NCME Executive Board of Directors
Meeting Minutes
April 13 & 16, 2009

Members Present:

Leslie Lukin

Guests:  Gerald Melican

Kathleen Gialluca
Jim Carlson

Graduate Students: Anthony Fina, Ian Hembry, Nina Deng and Hanwook Yoo

Call to Order

Mark Reckase called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm on Monday, April 13th.

Approval of the December 2008 Board Meeting Minutes

Two corrections were requested. Terry Ackerman made a motion to accept the minutes with corrections.  seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The motion was passed.

Consent Agenda Reports

Dr. Reckase asked if there were questions related to any of the Consent Agenda Report items. The NCME Committees that indicated, “no action is requested of the Board” on the Consent Agenda Report form were as follows:

Alicia Cascallar Award
Brad Hanson Award
Jason Millman Promising Measurement Scholar Award
Annual Awards Committee
Membership Committee
Program Committee
Training and Professional Development Committee
Outreach and Partnership Committee
EMIP Editor Report
JEM Editor Report
Standards and Test Use Committee
Dr. Ackerman indicated that had provided a list of names of individuals recommended for the EMIP Editor position. After some discussion the decision was made to add the topic to the April 16th meeting agenda.

The Board also noted a number of recommendations from various awards committees suggesting changes in standardized procedures. The consensus of the Board was that these considerations could be addressed as committee chairs reviewed their respective sections during the revision of the NCME Handbook.

Dr. Reckase introduced the NCME Program Committee Chair, Kathleen Gialluca and transitioned the topic to a discussion of the 2009 Annual Conference. Everyone present agreed that the Program Committee and the Training Committee had done an exceptional job of putting together content for the conference. Dr. Reckase offered Dr. Gialluca an opportunity to address the Board and share her observations.

Dr. Gialluca summarized the decisions made by the Program Committee in putting together the 2009 event and talked about the challenges they faced. Dr. Gialluca also shared some observations for improving the process including 1) completing development of the backend of the online submission system so that information needed by Program Chairs can reside in one place and 2) continuing attempts to secure AERA’s final program information in a timely manner in order to complete NCME’s conflict resolution process. In response to Dr. Gialluca’s description of the abstract selection process, the Board suggested that language be added to the Call for Proposals to help articulate the Program Chair’s need to sometimes accept papers based on NCME’s goal to seek contributions across a broad spectrum of topics. Dr. Reckase thanked the Program Committee for a job well done and transitioned the Board to the next topic on the agenda.

JEM Editor Report

Dr. Reckase introduced Jim Carlson, JEM Editor, and offered him an opportunity to address the Board. Dr. Carlson explained his desire to facilitate the appointment of the new JEM Editor in a timely manner, prior to the acceptance of additional manuscripts for the journal. Dr. Carlson also provided the Board with details regarding the guidelines that he and reviewers use for the selection of manuscripts. Lastly, Dr. Carlson described the work effort and the need for editorial assistance as the Board looks toward the future.

NCME Annual Awards

Dr. Reckase provided background on the next topic for review by the Board. Dr. Reckase pose the question of whether or not a requirement should exist stating that a paper needed to be published prior to being submitted for an NCME award. In response, the Board discussed the reasonable expectation by most NCME members that any paper submitted for an award would likely be accessible online. The general consensus of the Board was in support adding such a criteria.
Outreach Committee

Dr. Reckase opened the floor for further discussion before concluding the topic of the Consent Agenda. In response, asked the Board to address a request for review of a plan submitted by the Outreach Committee. Dr. Reckase asked that the Outreach Committee request be added to the Annotated Bibliographies topic. Dr. Rogers agreed.

Standards Revision Committee

Dr. Reckase indicated that Steve Ferrara could not be present at the meeting but provided a written report for the Board. Dr. Reckase summarized the report for the Board and requested additional comments from. Dr. Camara, who also attended the Joint Committee for the Revision of Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, provided an additional perspective. Dr. Camara shared his involvement with the funding and budget oversight for the project. Additionally, Dr. Camara spoke to the Board about past efforts and challenges to disseminate the results of changes in standards to a mass audience. Dr. Camera engaged the Board to determine what types of involvement might be appropriate for NCME after the standards revision has been completed. Dr. Camera indicated that based on the current timeline the project was on-schedule.

Annotated Bibliographies

Chair of the Outreach and Partnerships Committee was present at the April 13th Board meeting and was introduced by Dr. Reckase. Several graduate students who participated in the Annotated Bibliographies project joined Dr. Winter. Students attending the meeting were Anthony Fina, Ian Hembry, Nina Deng and Hanwook Yoo.

Dr. Winter provided a brief history on the Annotated Bibliographies project and the original 2008 goals that were established based on survey results. Nina Deng followed-up with a description of the process involved in the project and her desire to ensure that access to the information was user friendly (Examples: pdf, website, or searchable database). Ms. Deng explained the need for feedback from the NCME Board in order to move forward on the project.

Based on the report provided by the Outreach Committee, Dr. Reckase facilitated additional Board discussion. Dr. Reckase summarized the questions associated with the project as 1) what is the best method for publishing this information online; 2) what are the copyright guidelines related to repurposing existing journal articles; and 3) how will the revision process be managed.

After some discussion the Board recommended that the Annotated Bibliographies project team focus on three objectives for next steps 1) confirm the audience and their information needs (both primary and secondary audience); 2) determine the best way to translate the existing information to meet those needs and 3) determine how best to incorporate the NCME website to provide access to the information.
The consensus of the Board was that the Website Management Committee should play an active role in offering potential solutions. The final suggestion was to have the group come up with a plan and present it to the Board. The discussion concluded with an expression of gratitude from the Board for the great effort by the students working on the Annotated Bibliographies project.

**Outreach Committee – CCSSO’s NCSA 2009**

Dr. provided an update to the Board of efforts to set-up an NCME booth at the 2010 CCSSO conference. CCSSO begins conference planning in June. According to Dr. Winter, the 2010 conference would take place in Los Angeles, California. The cost estimate for a booth in the exhibit hall is approximately $2,500.

Dr. Winter explained that there is considerable interest from CCSSO in having dialogue with NCME to discuss a potential collaboration. The Board discussed strategic importance of CCSSO and whether the timing was correct for NCME Executive level contact with CCSSO.

Based on visitor traffic and the opportunity for communication with conference attendees, the Board agreed that there are advantages to having an NCME booth in the exhibit hall. The concerns raised by Board members regarded the need for volunteers to provide a presence at the booth and the emphasis on free giveaways. There was also considerable interest in exploring the idea of presenting an educational session. However, there was consensus that the latter solution would offer less opportunity for communication with attendees.

The final recommendation from the Board was to have the Outreach Committee investigate each option and provide the Board with additional recommendations.

**Finance Committee**

Dr. Gerald Melican provided a report from the Finance Committee. Dr. Melican explained that the organization’s net revenue, which included investments, in 2007 was $192,017. In comparison, the net revenue for 2008 was $42,180. This net loss was directly attributed to the volatility in the current investment environment. Dr. Melican assured the Board that the Finance Committee had recently met with the manager of the organization’s investment portfolio and were provided with a detailed strategy for surviving the economic downturn. Dr. Melican informed the Board that NCME continued to be in good fiscal shape for the future.

Next, the Board addressed the 2008 Audit Report. There were two concerns addressed by the auditor that the Finance Committee wanted to share with the Board. The first was regarding the size of NCME’s money market investment. NCME currently has a money market investment of over $300,000. One of the issues indicated in the Audit Report is that this amount exceeds Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) limits.
To address this concern, the Finance Committee agreed to strategically lower the amount held in the money market account (February 2009 balance $303,000). These funds would be re-distributed into multiple accounts to bring the account within acceptable FDIC guidelines.

The second observation from the Audit Report shared by Dr. Melican was the recommendation that NCME consider the creation of a permanent board position as part of the Finance Committee. According to Dr. Melican, this observation may have been due in part to the often time consuming tasks associated with being involved with the Finance Committee. Additionally, the auditor may have felt that the creation of a designated Board position would insure better communication between the Finance Committee and the rest of the Board.

Dr. Melican explained that the Finance Committee had considered various solutions to the observations outlined in the Audit Report. After some deliberation the Finance Committee concluded that the auditor’s concerns could be resolved by establishing an NCME policy mandating that a member of the Finance Committee be present at all Board meetings. Based on this policy, contained in the NCME Handbook, the Finance Committee Chair would serve as an “Ex-officio” member of the Board.

Plumer Lovelace, NCME’s Executive Director, offered the suggestion of scheduling a meeting with the auditor to discuss the proposed solution prior to making any changes. After additional discussion the Board agreed and asked Mr. Lovelace to schedule a meeting with the auditor.

The final topic presented by the Finance Committee regarded the annual “Fun Run / Walk” which takes place each year during the annual conference. During the discussion Dr. Melican shared two years of expense / revenue history for the event. Based on this information Dr. Melican illustrated the financial challenges associated with planning and coordinating the annual event. Plumer Lovelace provided additional insight based on his involvement with the event. As Mr. Lovelace explained, starting with the 2009 Fun Run / Walk, The Rees Group had gradually begun to provide support and consultation to the event coordinator. This effort had resulted in some important improvements including contract oversight and the acquisition of event insurance. Mr. Lovelace suggested that this type of support could result in a financial turnaround for the event.

Dr. Reckase concluded the topic of the annual Fun Run / Walk by summarizing the suggestions that surfaced during discussion. The Board requested 1) contact with Brian French to discuss ways to improve the financial outcome of the event; 2) creation of a formal budget to help provide expense controls and 3) involvement from The Rees Group staff to help oversee improvements.

**Careers in Statistics**

Dr. Reckase explained to the Board that he had recently been contacted by the University of Iowa and provided with information regarding an organization called, “The National Alliance for Doctoral Studies in the Mathematical Sciences.” Dr. Reckase distributed an article describing the program for review by the Board.
The stated goal of The National Alliance for Doctorial Studies in the Mathematical Sciences is to recruit college students to the fields of engineering, informatics, chemistry, physics and mathematics, especially minority students. The program invites statistical leaders in academia, government and the private sector to share their views on careers in statistics. Dr. Reckase was contacted because the program is seeking additional funding to continue providing educational activities.

Dr. Reckase asked the Board for discussion. In response, Dr. Ackerman shared his experience with similar outreach programs being coordinated at the University of North Carolina and emphasized the challenge of funding one program over another. The Board acknowledged the dilemma but expressed an interest in seeking alternatives for support of student outreach programs. asked the Board to consider the possibility of funding scholarships and volunteered to write a proposal to create a program to provide support for efforts to fund minority students’ interested psychometrics.

Dr. Reckase requested the Board consider Dr. Rudner’s offer and revisit the topic during the Thursday, April 16th meeting.

AERA Visit

Dr. Ackerman provided a summary of the February 18th visit to the AERA office in Washington, DC. and Plumer Lovelace accompanied Dr. Ackerman on the visit to meet with, Senior Advisor & Director of Government Relations and, Director of Meetings.

Prior to the meeting The Rees Group had generated a list of suggestions for improving and better integrating the conference development processes between NCME and AERA. As Dr. Ackerman explained, one goal of the visit was to provide this list of suggestions to AERA as a precursor to a follow-up meeting that would take place later. The other goal was to simply establish open and consistent dialogue about our respective organizations.

Dr. Ackerman’s overall conclusion was that the meeting was extremely insightful and clearly set the stage for additional discussions. Everyone present had an opportunity to share observations and ideas for improving the quality of the annual meeting experience. The AERA meeting ended with an agreement to follow-up after the annual conference in April to further discuss the list of ideas presented by NCME.

Dr. Reckase adjourned the meeting.
NCME Executive Board of Directors
Meeting Minutes
April 13 & 16, 2009

Members Present:
Mark Reckase

Guests:
Robert Henson
Luz Bay
Young Yee Kim
Jennifer Davison

Call to Order

called the NCME Board meeting to order at 4:15 pm. Both the Consent Agenda Reports and the minutes from the December 2008 meeting were addressed during the Monday, April 13th Board meeting.

Wiley-Blackwell

Dr. Ackerman introduced Jennifer Davison, Editor for Wiley-Blackwell and primary contact for both JEM and EMIP. Ms. Davison explained that she was invited to the Board meeting to share potential strategies for avoiding journal page overruns and to provide information on each journal’s impact factor.

Page Overruns

Ms. Davison began her presentation by congratulating the Board on having the problem of too much content and explained that the lack of adequate content often presents other types of challenges for organizations including missed publishing deadlines and declining institutional subscriptions. Ms. Davison indicated that in 2008 both journals experienced page overruns. The total cost to NCME was $2,061 for page overruns on both journals.

According to Ms. Davison, NCME had selected to try a common solution for page overruns, increase the number of journal pages. JEM has 112 more pages in 2009, than in 2008. The cost of the page increase in 2009 was off-set by a 12% increase in the institutional subscription fee last year. Unfortunately the current economic condition has led to an inability in the marketplace to do any significant price increases. As a result, Wiley-Blackwell has tried to cap price increases at 5%.
Given the state of the economy, Ms. Davison offered several suggestions for managing within the page limitations of the journal. These suggestions included 1) adding a page length limit on submissions; 2) reviewing acceptance rate and consider lowering it (Note: suggested best practice level should be 12-15%); and 3) create a supplementary issue. Ms. Davison also confirmed that organizations making the transition from paper submissions to the Manuscript Central online submission system have all experienced a significant increase in submissions.

The consensus of the Board was to investigate cost saving options, including offering the journals as an online product only. Ms. Davison agreed to provide any relevant information for Board review.

**Impact factor**

Ms. Davison was asked if she could provide information on the Impact Factor for the journals. To help provide a point of reference for those of us new to the topic, she described the Impact Factor as the average number of citations that the average journal article would receive in the two years following its publication.

Ms. Davison explained that only JEM has an Impact Factor rating. The most recent Impact Factor information for JEM was from 2007. The Impact Factor for 2008 will be released in June of 2009. In 2007 the Impact Factor for JEM was 0.657.

In conclusion, Ms. Davison offered some suggestions for improving NCME’s journal Impact Factor including 1) publish journal in a timely manner; 2) load the earlier issues of the journal the most stellar articles; 3) publish special sections or special issues and 4) inform Wiley-Black marketing department about any special topic that will be addressed.

**Jim Carlson**

After Ms. Davison concluded her presentation, Dr. Carlson requested an opportunity to address the Board. Dr. Carlson informed the Board on his effort to trim the size of the manuscripts. However, he stressed that to accomplish the reduction in content was very time consuming for him. Dr. Carlson also informed the Board that the elimination of white pages in the journal had resulted in lowering expense.

Dr. Carlson emphasized again the importance of selecting a new JEM editor. If an editor was not selected soon, Dr. Carlson was fearful that he would have to delay the acceptance of articles.
Handbook of Teacher Evaluation

Gary Natriello provided update to the Board on the status of the Handbook of Teacher Evaluation project. Plumer Lovelace had arranged for a meeting in San Diego between Dr. Natriello, Dr. Gregory Cizek and Arnis Burvikovs, a representative from Corwin Publishing. The objective of the meeting was to discuss NCME’s handbook project and determine what steps were required in order to move the project forward.

Dr. Natriello explained that he and Dr. Cizek met with Mr. Burvikovs but were surprised to learn that he had no real knowledge of the project. Additionally, since the merger of Corwin and Sage Publications, Mr. Burvikovs had also questioned whether or not the NCME handbook project might be a better fit for Sage distribution.

After some discussion Dr. Ackerman suggested that he would work with The Rees Group to sort through prior communication and determine the appropriate next steps.

Program Committee Training

Dr. Ackerman ask the Board to move to the Program Committee Training topic on the agenda. Dr. Ackerman described the importance of NCME providing opportunities for committee chairs to learn as much as possible about their role prior to taking on new responsibilities. As Dr. Ackerman explained, it was that rationale that prompted him to coordinate an orientation for the 2010 Annual Conference Program Chairs.

The event took place in Madison, Wisconsin, near the offices of The Rees Group. Robert Henson, John Willse and Luz Bay had an opportunity to address the Board and describe the experience. Dr. Henson, Dr. Willse and Dr. Bay felt fortunate to have a chance to devote a day and a half to talking specifically about program development. Additionally, The Rees Group prepared a 3-ring binder of important information for each member of the group.

During the visit to Madison, the 2009 Program Chair, Dan Bolt joined the session and provided an overview based on his experience. This allowed the new Program Committee Chairs to benefit from Dr. Bolt’s knowledge as well. Dr. Henson, Dr. Willse and Dr. Bay recommended that future Program Chairs have the same opportunity.

EMIP Editor

Dr. Ackerman informed the Board that it was time to appoint a new EMIP Journal Editor. The Board agreed to add the discussion to the agenda. In preparation for the process, the prior Publishing Committee Chair, , submitted a list of recommendations to Dr. Ackerman for review. The Board reviewed the list of candidates and discussed qualifications. The Board concluded it’s review and Dr. Ackerman agreed to follow-up the final candidates.
Graduate Student Issues Committee Report

Dr. introduced the Graduate Student Issues Committee Report and expressed the importance of the proposed graduate student web page project. Plumer Lovelace also provided some additional background information. As Mr. Lovelace explained, the amount of focus on developing content as part of the proposal was very impressive. Based on Mr. Lovelace’s experience, most committee’s become distracted by the aesthetics of web projects and overlook the need for content. Additionally, Mr. Lovelace had confirmed that the proposal is indeed an extension of the existing website and not a separate website. Lastly, Mr. Lovelace had recommended that the Graduate Student Issues Committee share their concept with the Website Management Committee Chair.

As part of the discussion, the Board also addressed the need for an agreed upon workflow process for managing website related projects. Mr. Lovelace explained to the Board that currently requests are directed primarily to both he and at The Rees Group. Since the establishment of the Website Management Committee, Mr. Lovelace has directed web page development project to the Chair of the Committee, Michael Bunch.

The Board expressed their support for the Graduate Student Issues Committee web page project and asked for continued updates.

Other Business

As part of “Other Business,” discussed an idea from the Graduate Student Issues Committee to consider putting the graduate student posters in the same room as the joint NCME / AERA Division D reception. Dr. Rogers informed the Board that discussions with Linda Cook at AERA, had already taken place and she was supportive of this suggestion.

The Board discussed the idea in detail and talked logistics involved. The final recommendation of the Board was to allow the Graduate Student Issues Committee to review the suggestion and inform the Board of their decision.

Free Or Reduced Pre-Conference Workshops

Dr. Ackerman introduced the topic of the Reduced Pre-Conference Workshops idea. The Board raised several questions regarding past attendance by graduate students. Plumer Lovelace agreed to investigate sources that might provide attendance demographics.
Additionally, the question of how to select and award funding for individual students was discussed. The final recommendation from the Board was to have TRG provide information indicating the number of graduate students attending overall, as well as the number of graduate students attending the training sessions.

**Award Committee**

provided a brief summary regarding her work on the Call for Awards. As Dr. Ercikan explained, Leslie Lukin suggested that she review the Call for Awards information for accuracy and continuity. During her review Dr. Ercikan discovered that the information contained in the Call for Awards varied dramatically between documents. To create continuity, Dr. Ercikan revised each individual Call for Award document. Copies of each Call for Award were provided to the Board for review.

Dr. Ercikan explained that the only new language that she added to the Call for Awards was a reference to the ability to submit electronic copies of information.

Dr. Reckase expressed concern that the Call for Awards does not clearly indicate that the body of work be required to have been published or be publicly available. Dr. Ercikan acknowledged the observation and agreed to include language to address the issue.

**Fall Board Meeting Activity – Consider Visiting With Elected Officials in Washington DC**

Dr. Ackerman introduced the topic of the Fall Board Meeting and his desire to include the subject of NCME’s role in the political arena on the agenda. Dr. Ackerman emphasized the importance of NCME’s involvement in national politics. Additionally, he shared the idea of working with CCSSO as a strategic partner in the effort to reach elected officials. Dr. Ackerman agreed to work with Dr. Camara on a strategy and provide an update for the Board at the summer meeting.

**2010 Annual Conference – Program ideas**

Dr. Ackerman asked the Board if anyone had additional ideas for the 2010 Annual Conference. The general consensus of the Board was to try to replicate those things that had been successful in 2009 including size and convenience of breakout rooms, program signage and AV support.

**Executive Director Report**

Plumer Lovelace provided a brief update for the Board. Mr. Lovelace felt that the annual conference sponsorship effort had gone exceptionally well considering the economy. The total dollars received was #13,500, which was $1,000 less than 2008. However, there was great concern that the sponsorship list had not been reviewed over the years to indicate changes in contact information. Additionally, Mr. Lovelace felt that the sponsorship list could be expanded to include new organizations.
During his effort to put together a marketing plan for the conference, Mr. Lovelace explained that he was informed that the program is traditionally marketed to NCME members, past members and conference attendees. Mr. Lovelace suggested that the Board consider a much broader range of contacts for marketing. Additionally, the organization should set a target for annual attendance growth for the conference. Mr. Lovelace also circulated marketing samples for Board members to review.

Mr. Lovelace provided a status report on the request from the Board to investigate the cost of videotaping 2-3 breakout sessions during the conference and later providing playback of that video via the NCME website. Mr. Lovelace explained that he had reviewed two software tools, Adobe Captivate and Mediasite Live. Both would allow the capture of both video, as well as the presenter’s Power Point presentation. Mr. Lovelace emphasized the importance of the viewer being able to see the Power Point slides as part of the playback of the session.

Additionally, The Rees Group has purchased a licensing agreement with a company called BaseCamp to provide clients with an online, virtual workspace. BaseCamp allows users to create a project management calendar, collaborate on the creation of documents, store files and download files. Several NCME Committee Chairs had already voiced an interest in using this technology. Training would being within the next few weeks.

Lastly, Mr. Lovelace reminded the Board that NCME has an account with a teleconference vendor. The purpose of this account is to allow Board members or Committee Chairs to schedule meetings. No advance notice is required to schedule an audio conference. Mr. Lovelace asked that he be copied on email messages during the planning stages to the in order to help him translate the teleconference invoice when it arrives at The Rees Group.

Dr. Ackerman adjourned the meeting.