

**NCME BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
JULY 14 – 16, 2005
MADISON, WI**

Members present: Terry Ackerman
Jeri Benson
Linda Cook
Dan Eignor
David Frisbie
Jim Impara
Judy Koenig
Duncan MacQuarrie
Hariharan Swaminathan

Staff: Bruce Wheeler
Susan Rees, guest
John Hofmann, guest

Friday, July 15, 2005

1. Welcome and Approval of minutes from April meeting

President Impara welcomed the group. A revised version of the April minutes was distributed, but Impara and David Frisbie agreed to use the minutes originally mailed with the board book. Impara asked for corrections. Jeri Benson said that the “Outreach Committee” heading had not been included in the minutes and that a report had, in fact, been included. Bruce Wheeler said he would make the changes, as well as others that would be forwarded by Frisbie.

**Terry Ackerman moved to approve the minutes of the April Board meeting;
Duncan MacQuarrie seconded the motion. The motion was passed.**

2. Transition to TRG

Impara welcomed Susan Rees, owner of The Rees Group (TRG), and John Hoffman, TRG Vice President and IT Manager to the meeting. Wheeler briefly updated the group on staff’s receipt of the membership database from AERA; transfer of funds; mailing of dues invoices for individuals whose membership expired January 1 through September 30 of 2005; and historical documents received from AERA. Rees said that the membership database may need special attention as it appears some of NCME’s membership history had been destroyed. Wheeler offered to work with Frisbie on a mailing to members in order to verify and/or update information in the database.

Website. Hofmann distributed a report and explained that the web transition had been a challenge due to its current location at Solnet in Illinois. Access to work on the site is limited and there are problems associated with the language in which the dynamic content is written. Hoffman reported that he is currently transferring individual pages from the original language to the cold fusion-based language that can be supported by TRG. Frisbie told the group that this transition in language is inevitable, regardless of whether the website is managed by TRG or by any other vendor. Impara told Hofmann that online renewals are important to NCME, as is online balloting. Hoffman said that a members-only section would allow for these and other upgrades, including updates to member records by the members, themselves.

The group discussed various ways to encourage members to visit the site, as well as tracking hits to individual pages. Hoffman said that he would work with Frisbie and Impara, as well as the Publications Committee, on a potential refresh of the site, commenting that it was built in a 'second generation in a world that is now fourth generation.' In particular, he recommended a change from the current image-based menus to cascading, text-based menus. Linda Cook asked if the website is ADA-compliant; Hofmann said it probably was not, but that he does consider ADA regulations when building sites.

Frisbie asked the group to continue sending requests for web changes to David Miller rather than to Hofmann, as TRG is not expert in the measurement field and it is part of Miller's responsibility as Web Editor to approve and edit web content.

Frisbie asked if a cost estimate would be provided prior to Board approval of major activity on the website; Rees said she would provide written proposals prior to any work not included in the current contract. The Board agreed to give the Executive Committee responsibility for making such decisions between Board meetings.

Listserve. Hoffman reported that 3,000 names and e-mail addresses had been added to the initial listserve when TRG took over and received negative responses from approximately 800 people. Currently, the listserve reaches approximately 1,600 individuals, but Hofmann added that it is not a particularly active listserve, with fewer than 25 posts since March.

Proposal Submissions. A new online proposal submission system is currently in operation with 18 registered users and four proposals submitted to date. Hofmann offered to demonstrate the system to interested Board members. Cook told the group that she had gone through the process and found it easy to use. Hofmann reported that the proposal review and reporting process is not yet completed.

Change of membership renewal date from anniversary to calendar. Impara began the discussion by reminding the group that NCME membership was originally renewed according to calendar year, but that at some point both NCME and AERA had made the change from calendar to anniversary renewals. Rees said that TRG works with associations that renew by both calendar and anniversary date, so the question was not

about what staff could or could not do, but what the Board of NCME preferred. She added that calendar renewals were easier to process, but certainly not the only option. Wheeler added that, at the very least, a switch from bi-monthly anniversary renewals to quarterly anniversary renewals would improve the process from the standpoint of tying memberships to journal publication. He added that the primary advantage of renewing by anniversary date is cash flow, versus calendar renewals, which result in the majority of dues being received at the beginning of the year.

Duncan MacQuarrie moved to change NCME's membership renewal cycle from bi-monthly anniversary dates to a renewal cycle by calendar year, specifically following Option 1 on the handout prepared by Frisbie (see handout in Board book); Ackerman seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Impara directed Wheeler to work with Frisbie and, to the extent necessary, himself and Dan Eignor on the transition, adding that information should be placed in upcoming journals and newsletters.

The group discussed changing the definition of a "lapsed membership" from five months to three months (one quarter). Wheeler suggested that the grace period apply only to journals, but not to other benefits of membership; the group agreed.

Frisbie asked staff to start discussions with AERA to insure that non-members are not given the member-price for the 2006 program and training.

3. Committee Reports

NATD Update. Jeri Benson referred her fellow Board members to the report in the Board book, and said that she was hoping to get historical information on the origins of the relationship between NCME and NATD from the documents being forwarded to TRG by AERA. MacQuarrie estimated NATD membership to be approximately 100 people geographically spread around the U.S.

Benson told the group that the relationship with NATD had not been very well nurtured. Suggestions from the group to improve the relationship included looking into the possibility of joint membership of NCME and NATD and jointly sponsored sessions at the conference; MacQuarrie suggested a meeting between the two boards to discuss common interests. It was also suggested that the Outreach Committee nurture relationships not only with NATD, but also with other groups focusing on practice/application of measurement.

Benson reminded the group of suggested action items from the prior day's planning session discussions. Specifically, she noted the suggestion that NCME's and NATD's president write an article for the other's newsletter; a letter from the EM:IP editor to NATD members or a newsletter article asking for submissions of interest to NATD;

addition of an NATD column in NCME's newsletter; and Frisbie suggested having NATD's president send information about NCME through their listserve, and suggested that both organizations add links to each other on their respective websites.

International Test Commission (ITC) Update. Benson told the Board that ITC is an association of associations and was started because of standardized testing in European countries. She was unsure of NCME's membership status. Issues for NCME related to a relationship with ITC include eligibility to vote and to whom the journal is sent; she asked what the Board wanted to make of the relationship.

It was suggested that NCME could publish ITC meeting dates in its newsletter and promote ITC membership. Impara suggested a liaison be responsible for reviewing issues coming from ITC; Benson suggested a reactivation of the relationship and taking better advantage of NCME's membership. Since NCME does not currently have an official representative/liaison to ITC, Impara said that he, Frisbie and Eignor would discuss options and present a recommendation at the next Board meeting.

Recognition Area. Cook reported that she is working under an interim restructure, with six committees responsible for individual awards. She said a potential seventh award committee—Classroom Assessment Award Committee—was under consideration in the new restructuring plans to move to her area. Cook told the group that the two key activities of these committees are to distribute calls for nominations and to put the respective committees together. She also noted that calls for nominations had been updated on the NCME website's home page, but not on other pages within the site.

Cook told the Board that committee roster updates are in process and that her written report includes updated information on committee rosters, and she asked staff to update the master roster of committee members accordingly.

Cook reported asking her individual committees about whether or not award recipients needed to be members of NCME. Three of the four responding committees felt it was not important either way, but the Brad Hanson committee felt the award should be restricted to an NCME member or graduate student working with an NCME member. Cook said that she will come to the October Board meeting with a final recommendation on the subject.

Cook briefly discussed the NCME Classroom Assessment Award Committee, which is traditionally chaired by Rick Stiggins of Assessment Training Institute (ATI). Rick agreed to co-chair in 2006 with an NATD member and use NATD members from the San Francisco area on the committee. Frisbie expressed concern over the lack of NCME participation in the process when the award carries NCME's name. Cook replied that the award needs to be formalized, but that the immediate goal is to minimize bureaucracy. She asked the group if they felt a more formal structure should be imposed; Frisbie expressed support for the award and suggested that a formal structure was necessary in order to ensure long-term support of the award. Impara suggested a gradual imposition of structure. Cook suggested looking for ways to use this award to strengthen the relationship between NCME and NATD.

Cook agreed to contact Judy Arter and Peter Hendrickson to discuss potential structure, membership of a committee, etc. Eignor expressed support for the gradual imposition of a formal structure and the group generally agreed. MacQuarrie suggested the award look more like NCME's endowed awards, which would allow for a unique structure. It was agreed that an ATI representative who is an NCME member will co-chair the committee with an NATD member, and that a structure will be formalized moving forward with the goal of a final recommendation to be presented during the October Board meeting. Cook said she will look to the people currently responsible for the committee to get input on structure, including a mechanism to call for proposals.

Diversity committee. MacQuarrie reported that working with the Diversity committee had presented challenges; the committee roster, among other things, had been in question, and MacQuarrie said that Chairman Michael Rodriguez will need to fill vacancies and move the committee forward. MacQuarrie commented on what he perceived to be a pattern of weak organization in the management of this committee and Frisbie noted that the charge had not clear. Impara said that a subcommittee would address the charge. The question of length of term for student representation was raised and the group agreed that student terms are one year, not for three years, with the exception of the Graduate Student Committee, which has student terms of two years.

Benson pointed out a discrepancy between the actual number of committee members and the number of members specified in the NCME Handbook. Impara asked the group to look at what is actually needed and to provide appropriate information to Eignor as he looks toward making appointments and sending letters to committee chairs in early 2006. Impara directed the group to use the Handbook for information about committee size and makeup.

Elections Committee. Impara reported that the purpose of the committee is to count ballots, but that this may change if electronic balloting is implemented in the future.

Training Committee. Impara referred the group to the brief written report included in the Board book and offered no additional information.

Nominations Committee. Impara told the group that Frisbie is serving as chair and has formed a committee. Frisbie reported that a roster of candidates is almost complete, with one additional VP candidate to be identified.

Program Committee. Impara reported that the colleague recognition session had been popular at the 2005 conference and that the Program Committee is interested in learning who the Board might want to honor in the future. The Board agreed that Cronbach and Fred Lord were worth special consideration and agreed that other names discussed would be forwarded to the Program Committee for final consideration. It was suggested to include in the Program Highlights brief biographies of those individuals honored.

2006 Annual Meeting Contract. Impara told the group that a copy of the signed contract with AERA had been included in the Board book, and that a multi-year contract will be

actively pursued before the end of the annual meeting. He said the goal is to stay with AERA for program management due to the cost benefit. Impara said that an AERA representative might be invited to the October board meeting to discuss annual meeting issues for 2006.

Annual Fitness Run/walk. Impara reported that 2005 contracts had been paid and that Brian French (Purdue) will be taking over the run for 2006.

Recruitment Committee. Benson reported that the committee roster is complete, but that the final draft of the Career Brochure is not ready for Board review. Benson expects the brochure to be ready for mailing prior to the October Board meeting. Frisbie asked about the brochure's distribution, which was an issue raised at the previous Board meeting; Benson responded that she had sent detailed notes to the committee following that discussion for consideration as they formulated a distribution plan. Impara asked that the final distribution plan be shared with the Executive Committee.

Benson moved that the Recruitment Committee provide a distribution plan for its Career Brochure to the Executive Committee for final approval, upon which the Committee would be allowed to spend up to \$2,000 for printing and distribution; Frisbie seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Benson told the group that the committee has been tasked with surveying employers of measurement people to gather information on skills needed to succeed; job tasks; and salary. This project will be undertaken after the recruitment brochure is completed.

Outreach Committee. Benson reported that the committee currently has nine members, although the Handbook calls for six. She is trying to determine the actual makeup of committee, but will not try to resolve discrepancies until the 2006 committee is seated. Benson asked staff for an Excel spreadsheet of membership on behalf of the Outreach Committee chair, who will compare Division H and NATD membership rosters against NCME's roster.

Benson reported that the committee has had trouble accomplishing activities tasked by the Board, and that it will be working more with groups such as NATD and other groups more closely aligned with NCME in order to ensure future success. She believes the problems occur when joint projects are undertaken with groups too far removed from NCME's mission and purpose.

Benson said that the committee is asking for permission to hold conference calls. The Board agreed that they prefer communication be handled without such cost, but were in favor of conference calls if they would help to get the committee moving forward. Frisbie encouraged Benson to participate in the first call to represent Board interests.

Publications Committee. Ackerman reported that calls for new editors for ITEMS and the newsletter had been made, but little response had been received. The only two names submitted were Mark Gierl for editor of ITEMS and Scott Bishop for editor of the

newsletter. Ackerman recommended approval of the two individuals but offered to try to get a larger number of people to choose from.

Impara said that it was disappointing that the procedures for selecting editors as outlined in the Handbook could not be followed, but understood the difficulty of filling these particular positions and asked for a motion to approve the recommendations.

Ackerman moved that Mark Gierl be appointed editor of ITEMS and that Scott Bishop be appointed editor of the newsletter. MacQuarrie seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Ackerman presented four articles from recent JEM issues to the Board for possible use by Blackwell in promoting JEM through press releases that would draw attention to the publication and NCME. Impara suggested that topics of greater interest to the general public, as well as to the larger profession, be selected, adding that the current selection of articles isn't likely to catch the attention of mainstream press. It was suggested that JEM solicit such articles in the future.

The group discussed withholding a fall press release on JEM, pending Ackerman's ability to gather more information, and agreed that EM:IP might have articles more appropriate for public consumption.

Ackerman announced that Nam Raju, Illinois Institute of Technology, and Dan Bolt, University of Wisconsin, would be added to the Publications Committee.

EM:IP. Ackerman referred the Board to the written report submitted by Steve Ferrara, editor of EM:IP, then asked for discussion on Ferrara's recommendations for clarifying the Journal's mission/focus. Benson suggested more interaction with NATD to get articles that may help bridge the gap between technical information and practical application. Ackerman underscored the need to generate articles to bridge the gap, and Frisbie noted that such articles are hard to write and writers have less incentive to write them. He suggested soliciting articles from specific individuals rather than relying on a call for articles.

Impara told the group he was concerned about any shift that would result in bringing EM:IP closer to JEM in content. The board agreed. They also agreed that content should not be targeted to an audience of NCME members, alone, but to the broader community of measurement professionals.

The Board further agreed that the current mission of EM:IP is valid and that the editor should move forward accordingly, encouraging that a more pro-active approach to gathering articles be undertaken. Cook suggested a co-editor or other person to help relieve the editor's workload. Benson offered to intervene on behalf of the Board in her capacity as a former editor of EM:IP. Ackerman said that he, too, would follow up and arrange a time for himself, Benson and Ferrara to talk.

Newsletter. Ackerman reported the newsletter editor's concerns about archiving back issues and ascertaining the number of hits to the website. Wheeler said that back issues of the newsletter had been requested from AERA and would be archived upon receipt; Hofmann will be tracking web hits.

Wheeler also said he had agreed to write an article for the upcoming newsletter, introducing himself and TRG to the NCME membership.

JEM. Ackerman said the JEM editor had asked if the cost of additional pages for the journal, previously approved by the Board, had been negotiated with Blackwell. Frisbie said it had not and offered to contact Suzanne Lane to enlist her help in negotiations with Blackwell.

ITEMS. In answer to the editor's question if opportunities to promote ITEMS in places such as NCME newsletters and training sessions existed, the Board agreed that they did. MacQuarrie suggested asking graduate students to contribute content.

Website. Ackerman highlighted the e-mail from David Miller included in his Board report explaining the status of the website and personal issues he's faced recently. Frisbie asked if Miller had an advisory council; Ackerman didn't know. It was suggested that a council or committee could be helpful in reviewing the website and making changes in the future. Ackerman said he would raise the issue with Miller.

Report on Blackwell Transition. Ackerman referred the Board to a brief letter included in his report from Suzanne Lane regarding NCME journals, noting the disparity in number of members receiving JEM and EM:IP is due to different publication schedules. The board expressed their surprise and delight at the number of institutional subscriptions.

Ackerman concluded his report by informing the Board of his intent to set up regular meetings of the Publications Committee in order to see that issues related to NCME's various publications continue to move forward.

Membership Committee. Eignor referred the group to the written report of the Membership Committee and noted that chair Ed Wiley had not yet filled all committee positions.

Eignor said the committee had identified as its first activity follow up on the potential of bringing former members of AAHE, which no longer exists as an organization, into NCME. The Board discussed the apparent lack of a volunteer governance structure, the existence of which would make negotiations easier, and potential activities that might entice AAHE members to join NCME, including offering slots in the annual program; hosting a special listserve; and generally expanding NCME's services and offerings to appeal to a wider audience more focused on application than on research.

Eignor suggested an e-mail drive to the Practical Assessment COP, rather than to the entire group in order to determine interest.

Frisbie suggested offering a temporary home to the Practical Assessment COP for a defined time period of two years. Benefits might include program slots; listserve hosting; a newsletter column; and other activities that would not cost NCME any money directly. He added that, operationally, some sort of advisory committee would be required, as would modifications to NCME's membership database. The relationship would be reviewed after a pre-determined period of time to evaluate the benefit to both AAHE and NCME.

Benson expressed concern over giving AAHE a program slot without review and approval of content quality. Judy Koenig agreed, although Eignor reported that, as a former program chair, he did not believe that giving one slot away would be problematic.

Cook said that NCME is looking at expanding membership and bringing new membership 'groups' but asked if this was a group NCME was truly interested in joining with. Impara voiced his support for the pursuit of AAHE, within specific parameters and with the promise to revisit the issue at the end of the agreed upon trial period.

Frisbie suggested opening a discussion with AAHE and asking AAHE representatives what level of support they would want from NCME in order to join. He also suggested that either Eignor or Impara be involved in any decisions or negotiations. Eignor agreed to work through the Membership Committee to begin discussions and report back to the Board in October. MacQuarrie clarified that NCME was interested in pursuing the Practical Assessment COP, only, and not the larger group originally suggested.

The Board agreed not to fund the postal mail membership drive suggested by the Membership Committee.

Graduate Student Membership Drive. MacQuarrie told Board members that the Membership committee had proposed changing the fee for Graduate Student Membership. Impara said that dues were specified by NCME bylaws, therefore the proposal to lower the membership fee to \$5 was not possible.

Ongoing membership activities. Eignor highlighted proposed recruitment activities in the written committee report. It was agreed that one suggestion – a “starter” membership fee – is not possible, but Eignor offered to work with Suzanne Lane to learn if Blackwell would be willing to send a complimentary journal to targeted individuals in lieu of a trial membership.

The group briefly discussed targeting larger measurement companies and universities, as was done last year, for new members.

Graduate Student Issues Committee. MacQuarrie reported that the major question facing the committee is whether or not they should be soliciting funding for the no-host

cocktail event at the annual conference. He noted that the Board had already mentioned the need to solicit potential corporate sponsors one time only and for a variety of activities, rather than having potential sponsors solicited by different groups within NCME for individual activities.

Impara mentioned two primary strategies for corporate sponsorships: a fixed fee (one fee for all sponsors to cover all events); and different levels of sponsorships with different levels of returns based on the amount of financial support given. He offered as possible enticements to corporate sponsors the following:

Link on NCME's website

Organization's Name on signage at sponsored events

Organization's Name in annual program

Complimentary registrations for annual conference

Complimentary booth at exhibit hall

Potential advertising in journals (which would need to be worked out with Blackwell)

MacQuarrie voiced support for limiting benefits to the annual conference and not involving the journals or website. Wheeler told the group that, as a 501c3, NCME needed to be careful about pricing "benefits" as the IRS has regulations that would impact this kind of activity.

Impara asked the members if they supported the consolidation of solicitation requests or the current method of fundraising by which different groups within NCME solicit sponsors independently of one another. Frisbie supported the former, suggesting a letter from the President, with funds being sent to the Central Office. Impara estimated the financial need to be approximately \$10,000, offering to target all publishers and asking additional suggestions of corporate sponsors be forwarded to him.

Saturday, July 16, 2005

MacQuarrie moved that the GSIC no longer be charged with soliciting financial support for the no-host reception; Benson seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

MacQuarrie moved that the NCME president solicit financial support in the form of corporate sponsorship for a variety of activities during the annual meeting to include the no-host reception, fun run, and membership breakfast; Ackerman seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

MacQuarrie moved that graduate students be provided two tickets per student for complimentary drinks at the no-host reception; Hariharan Swaminathan seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

4. Financial Issues

Wheeler handed out a copy of NCME financials as of April 30, 2005. Frisbie asked that the group focus, instead, on the original financial report sent with the board book. He told the group he had received March 30 financials from AERA and noted changes from the March to April financials where activity should not have been. He has forwarded questions about the discrepancies to Jerry Sroufe.

He referred the group to the “Net Income Over Expenses” line item for YTD FY2005, which showed a positive balance of \$43,772, noting that he was unsure if all the annual meeting bills had been received, and that an additional bill for AERA central office contract payment was outstanding. He said that additional dues income would be reflected in subsequent financial statements.

Cook asked about how funds that support individual awards are received, noting that an expense item was listed for several awards, but no income was shown. Frisbie said that, in the new format of financials he had worked on with TRG, a more accurate reflection of income and expense for awards would be shown.

Frisbie told the group that NCME’s investments are still with AERA but that TRG is in the process of getting those investments transferred. He said that development of an investment policy would be a responsibility of the proposed Finance Committee.

Finance Committee. Impara distributed a handout listing possible charges and duties of the proposed Finance Committee. The proposal calls for a three-person committee overseeing financials, as well as risk allocation, budget development, and investments. Unlike other committees, continuing membership is anticipated.

Swaminathan asked about appointing committee members from businesses that might result in conflict of interest. Impara responded that safeguards would be taken to assure no conflict of interest, including disclosure of business associations. Swaminathan raised the question of ethical investments; Impara said that would be a policy to be discussed by the Board and passed along to the new committee.

Swaminathan moved to create a Budget & Finance Committee, as outlined in Impara’s handout; Benson seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

5. Governance Restructuring Plan

Frisbie referred the group to the handout included in the Board book. Impara noted that Eignor would probably need to appoint a liaison to work with AERA in order to monitor the annual meeting contract; an option would be to have the Program Committee and/or staff to follow up with AERA as needed.

Frisbie highlighted the fact that Training & Professional Development is currently under the Administrative Area, but under the proposal would move to a newly created Professional Area; the proposed Professional Area would bring together several

committees involved in the professional development of NCME members. Benson and Swaminathan suggested that the proposed Professional Area might present challenges due to the amorphous nature of several sub-groups. Cook suggested co-chairs to help distribute the workload.

Frisbie also highlighted the proposed revisions to the Standards Area, saying that the revisions called for additional duties not in the current structure. However, he noted that several of the responsibilities in this area have peaks and valleys, and in slower years the Board member responsible for Standards might be able to help in other areas.

MacQuarrie said that, with impending discussions on combining committee activities, it might be premature to make final decisions on the full proposal. Frisbie agreed, adding that one change had already been approved (creation of the Budget & Finance Committee).

Final approval of the proposed changes was set aside, pending further discussion of committee restructuring by Benson, MacQuarrie, Swaminathan and Koenig.

Benson moved that the liaison relationships not currently assigned to a Board member be moved to the Board member responsible for Standards; Frisbie seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Koenig agreed to inform Cizek and Yarbrough that they would be working with her and with MacQuarrie moving forward.

6. Standards

Eignor told the group that he had been in contact with APA, which had only recently finalized the 1999 Standards. APA has been pushing AERA to start on the next iteration of Standards and encouraged NCME to help move this process forward.

Wheeler was asked to request from AERA a copy of the contract between NCME, APA and AERA for the 1999 Standards, signed in November/December 2004.

Eignor reported that APA is in process of deciding on a person for the three-person Management Committee, adding that NCME should consider starting the process to appoint a person to that same group, as well as a chair for the Standards and Test Use Committee. He said he felt it would be 2006 before any real activity is undertaken and that a Board liaison to the Joint Committee would also be necessary.

Benson suggested updating the Handbook to reflect the need for the Joint Committee liaison to be an ongoing obligation, rather than a position that changes yearly.

Eignor told the group that the responsibilities of the Management Committee would include monitoring of expenses and charges of the Joint Committee, and laying the

groundwork for how the Joint Committee would actually operate, who could serve on it, etc. Impara said that he envisions action on this topic in the fall, and would include the incoming and past president in appointments, due to their importance.

Frisbie said that, with the change in management of NCME, Wheeler may need to be involved in the process to represent NCME's specific interests at the staff level. Eignor said he would inquire about past involvement of association staff.

7. JCTP Proposal for Best Practices for Educational Test Users in the Use of Technology-Delivered Assessment

Impara told the group he had received a letter from Greg Cizek regarding the Joint Committee on Testing Practices, noting that the only changes made since the Board's previous review of the proposal were in the final paragraphs; the letter was distributed. Impara said that the overall structure had remained unchanged from its previous iteration and that only the final endorsement process had been modified. Frisbie gave the group a brief overview of the history of the issue and NCME's specific concerns in the past, noting that the majority of NCME's concerns had not been addressed.

The Board agreed that the issue was important; however, they felt the proposal, itself, was not a good one. Koenig and MacQuarrie were directed to provide feedback to JCTP on behalf of the Board. It was agreed that, following the followup discussion, Impara would send a formal letter with NCME's formal veto of the proposal.

Frisbie moved to veto the JCTP proposal for Best Practices for Educational Test Users in the Use of Technology-Delivered Assessment; Ackerman seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Before adjourning the meeting, Impara asked the Board to send to him their suggestions for an NCME mission statement and two or three goals related to their specific responsibilities; he asked that those be received by August 15. Wheeler requested receipt of Committee reports no later than September 15.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 A.M.