether the archive materials should be in a member-only or publically available area, and agreed that some material will be appropriate for members only and other material can be publically available.

Committee Reports

Lauress Wise asked if there were particular comments or concerns about any of the committee reports.

Rich Patz suggested that board discussion of committee reports might occur at the first board meeting during the annual meeting so that committees can discuss any board feedback and concerns when they meet in person.

Volunteer System

Lauress Wise discussed options for restoring the NCME committee volunteer process. This could be part of the membership renewal process, or via an email blast. Lauress asked Rich Patz to lead a process to decide on the system to identify new committee members and to suggest a schedule for Board liaisons to be in touch with committees to begin the process. Linda Cook led a process a few years ago to establish a volunteer system that is no longer being used. The board should determine whether this system is still viable.

ACTION ITEM: Susan Rees will discuss the status of volunteer database with TRG staff and get back to the board with recommendations.
--

Lauress Wise suggested dates for upcoming board meetings: July 21st, Madison, Wisconsin; October 7th, Princeton, NJ; and January 15th, Monterey, CA.

The Board held an executive session.

Lauress Wise adjourned the meeting at 7:02pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin, NCME Recording Secretary

NCME Board Meeting Minutes
July 21, 2014
Madison, WI

In attendance:

Wim Van der Linden, Past President
Lauress Wise, President
Richard Patz, Vice President
Susan Brookhart, Board Member
Cindy Walker, Board Member
Amy Hendrickson, Board Member
Huafang Zhao, Board Member
Won-Chan Lee, Board Member
Kristen Huff, Board Member
Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee
Terry Ackerman, Chair of Annual Meeting Committee
Susan Rees, TRG
Amanda Penisten, TRG
Linda Hargrove (via phone), Chair of Fund Development Committee

Lauress Wise began the meeting at 8:30 a.m.

Lauress asked the Board Liaisons to ask committee chairs to put key topics for discussion and decision points in the agenda to help focus on the issues that need attention. This will start at the next Board meeting.

Annual Meeting Committee Update

Terry Ackerman provided an update on the Annual Meeting Committee. The committee has had conference calls approximately every three weeks, and has revised the committee description for the handbook. A membership survey is planned to get feedback to inform how to move forward with AERA starting in 2016.

Richard Patz asked whether Terry has had any communication with Matthew Gaertner (chair of the Membership committee), as this committee is also planning a membership survey. Kristen Huff asked whether we would want to share the survey results with the current and incoming Vice Presidents of AERA Division D (Wayne Camara, Kadriye Ercikan). Lauress agreed that we should have a conversation and can share the survey (as information only).

ACTION ITEM: Kristen will share the survey and inform Wayne and Kadriye that we will share the results of the survey when they become available.

The committee is planning to create an Annual Meeting handbook, which will detail all of the tasks/events that occur at the annual meeting, to document the history of the event and include a mechanism for evaluating success. A template was created to document information for each event at the annual meeting. The users would include the Executive Director, President, and others. The committee plans to have a draft for the Board's review by the annual meeting in Chicago.

Huafang Zhao asked about events for award recipients and whether career award recipients should be selected early so that they can present the same year they are selected. The award committees would need to accelerate the selection process. In addition, the conflict resolution process would need to be considered.

ACTION ITEM: Huafang will ask the committee chairs to share any concerns about accelerating the selection process for 2016 awards so that winners would have the opportunity to present their work that same year; Huafang will relay this information at the October Board meeting.

Lauress asked Terry for a summary of the 2014 annual meeting evaluation. He would like to be able to determine the quality of the meetings from year to year. There was some discussion about an article about the proposal review process in the latest issue of EM:IP (written by Derek Briggs).

Wim asked about the structure of the Annual Meeting Committee, including terms, identifying new members, etc..

ACTION ITEM: Terry will propose structure for the Annual Meeting Committee.

Program Co-Chair Update

Lauress provided an update from the Program Co-Chairs (Ye Tong and Jennifer Randall)

So far there are 31 submissions for presentations; many have asked specifically for electronic bulletin boards. This year's program will bring back discussants for paper presentations. The program co-chairs are working with the archive committee on a repository for papers or presentation slides. Session chairs will be asked to encourage participants to upload their papers and will be asked to review submissions for appropriateness. The program co-chairs are working to determine a way to capture the proposal ratings so that trends can be examined in future years. Decisions are yet to be made about recording and webcasting training sessions.

Amy Hendrickson noted that there is a report detailing possible directions for the webcasts, and the main issue is determining how to pay for the costs for the recordings. Anne Fitzpatrick asked for a proposal for costs to see if there is revenue to cover it, by August.

ACTION ITEM: TRG will get an estimate from Sonic Foundry to record and webcast six invited speakers and about 4 half-day training sessions.

Kristen Huff proposed adding a sunrise yoga/meditation session to the annual meeting program. She got three estimates from yogis in Chicago who do corporate events. Costs run from \$250-\$450. Expenses could be covered by having a fee for attendance. The largest hurdle may be finding a location. Susan Rees noted that we don't know what hotel NCME has in Chicago and will not know about space allocation until September. Registration could be capped to accommodate a small meeting room space if other space is not available. The Board approved moving forward.

Budget and Finance Committee Report

Anne Fitzpatrick presented the report from the B&F committee. She noted a tight schedule to develop a first draft of the budget for review by the Board in September, and a final draft for presentation at the October board meeting. All funding requests are requested by the middle of August.

Anne discussed the results of the audit and how charitable contributions are categorized. Under the Net assets heading, the "temporarily restricted" category includes sponsorships, Millman award funds, money from NCME's book on test security, and the Hanson and Cascallar family contributions for the awards. The mission fund will be part of this category.

Anne suggested that since the Cascallar and Hanson award money gets spent immediately, these items should not be considered assets. Anne proposed recording revenues not used for operational expenses (including the mission fund) at the bottom of the income statement so that one can see the revenues/net without seeing what's coming in as restricted assets. This model is used successfully by other organizations.

Richard Patz asked where the expenses from the mission fund would show up. Anne will think about where to include this. The auditors will advise on these proposed changes.

Anne reviewed NCME's investment portfolio, and provided figures indicating changes in value and comparison of year end actual values for 2012 and 2013 and values reflecting 3% growth for these years. The portfolio is getting large and Anne suggested that the Board think about spending some of the money on strategic initiatives. In the past, this money has been used for things like program software, the edited book series, and website updates.

There was some discussion about the amount of reserve for funds and about linking initiatives to the strategic plan for spending the surplus.

Fund Development Committee Update

Linda Hargrove joined the meeting via phone at 10:35 a.m.

Linda reported that the FDC initial campaign has received more than \$18,000. They are anticipating beginning a second campaign before the end of the month; and a third campaign to begin early fall. The amount raised will be used to encourage and inspire additional donations. The FDC would like the Board to approve adding a donation line(s) to the membership renewal forms that will go out in late fall. The

Board was supportive of this request. Anne asked if this line will ask about contributions to the mission fund or a general request. (Linda noted the former)

The FDC is working on additional communications, including an announcement that will be published in EM:IP. The FDC's contract with a consultant wrapped up and the committee feels that this was very valuable to their work. The FDC may want to re-engage with the consultant. Anne asked for a budget estimate to be reviewed at the October board meeting.

The FDC has been discussing priority areas for funding and was asked to recommend two main priority areas. The first priority area was in the outreach and dissemination area, which would include workshops and webinars on measurement-related topics. An example would be a workshop presented at the CCSSO meeting. FDC committee members asked CCSSO leadership if they would be interested in this for their next conference in June 2015. Approximate costs would be 10-15k. The FDC would like approval on this and would come back with a detailed proposal for the October board meeting.

Lauress Wise suggested coming up with lean cost estimates so that the entire fund isn't depleted by this one initiative. Wim van der Linden questioned the idea because a single workshop would reach only a small number of people. A webinar that could be recorded could have more impact. Kristen Huff added that developing a set of "turn-key" training kits could reach a lot more people. The workshop could be used to develop and test the training materials. Amy Hendrickson noted that this could be part of the cost estimates from Sonic Foundry.

There was some discussion about the intended audience and aiming the outreach where we would have the most impact. Wim asked whether this could be a joint project with APA; it may be worth reaching out to them. Huafang Zhao suggested a broader audience, i.e., school districts, with regard to use of new assessments based on the Common Core.

The second priority area identified by the FDC is travel and professional development grants for graduate students.

Lauress asked about timeline for making decision about use of the funds. Linda Hargrove suggested no later than the October board meeting.

The board supported having the FDC define options for use of the funds.

Susan Brookhart suggested that the first test case may be travel grants for graduate students (because it is easy to start with). The Board would like the FDC to continue working on initiatives for measurement knowledge for teaching training programs. A few Board members noted preference for not funding travel grants, raising the issue of the selection criteria to award the grants. One suggestion was to provide grants to institutions rather than to individual students.

Cindy Walker asked whether we need to spend the money right away or whether we can wait to use it more strategically.

The FDC was asked to continue to flesh out the idea of a workshop on the test standards, and some materials on assessment literacy for teachers. Travel grants may be revisited in 2016.

Anne Fitzpatrick noted that NCME has money from the sale of ABC's of Testing. This is waiting for revision; may be tied into the test standards workshops.

Kristen brought up the NAEP ambassadors program and thought that NCME could do something analogous for a strategic activity (have NCME members go out and talk to state and district staff about measurement issues).

Sponsorships for Annual Meeting

Lauress Wise asked the board whether this should be part of or separate from the mission fund. Lauress felt that there is good reason to be separate, as sponsors support the annual meeting, which is part of NCME's operational budget. Linda Cook will lead the sponsorship recruitment with the understanding that someone else will take over the following year. Lauress volunteered for this role.

The mission fund doesn't have concrete plans to solicit outside organizations. Wim van der Linden's concern is on the side of the donors; having multiple requests for donations will be confusing. He suggested overall coordination to avoid any confusion. Having a member of the FDC solicit sponsorships would promote this coordination.

Lauress asked the board to help update the organizational contact list for sponsorships. Anne Fitzpatrick asked for an estimate of the monetary amount that will be received.

Wim thinks we could improve organizational support by naming events for the sponsoring organizations.

Archive Committee

The Archive Committee would like the board to approve request for funds to test out the paper repository system. It is a one-time programming cost (hosting costs are not included). The funds would be taken out the initiatives budget.

Amy Hendrickson noted that the announcement should be made at the time of notification of acceptance. There will be language about copyright issues and should be available only to members.

Publications Committee

Susan Brookhart presented the report on behalf of the Publications Committee.

The committee met in April and recommended candidates for next NCME newsletter editor (2015-2017). There are two nominees and the committee rank ordered them for consideration.

VOTE: Susan Brookhart moved to appoint the publication committee's first choice for newsletter editor. Seven board members voted in favor. Two board members abstained. Motion passed.
--

Lauress noted that the Board should start thinking about how to transmit/promote electronic journal access and publishing. Wiley is raising the price for institutional memberships. Susan would like to negotiate charging the authors for electronic publishing. The publications committee is asked to consider NCME's vision for publishing electronically with some options to consider.

Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee is making good progress identifying candidates. The committee will provide an update at an upcoming Board meeting.

Test Standards

Lauress Wise asked the Board to consider whether NCME should make a bulk purchase of the Standards to help give access to a wide audience. There was some discussion about having a PDF of the standards available and costs to acquire and distribute the PDF rather than printed copies.

Graduate Student Issues Committee

The GSIC is requesting funds for electronic bulletin boards. The Board agreed that this should be coordinated with the overall program. The GSIC is also requesting for money for their reception; there was a question about whether this would be the no-host reception or a separate reception. The GSIC report mentioned approaching business sponsors for this reception, which would be considered an operational budget item. Amy Hendrickson will clarify this item with the GSIC. Kristen Huff suggested asking the GSIC to have some focus of the social; perhaps exploring collaboration with the Division D graduate student group.

Website Committee

The website committee would like to appoint two additional two members, due to the departure of members for other NCME responsibilities. Richard Patz will communicate the process for appointment with the committee chairs.

Awards Committees

The Awards Committees updated their calls for nominations for this year, which are now posted on the NCME website. The Annual Awards committee replaced one member who did not respond. There was some discussion about tracking and documenting the receipt and distribution of award monies. The Board discussed the strategy of repeated communication to the membership to help increase the number of nominations. Kristen Huff feels that it is not necessary to give awards every year and the Board should think about staggering the awards if it is always difficult to get nominations.

ACTION ITEM: Lauress and Huafang will discuss convening an ad hoc committee consisting of Awards Committee chairs to review the current status of awards and propose a vision to make the awards more attractive and meaningful for NCME; they will discuss a charge to bring to the Executive Committee.

Standards and Test Use Committee

The Board discussed the status of the ABC's of Testing publication, and there is general consensus that it needs updating. The STUC should consider whether it is worth distributing the publication in its current form.

Strategic Planning

The Board engaged in a strategic planning activity, and broke out into three groups to identify and define activities to achieve each of the following goals: 1) advance the field of educational measurement; 2) increase awareness and influence; 3) support measurement professionals. The groups were also asked to identify measurement/metrics to measure attainment of the goals. These activities would be undertaken within five years.

When the Board reconvened, each group presented its ideas for discussion. There was discussion about the turn-over of Board and committee members and how to create continuity to see initiatives to completion. Kristen Huff mentioned another organization that convened a strategic committee comprised of Past presidents to remind the Board of strategic initiatives.

Lauress Wise would like the Board to write a global description of a 5-year strategic plan, including individuals who will be charge of initiatives in the short term, and metrics for measuring success. He asked the Board liaisons to work with committees to review and update their charges. Some specific ideas that emerged during the strategic planning discussion included:

- It would be beneficial to reach out to education media writers, write press releases, and/or leverage media networks through members' organizations (College Board, ACT, ETS, Pearson).
- With regard to dissemination, we should distinguish between promoting ideas and responding to misconceptions.
- Kristen Huff suggested a survey of TILSA SCAS group to find out how many are members of NCME, and if not, why not.
- How to learn more about membership needs by analyzing membership data (Amanda Penisten showed the membership database and noted that it can be modified to collect additional information of interest).

The Executive Committee will determine concrete next steps based on the strategic planning brainstorming.

The Board held an Executive Session.

Lauress adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin, NCME Recording Secretary

NCME Board Meeting Minutes
October 7, 2014
Princeton, NJ

In attendance:

Lauress Wise, President
Richard Patz, Vice President
Susan Brookhart, Board Member
Cindy Walker, Board Member
Amy Hendrickson, Board Member
Huafang Zhao, Board Member
Won-Chan Lee, Board Member
Kristen Huff, Board Member
Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee
Susan Rees, TRG
Linda Hargrove (via phone), Chair of Fund Development Committee

Not present:

Wim van der Linden, Past President

Lauress Wise began the meeting at 8:45 a.m.

Kristen Huff made a motion to approve the minutes from the April and July 2014 Board Meetings. Amy Hendrickson seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor. Motion passed.

The action items will be addressed during discussion of committee reports.

Annual Meeting Program update

Lauress provided an update on the annual meeting program on behalf of the program co-chairs. The proposal review panels have completed reviews. The committee anticipates being on schedule. This year we will be bringing back discussants for stand-alone papers. We will have larger number of bulletin board sessions this year, and are still expecting a relatively high acceptance rate.

Arne Duncan was invited as a speaker, but has not yet responded to the invitation. John King, New York Commissioner of Education is a confirmed speaker. Lauress described the other planned topics/sessions for the meeting, including a session on standard setting for PARCC and SBAC, a comedy routine, and a joint symposium with the National Association of Test Directors.

It has been a challenge working with Ungerboeck, as they have not been responsive to questions. The program chairs are requesting additional funds for an add-on to the software to help create the program

book. Anne Fitzpatrick noted some concern about whether the software will be able to serve all of our needs going forward, and would like to get perspective on whether the software is making the program chairs' tasks easier. Rich asked if there are other alternatives for completing the program book. Susan Rees noted that there should be other systems available. The job should be easier than it was last year, but will still require the program chairs' manual labor.

Huafang noted that the Career Award address was not on the list of sessions from the program co-chairs.

NCME's sessions will be held in the Intercontinental in Chicago.

Website Committee Report

Lauress asked the Board to discuss the request from the Website Committee for \$4,000 for Ungerboeck to modify the software to print the conference program. Rich asked how much work this would actually save this year. Susan Rees is not clear because she is not sure what the export file will look like. Rich said we can approve, pending more information from Ungerboeck on what the information will look like. The program book should be in development by January. Ungerboeck needs 6 weeks to put this on their production calendar. The proposal states that Ungerboeck needs 3 weeks to complete the task. We would expect delivery by the end of November. Lauress asked whether we can sign the contract and pay when the product is delivered, rather than pre-paying. If they won't agree to user acceptance testing, we may not want to work with them. The Board would like to approve the expense on a short timeline with the ability to reject the deliverable if it doesn't meet our needs.

Rich Patz made a motion to accept program committee's recommendation to pay for the software upgrade. Susan Brookhart seconded the motion. All board members voted in favor. Motion passed
--

Sponsorship Status

Linda Cook volunteered to solicit sponsors for the Annual Meeting, and Lauress agreed to help. Letters have gone out to potential sponsors, which increased the ask from \$3,000 to \$4,000. So far, \$27,000 has been promised and about half of that is in house.

Budget & Finance Committee Update

Anne Fitzpatrick provided a report on behalf of the B&F Committee. The 2015 budget moved charitable contributions so that they are not directly affecting revenue or expenses. Discretionary items were reduced by 12.5%. Anne asked the Board to for approval of the budget.

Kristen Huff moved to approve the 2015 operational budget. Amy Hendrickson seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor. Motion passed.
--

Anne presented the budget for proposed initiatives for 2014-15. These requests are outside of the budget. There was clarification about the budget item for recording the training sessions. Training

session presenters are usually asked whether they agree for the session to be recorded, so not all sessions are recorded.

Rich noted that the activities requiring approval for funding should all have a sponsor (individual or committee) who would be tasked with evaluating the activity and reporting back to the Board. Budget items associated with Annual Meeting should be sponsored by the Annual Meeting Committee (chaired by Terry Ackerman).

Kristen asked if there was specification of what would be done with the training session recordings. Lauress noted that they would be put on the website and made more accessible to members. There was some discussion about the extent to which the sessions have been viewed and advertising/publicizing of the training sessions. Kristen supports recording the sessions to make these available to state and district employees who are limited in their ability to travel, but she noted that having the training sessions available online may reduce attendance at the live sessions. She also suggested thinking about recording training presenters who are close to retirement for archival purposes.

Anne noted that if expense items are tied into the mission of NCME, it can change how it is reflected in the budget. It also can be supported by the mission fund (but this may be problematic if it is kept as a member-only benefit).

Amy noted that some of the training sessions come with books, and asked if there is a charge for viewing the recordings online, would the books also be provided? Won-Chan also noted that testing companies may begin using the videos for their training. Rich suggested that NCME clearly specify the terms of use.

Lauress Wise moved that the Board accept the proposed initiatives for now, pending discussion about the Fund Development Committee's request. Rich Patz seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor. Motion passed.

There was discussion about whether to take on recording all training sessions or whether to select a subset. The Training chair/committee will be asked to propose a process for determining which sessions to record. They will be given the budget to record all sessions, recognizing that they will not actually record every session.

Fund Development Committee (FDC) Update

Linda Hargrove joined the meeting via phone at 10:30am to provide an update on the FDC. Linda reported that the FDC has met 44% of its goal. The FDC will be launching its third campaign very soon. Communication will be contingent on Board's feedback. The FDC is working on a number of communications for the general membership campaign. They are also planning to work with TRG on modification of member renewal form to capture donations.

The committee is requesting up to \$6,000 in 2015 for re-engagement of a consultant to assist with the donor campaign, messaging, and creating policies for the committee. Lauress asked Linda to talk about the benefits from the consultant to date. The consultant has provided expertise at critical junctures and has provided added support, especially in terms of fundraising, messaging, and planning. While the previous engagement of the consultant was more consultative, the re-engagement will include more specific work tasks, including strategizing on future campaigns, messaging to the membership, and developing gift acceptance policies. Kristen asked how much time we get for \$6,000. Linda indicated that the committee would submit proposals for specific tasks and timeframes, and this this amount was a ballpark estimate of what would be required.

Lauress asked about the process for requesting funds to support the pre-conference session with CCSO at the June 2015 conference. Lauress suggested that the Board consider a motion to approve the request for a consulting fee and ask the FDC to develop a cost proposal for the CCSO initiative that would come out of the mission fund.

Rich raised some concerns about how this session would interface with the conference, who would be invited, etc. and questioned whether the mission fund is the best way to fund the session.

Kristen Huff made a motion for the FDC to move ahead in planning the CCSO pre-conference activity and come back to the board with a specific proposal. Amy Hendrickson seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor. Motion passed.

Rich Patz made a motion to support the \$6,000 to engage the consultant in ways most productive to move forward in planning. Won Chan Lee seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor. Motion passed.

Lauress reported that the Test Standards have been published. The lawsuit regarding the posting of the standards online is progressing. The costs for the lawsuit are ongoing and have been coming out of the development fund. The Joint Management Committee for the Standards has discussed the use of the development fund. At some point there may be a specific action that will come back to the Board. The new Management Committee agreement may be negotiated in the next 4-6 months. The organizations want a more specific requirement for management support, and a mechanism for reviewing Management Committee work and how the funds are being used. NCME may offer to manage the fund, to have a more significant role in the Standards. The Management Committee would develop a strategy for managing the funds (investment strategy, reporting, etc.) NCME would write the checks and work with the publisher to manage the royalties. Susan Rees suggested that there are liabilities and tax implications for the funds and it might be wise to set up a legal entity. NCME could still manage the funds.

The Board discussed and provided advice/feedback and will make a motion once the Management Committee develops a charge. Laress will report back to the Management Committee to move forward.

Annual Meeting Committee

The Annual Meeting Committee is developing a handbook for running the Annual Meeting that will include timelines, forms, and samples. The committee conducted a survey about the future of the NCME Annual Meeting. About 20% of the membership responded to the survey. About 60% of respondents would like NCME to stay with AERA.

The Board discussed the survey results and the possibility of having a small conference in the fall on a specific topic to see if there is enough interest among the membership. Laress will ask Terry to summarize the survey results and talk about next plans for the Annual Meeting Committee at the Annual Meeting Breakfast. Kristen suggested having some framing remarks about some of the challenges with AERA to set the context for the survey results.

Archive Committee Update

The Archive Committee was asked to draft a statement for members to check off regarding copyright issues for posting conference papers online and implications for publishing papers in other venues. We will want a legal review of the statement. This is intended to be for members only. Rich noted that the draft text provided by the committee implies that it is open access. Laress noted that the idea is to start making this available to members only and may move towards public access. There was some discussion about AERA's paper repository. Rich noted that he likes the idea of providing titles and abstracts (for wider dissemination purposes) but has some concerns about providing full papers, due to potential publishing conflicts. The latter should be upon consent of the authors. If the archive (full papers) was limited to members only, we may get more participation. It was suggested that the Archive Committee ask the publications committee if they would have concerns about making conference papers available. The Publications Committee should be aware of this discussion and provide any insights and recommendations.

ACTION ITEM: The Archive Committee should get in touch with Publications Committee. The Publications committee should contact Wiley to determine if posting conference papers would constitute a prior publication.

Won Chan brought up whether authors should have opportunity to revise papers before posting. Laress also mentioned idea of having a process for reviewing papers to confirm that what was uploaded is in fact what was presented.

Laress will update the Archive Committee with the Board's discussion.

Publications Committee Update

Susan Brookhart provided an update on behalf of the Publications Committee. The committee would like clarification about forms of online publishing and needs more direction in their charge. The Board requested more information about what Wiley currently does to make journal content more accessible online, to provide some ideas and options. The Board would like to think about the next online publishing capability that NCME might pursue.

Awards Committee Update

Huafang and Won Chan provided an update on behalf of the award committees. The Career Award received ten applicants; the committee will make a decision by mid-October. The winner will have a presentation at this year's conference. After the committee makes its selection, Laress will approve and notify the winner. The five other awards are in the process of receiving applications; the winners will be selected in January.

An Ad hoc committee on consolidating awards is being convened to discuss issues related to awards, including timing, deadlines, etc. The committee will consist of award committee chairs and Board liaisons (Huafang and Won Chan).

Nominations Committee Update

The nominations committee has finished its work. An Elections committee has been reconvened this year, with James Wollack as chair. Ballots will be sent out by mid-November.

Graduate Student Issues Committee (GSIC) Update

The GSIC is waiting on the decision about electronic boards. Laress will check with the program co-chairs to make sure this is coordinated. Kristen asked to confirm that the GSIC social event will be held in conjunction with the Division D graduate student event. There was some concern and discussion about having the GSIC look for sponsors for their social.

The other committee reports were information only.

A strategic planning update will be presented in January. Laress will organize a brief document to outline how current initiatives fit in with strategic plans.

Laress adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.

Addendum to the Minutes of the October 2014 NCME Board of Directors Meeting, added 4/20/15.

Executive Session. The Board met in closed session to hear presentations from two finalists recommended by the ad-hoc committee on selecting an association management company for NCME. The Rees Group and Fernley & Fernley made presentations and answered questions from board members. The board subsequently discussed the presentations, the proposals, and the report of the ad-hoc evaluation committee. Upon conclusion of the discussion the board unanimously approved the

selection of Fernley & Fernley and appointed a negotiation committee comprised of Laurie Wise, Anne Fitzpatrick, and Rich Patz for the purpose of putting in place a contract with Fernley and Fernley.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin
NCME Recording Secretary