

NCME Board Meeting

September 29 – October 1, 2010

In Attendance

**Board Members:**

Wayne Camara

Linda Cook

Terry Ackerman

Susan Loomis

Michael Rodriguez

Sherry Rose-Bond

Deborah Harris

Bruno Zumbo

Kadriye Ercikan (Thursday and Friday only)

**Committee Chairs:**

Kris Waltman, Website

Jerry Melican, Budget & Finance

Lietta Scott, Membership

Cara Laitusis, Program (by phone, Wednesday only)

Amy Hendrickson, Training Program (by phone, Wednesday only)

Steve Ferrara, Liaison to the Joint Committee on Testing Standards (Wednesday only)

Chad Gotch, Graduate Student Issues (Thursday only)

Lora Monfils, Recruitment (Friday only)

Kristen Huff, Assessment Policy (Thursday only)

Scott Marion, Assessment Policy (Thursday only)

Pheobe Winter, Outreach and Partnerships (Thursday only)

Jason Nicholas, Outreach and Partnerships (by phone, Thursday only)

**TRG:**

Plumer Lovelace

**Recording Secretary:**

Jennifer Kobrin

Wednesday, September 29

Meeting called to order at 12:50 p.m.

Housekeeping issues, Introductions

**1. NCME Website**

Kris Waltman walked through the contents of her committee's report. A website content editor has been appointed. There were two candidates. John Willsee is the recommended content editor. As previous program chair, he has established a working relationship with John Hoffman of TRG.

Kris indicated confusion about the process of appointment. Does President appoint editor who is then approved by the Board? Wayne Camara asked Plumer Lovelace to check and confirm the process.

Kris then described the procedures for making routine changes to the website. These have never existed before. She would like all individuals who "own" content on the web (NCME committees and governance members) to see these procedures.

Kris then presented data on website usage, focusing specifically on 2 tables. The first table showed which sections of the website are most commonly viewed in terms of the percentage of unique pageviews. The most popular sections are those to search and post jobs, provide information on the annual meeting, and proposal submission. Usage of the members-only section jumped in May due to Wayne's membership survey.

The second table showed the frequency of visits to various aspects of the new homepage during the period June 23-Aug. 31, 2010. Kris pointed out that there were only 228 clicks on the newsletter. Kris also pointed out that it is somewhat surprising that there were very few clicks on the award nomination pages, suggesting that we can't rely only on the website to get important information out to the membership.

Kris said that we have to get our members to go to the website on a monthly basis. This will take time and effort.

Bruno Zumbo noted that the number of clicks on the website may under-represent actual viewing (some may download content and print for colleagues)

Kris suggested three issues for further discussion:

1. Effectiveness of website as primary form of communication with members.
2. How should content from the NCME newsletter be incorporated into the website? Is the newsletter still a “member benefit” since it is now on the website for anyone to access?
3. What content and functions should be available to members only? Perhaps job opportunities? Should the discussion forum be a members-only benefit?

Kris wants to talk about short-term and long-term strategies

Kris showed screenshots of new website and indicated areas where particular committees would own the content. The new website is supposed to go live December 2011.

News section: content owned by publication committee and newsletter editor.

Resource center: content owned by outreach committee and standards committee

Annual Meeting: would include more timely information.

Students : content owned by GSIC, recruitment, and membership committees

Membership login – to update membership info, search member directory, search journals online (John Hoffman working on logistics)

Deborah Harris suggested uploading NCME papers and presentations to the website. There was some discussion on the best place to put these (Resources, Publications, Annual Meeting.) Cross-posting is a possibility. Lee Scott suggested putting the current years’ papers in the Members-only section, then moving them to the public section of the website after one year. Sherry Rose-Bond suggested posting a list of papers and their abstracts on the public section of the website to serve as “teasers”.

Bruno noted that this may not work to get people to join NCME, since individuals can contact authors directly for their papers. Wayne thought it would be very convenient to have papers available to download for members only.

Terry Ackerman suggested putting pictures on the website (of annual meeting).

Wayne asked each committee chair to brainstorm a wishlist for content for the website. The committees will then be responsible for creating the content that doesn’t yet exist. After the content is developed, then we can discuss whether it should be available only to members or to everyone.

Plumer reminded the Board to keep thinking about member benefits. NCME has marketed itself as sending out info to existing members. Once something is free, it is difficult to cut off access and make it available to members only.

Deborah asked whether the website committee considered soliciting content from the membership at large. Kris said that this will be considered at some point.

Linda Cook added that it is important to get committee chairs excited about this; and that a clear plan is needed on how to engage the committees.

Bruno likes the idea of having a Wiki, but it terrifies him what will be on there. Kris suggested starting with the glossary for the revision of the Standards. Sherry Rose-Bond suggested implementing a system where something has to be reviewed before it is posted.

As a short-term strategy, email blasts will be used to get members to the website, but we should have a policy on the frequency of email blasts and when this type of correspondence should or should not be used. Linda expressed the need to think more broadly on how we communicate with the membership. A long-term strategy will be needed for encouraging members to visit the website on at least a monthly basis. The committees will need to be involved in determining how to utilize website more effectively. Sherry suggested that each committee have page on the website to describe what they do.

Wayne reported that the membership directory will soon be available, and the search engine will be restricted to members only. Members will be able to search the directory by areas of expertise and region. When members renew, they will be asked to give information and give permission for their name to be included in the directory.

## **2. AERA Annual Meeting Contract Update**

Terry Ackerman described the contract with AERA. Plumer & Terry have had 5 meetings with AERA. At the first meeting, we gave them a list of things that were in the operating contract but that TRG had assumed. Three weeks ago, AERA sent us their first draft of the contract. They eliminated those things we pointed out to them. We paid them about 25-30k a year for the Annual Meeting. TRG is now doing a lot of those jobs. The question is – if they don't add new things to the contract, we would think the contract would be less money. Plumer, Terry, Diane Benson, Drew Nelesen, and Nate Ehresman all went through the contract. People who will always be working at the annual meeting have to be satisfied (TRG staff), so it is important that they have a voice. The individuals that reviewed the contract added and reworded some items, then the contract was sent to past presidents for their feedback. Quite a few gave feedback. Last week, Plumer and Terry had a phone call and took each presidents' comments and revised our draft of contract. Plumer is finishing the draft. Next, the draft will be shared with Linda and Wayne and will be sent back to AERA. In the past, AERA has not been held to keeping up some things that are in the contract. The length of the new contract will probably be four-years. The cost is anticipated at about 30k per year.

Wayne - Reduced scope by more than 5% - should also be built-in inflation. May not be realistic to expect reduced cost, but reasonable to expect no increase in cost.

Terry – we added things to the contact, like reconciliation between the AERA & NCME program. We've done a better job at communication.

Wayne – NCME Board members and committee chairs will not be scheduled against the NCME breakfast. The list of individuals attending the breakfast will have to be updated every year (Jennifer Kobrin will put the information in the Handbook). We won't know the award recipients in time to include on the list.

### **3. Update on Program Planning**

Cara Laitusis presented the Program Committee report. All proposal reviews are complete. As of today, 97% of all submissions have 3 reviews. Cara and Sandip Sinharay are waiting for TRG to put all reviews into one database so they can start selecting papers. There were 452 submissions (403 papers, and 49 coordinated sessions). 16 proposals were rejected outright due to excessive word length.

The committee is close to finalizing several invited sessions. There will be a session featuring a debate on CAT for accountability. Linda will moderate a session on contributions of pioneers. Wayne is organizing two sessions (there may be 3). One session will focus on test security and innovation, and the other two will be joint sessions with CCSSO. One will be a modified roundtable, talking about issues on common core assessments. CCSSO is interested in getting NCME involved in providing technical assistance in working with state leadership and SCAS groups. The other session would also be about technical issues in state assessments. Presenters would need to go to both conferences, but not funded by NCME. Cara would like to have a session on teacher proficiency but did not receive any proposals. Drew Gitomer from ETS is involved in a project on this topic, and Bruno offered to check on people who are doing this work internationally.

Action Item – Change database for submissions to ask whether reviewer is a graduate student or not (TRG)

John Wilsse and Bob Henson wrote an article about the process for creating the program and described the constraints, which was published in the June NCME newsletter.

Wayne wants to ask AERA for 6 rooms this year. Linda said that now is a good time to get meeting rooms from AERA since they have been cutting back the number of sessions. If we had extra rooms we could have training sessions during the conference. Bruno would encourage the Program Chairs to accept more papers to increase membership.

### **4. Training and Development Update**

Amy Hendrickson (on phone) presented the Training and Development Committee report. The committee received 20 training session proposals this year, and has a tentative list of sessions to accept/reject. The committee is considering having one 4-hour workshop during the conference, which would feature one of the previous award winners. A graduate student training session will be given by Randy Bennett on presentation skills, writing conference proposals, and turning papers into publications. Graduate students may be offered a reduced rate for the session. The committee is working with Terry and Michael Rodriguez on the webcast sessions. Presenters were asked whether they would be willing to have the sessions webcast, and all agreed.

Amy reported that evaluations of the training sessions are given via the web after the sessions, so the response rate is low. She plans to give out evaluation forms at the end of the session, and would coordinate with the presenters since many have their own evaluations. The committee is compiling information on what other organizations do in terms of professional development.

The Board discussed making the training sessions available outside of the conference. Sherry suggested putting videos of the training sessions on the web as member benefit. Plumer asked the Board to consider whether this would be a member benefit or should it be something for sale? If it's for sale we would have to build a shopping cart on the website. TRG has created and posted audio files, so it is easy to do.

Wayne said that the Board would need to consider the costs and whether we would need another server to host all this video. Plumer indicated that a webcast is pretty inexpensive, at about 97 cents per person. However, the production end can be expensive – paying someone to record the sessions over multiple days.

Deborah pointed out that some of the training sessions are repeated over time, and if they are available on the web then people will be less likely to pay for attending in person.

Amy noted the need for greater collaboration with AERA. All proposals are good, but the number that is accepted depends on the number of rooms available.

Susan Loomis asked whether it would be possible to offer the webcasts through CCSO. Terry replied that this was done last year, and the reason this will not be repeated this year is the issue of whether NCME should charge for the session. Rather than tackle that issue, we decided to use this year as another trial and focus internationally. We could have a much greater impact on the measurement community by offering this.

Wayne – after this year, it may be worth forming an ad hoc group to help structure a plan regarding the webcasts. There is a lot of potential, but the idea needs more structure.

Plumer added that the Board also discussed having someone from a remote location as the presenter. We have a cost model; we need to go back to the business model.

## **5. Joint Committee on Testing Standards**

Steve Ferrara reported on the activities of the Joint Committee on Testing Standards. Steve has been the liaison since Jan. 2009. Steve's role is to represent NCME interests in terms of the process (Steve noted that there is nothing about this role in the Handbook).

Steve indicated that past reports to the Board did not contain a lot of information because of an agreement with the Co-chairs of the Joint Committee (Barbara Plake and Laurie Wise) not to divulge substantive issues that are still in negotiation.

Steve reported on the charge from the Management Committee to Revision Committee. The report lists the five issues that the revision will focus on. The most significant substantive change is the fairness chapter.

Linda (one of the chapter authors) noted that they combined 3 chapters (fairness, assessing individuals with diverse linguistic backgrounds, and assessing individuals with disabilities) because they thought it was important to emphasize that fairness applies to all test-takers. Fairness is now emphasized throughout all chapters and is included in the foundational chapters.

Sherry asked whether the committee is addressing potential misuse of test scores to evaluate teachers. Steve said that there is a paragraph in the introductory material that addresses the issue, and Linda added that it may also be addressed in the policy chapter.

Bruno suggested that the revision also address multilevel uses of instruments and measures. Bob Linn said that the Standards don't address this issue (multilevel validity and validation). Bob Linn links it to accountability and evaluation.

Steve said that all chapters and introduction sections are now in final draft stages and are going through editorial review (Dan Eignor is the editor). To improve clarity there is a new organization of chapters. They are being prepared for public review, and the public review process is the opportunity to suggest new topics.

Bruno suggested mentioning diversity in a broad notion, including gender identity and sexual orientation. Steve/Linda said that this was discussed and acknowledged that this is an important issue.

Sherry asked whether Ch. 8-9 strengthens the sections on test security. This is a huge issue. Steve doesn't know that the new chapters were revised that much at all, so this may be an absence.

Wayne described the review process. The Management committee is not responsible for content; sets up the process, disseminates materials and gets feedback; and watches the budget. TRG is creating a webpage and interface (teststandards.net). Individuals/organizations will log-on and create ID and password. Will agree not to disseminate or share. There will be 15 separate PDF's: thirteen chapters, an introduction, and a glossary. Individuals can print out the PDFs for review purposes, and can log-in multiple times. Timeline: anticipated to receive chapters by early December; webpage would go live December 20<sup>th</sup>. January 1<sup>st</sup> will be considered the official posting date. We will give 90-120 days for comments.

Wayne - Greg Cizek is chair of standards and test use committee. Steve will be added as a member of the committee next year. The handbook says that chair of committee is the liaison. The language should be changed to say that "Ideally, the chair will be liaison" but another committee member can be the liaison. Greg is organizing the review process. There is no mechanism in the template to forward comments of NCME members to Greg Cizek so he can synthesize.

The Board and committee members should get word out to their organizations and other organizations. Greg will identify three experts and ask them to review each chapter. One of the reviewers for each

chapter will be a member of the NCME Board. The committee will take the comments and write up NCME's comments on each chapter; they will submit to the Board for review; we will have a tight window to make recommendations/changes.

Linda stressed that the NCME Board needs to endorse the standards. The Board that will be voting on the Standards will not be part of the review process. Can the Board also be a unit and go on record with their comments, and then be available to the Board that will be in place when it is time to endorse the standards? Wayne estimates that it will be 2013 when NCME will need to endorse the Standards. The document goes through legal, editorial review, and APA's council review before the final document is available.

Linda - the Board did not give a Level 3 endorsement the last time the Standards were revised because they felt they were not involved enough in the process.

Bruno/Michael – could the current Board form a standing committee that will stand through the existence of the process to then advise the new Board (or be authorized through the membership) to endorse the new Standards? Linda asked whether Greg's committee is taking this role.

The membership of this committee will change. We can change it to make it a fixed committee for a time.

Wayne – previous Boards felt that this was important job (to do review). The test standards committee may not have the time to give the review its due.

Deborah – this Board can give its endorsement at the review stage.

Wayne – there is a second review, but only for the 3 organizations (AERA, APA, NCME).

Jerry Melican – The handbook is open-ended with regard to Test Standards committee and length of terms and appointments.

The deadline for comments is May 15<sup>th</sup>. At the NCME conference we will have an open forum where everyone will have had the standards for 2-3 months. Greg and his committee, and this Board will attend. There will be a short presentation on the organization of the new chapters. Members of the joint committee and management committee will present, but 90 percent of session will be devoted for membership to give their comments. Those who participate will have a time limit to present their comments, and will be asked to sign-up in advance. We will also request written comments. We will have the session audio recorded.

The Board discussed adding categories of standards: primary or conditional. Wayne indicated that the statement of the committee (p. 2 of Steve's report) could be made stronger.

Steve noted that some committee members are expressing anxiety about the functionality of the website for getting comments. The committee wants to be assured that there is plenty of opportunity

to pilot test the website. They want assurance that system won't freeze and they will lose their comments; and they also want to be able to search and sort comments in efficient and logical ways.

Wayne said that we want to identify people to specifically ask for comments; we will send email in Oct./Nov. Would like to get more non-members aware, but we have not done any outreach. Wayne is not expecting to get many comments.

#### **6. Changes to charge and structure of the Standards and Test Use committee**

Michael Rodriguez led a discussion on changes to the charge and structure of the Standards and Test Use committee. This committee did not adhere to the Handbook which states that the Chair is the liaison to the Joint Committee on the Standards. In review of committee's work, Greg would like to see this committee be a standing committee; he proposes that this committee become involved in reviewing a number of other standards, like the Code of Fair Testing Practices. Some of these documents contain elements that overlap with the Standards.

Michael would like the Board to consider a proposal to make it a standard committee where members are appointed on 3-year staggered terms. (This conflicts with the earlier discussion about making this committee static in times when the Standards are being revised). Michael suggested adding a condition that the committee be made a static committee in these circumstances. Wayne suggested that, at the point when the Standards revision process begins, individuals would be asked to serve a second three-year term.

Bruno suggested moving the discussion to tomorrow morning.

The remaining items from the 9/29 agenda will be moved to 9/30.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Thursday, September 30

Meeting called to order at 8:45 a.m.

Wayne Camara asked Mike Cohen from Achieve to come over and talk to the Board about his initiatives.

## **7. President's Report**

Wayne is not thinking of new initiatives in the remainder of his term as President. He thanked everyone for their hard work. Wayne's presidential address will be about member data, and he will discuss the membership survey.

Before the holidays, NCME is going to write to organizations about NCME sponsorship. This year we are going after a larger group of sponsors. Wayne will personally follow-up. We will offer a tabletop space for sponsors to put their materials (about 2x4 ft.) The space will be unmanned, but they can post a notice that a representative from the organization will be there at a certain time during the conference. The NCME Headquarters table is becoming a place to meet; to try to further that idea, we will continue to negotiate with AERA to have this area to build a gathering place. In the future, we may want to negotiate with AERA to have our own exhibit space.

Linda Cook is concerned that people pay AERA money to have a booth; but would not have to pay for the table space.

AERA approved this because organizations would not sell anything at the NCME table space. The tables would not be in the Exhibit Hall; they would be in the NCME Headquarters Hotel, near the NCME registration table.

Sherry Rose-Bond suggested placing a card at the table explicitly stating that the organizations are sponsors of NCME events.

Jerry Melican noted that Drew Nelesen has asked us to increase the budget in a few areas, including signage.

Wayne added that we may want to consider an increase in sponsorship fees in the future. We now get \$1500.

In 2013 NCME will be 75 years old. We should begin planning a major celebration this spring/summer. SCIOP recently celebrated its anniversary, and had a room with posters showing a timeline of major events, with photos. Is there anything historical that we can get from our archives? We can program time dedicated to the history of NCME. We are hoping that we can recruit a group to work on this, maybe some past-presidents. The goal is to establish a task force to plan everything.

Kris Waltman reported that John Hoffman has asked if he can design a logo for the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Wayne says she can tell him to go ahead and do this.

Plumer Lovelace is going to meet with Herb Lehman to get an oral history of NCME; the meeting will be videotaped.

Deborah Harris suggested selling t-shirts to commemorate a year before; start getting people involved ahead of time.

Sherry – can have video clips of Past-presidents. In 2011 we should have a “save the date” to announce the upcoming celebration.

Linda would like to have a kick-off at the 2012 Annual Meeting. All the plans have to be in place this year. Avi Allalouf has been collecting a lot of artifacts for his museum exhibition. It was also suggested to get Ron Berk involved.

Kadriye suggested using the opportunity to expand and recruit new members.

## **8. Recording Secretary**

Jennifer Kobrin was asked to leave the room while the Board discusses the role of Recording Secretary.

The Board approved the position of the Recording Secretary. This position is an ex-officio, non-voting, member of the Board. This person serves a one-year term with annual renewal approved by the Board. The current responsibilities will be added to the handbook.

## **9. Standards and Test use Committee**

Michael Rodriguez presented the report of the Standards and Test Use committee.

At the last board meeting, the Board approved to move the committee from ad hoc to standing and increase student membership from one year to two years. Third and fourth recommendations were to clarify the role of the committee and expand the mission and charge to the committee.

Currently the liaison to the Joint Committee is not a member of this committee, yet they have responsibility for overseeing the revision and providing NCME’s comments.

The Board discussed changing the description and charge of this committee. The revised description is:

*This is a standing committee consisting of six regular members and one student member. Regular members are appointed to a three-year term with the possibility of reappointment for up to one additional term. Student members are appointed for one two-year term. The chair, who serves as one of the regular members, is appointed by the President. Effective in 2013, upon request of the President and the agreement of the chair, the chair of the committee will serve as liaison to the Joint Committee on Standards Revision for the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, at the time the Joint Committee is formed. All members will then be invited to remain on the committee at the time the committee becomes involved in the public review process, through an additional term appointment or provisional appointments. One member of the committee, appointed by the chair, may serve on the Advisory Committee for the NCME website.*

The revised duties of the committee are below:

*The committee provides input to the Board concerning the Standards, in terms of the need for a revision or progress when they are under revision. The committee monitors meetings of the Standards Management Committee and should receive all reports from NCME's representative to the management committee. The committee also develops timelines for, conducts recurring reviews of, and makes recommendations to the Board concerning the development of new standards and guidelines addressing testing or test use, as well as revisions of existing NCME-endorsed standards and guidelines.*

Wayne spoke with Cynthia Schmeiser about revising the Code of Fair Testing Practices. The committee would not necessarily do the revision, but would oversee it.

Kadriye noted that the International Testing Standards committee used to be in existence. She agreed to look into an ad hoc committee on international standards.

Michael made the motion to change the duties and composition of the Standards and Test Use committee.

Discussion: the composition of the current committee would stay the same. The changes wouldn't take effect until 2013.

All in favor; none opposed. Motion carried.

## **10. Executive Director's Report**

Plumer described the current TRG contract. So much has changed since the original contract. Wayne and Plumer put together project management to identify major cost factors in the contract. An addendum to the contract covered most of the extra activities. Only 4-5 things moved into the contract. They are now doing a comparison of staff hours. As of 2009, TRG instituted a timekeeping software tool.

The Wiley-Blackwell contract ends in Dec. 2011. There was a conference call mid-Sept. with Wiley-Blackwell. They have many resources that we are not tapping into; these may be included in the new contract.

Bruno discussed moving to a strategic partnership to foster communication, enhance dissemination and sharing of information. He would like to see NCME leverage the relationship with our publisher to foster membership growth. How do we increase impact factor of our journals? The Wiley online library would be part of our new contract. We should also move towards social media and new media, podcasts and a virtual conference capability. These will increase impact and also grow membership. We can also consider cross-journal marketing – e.g., I/O journals, health journals, other areas of education. Our potential book series is still in negotiation, and a new web platform has been approved. Everything mentioned here should be part of the new contract.

We can give email addresses to Blackwell and have them send out an email announcing new publications, with an option to opt-out.

Bruno believes there is some advantage with keeping the book series with Wiley. Having the book series with them should not be a separate negotiation (can be done together with the journal contract).

Plumer and Terry urged the Board to not have large gaps in our meetings with them. We should have a strategic plan for our publications. They will help us do this.

Wayne noted that EM:IP is not indexed in the social science index due to its format (it's like a magazine, newsletter). The backlog of articles for JEM is 2 years. We may want to negotiate for more pages/issues. Wayne asked Bruno to address these issues, and make sure these are part of contract negotiations with Blackwell.

Kris would like to ask Blackwell to also provide quality PDF's of ITEMS modules to put on our website.

Wayne asked for a vote to approve funds for a face-to-face meeting in Madison between the website content editor, website committee chair, and technology/website staff at TRG. Bruno seconded the motion; all in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Wayne presented the NCME Financial Policies and Procedures Pertinent to Editors. NCME will provide up to \$10k per year each for JEM, EM:IP and website content editor. That money is relatively flexible and can be paid to the institution or the individual for the things listed in the statement. TRG will take care of the details of the payment. The editors will have to present evidence/rationale for use of the stipends. This is the ongoing version, this is operational until April.

Bruno was asked to take this policy, contact the journal editors, and work with Kris to modify, change the statement, which will be brought to a vote at the Jan or mid-Feb. Board meeting (conference call). Susan will end her term as publications liaison in April; she will also be involved in these discussions.

## **11. Budget**

Jerry presented the proposed budget for FY11 on behalf of the Budget and Finance Committee. The proposed budget should not be viewed as static but as a working document that will be monitored continually. For example, estimates of costs for the Annual Breakfast are based on history but will not be known for sure until the agreements have been signed with the hotel. The projected net income/loss is much lower than the previous years' net income. The assumptions are conservative. There is a projected slight decrease in registrations for New Orleans conference (90% of last year's attendance).

Linda said she thought that AERA would be happy to share their projections of conference attendance to help estimate ours.

Our biggest sources of income continue to be membership dues, annual meeting fees, and royalties. Our biggest expenses are the annual meeting, and administration/new initiatives.

Wayne asked the Board to give feedback on the NCME breakfast. Should we repeat what was done last year because it got good feedback, or offer more breakfast tickets? He won't approve both.

Bruno noted that any additional costs for the breakfast should be seen to have several different purposes; increase membership, etc.

Wayne said that every year we subsidize the breakfast, but we have not developed new income sources to help subsidize this, since we are not increasing membership dues, conference fees, or sponsor levels. If we get more sponsors, we can possibly do this. We won't know about sponsors until February.

The Budget and Finance Committee estimates an income of about \$7,000 for the year. This does not include the fact that there is always some money in the expense portion of the budget that will never be spent. For example the editor stipend for JEM (\$10k) may not be spent.

Bruno makes a motion to approve the budget as proposed. Terry seconds the motion.

Discussion: Linda asks about the line for income from website advertising; why it was increased to \$10k this year. This is estimated for job postings on the new website. Kadriye Ercikan reported that ETS is planning to provide funding for the Cascallar award on an annual basis.

All are in favor; none opposed. Budget passes.

## 12. Review of Action Items and Minutes

Terry makes motion to approve the April 30<sup>th</sup> and May 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes. There were no changes or corrections - none. Kadriye seconds the motion. All approved; none opposed.

Wayne called for the status on the open action items . The Board thanked Jennifer Kobrin and Kristen Huff for all their work taking minutes at the May and June Board meetings.

## 13. President Elect's Report

Linda gave an update on NCME activities and some preliminary goals.

We will have an extensive planning meeting in the middle of October. Linda asked the Board to have in mind things they would like to see improved or initiated in the next year.

Linda is acting as liaison to the Budget and Finance committee, Website committee, and Membership committee. She has begun planning for first meeting of 2012 program committee (in January). She developed, with others, a proposal for member recognition; and appointed a task force to work on evaluating NCME meeting, led by Rosemary Reshetar and Cheryl Cardell. She developed, with Lora Monfils, a proposal to the NCME Board to revise the NCME committee volunteer process. She has started to work with Anne Fitzpatrick on the development of an NCME foundation.

Linda is planning to follow-through on initiatives begun by Wayne and Terry: contracts, website revamp, defining NCME's role in assessment policy, administrative and functional improvements, outreach & partnerships, and edited book series.

New initiatives will include: NCME foundation, development of strategic financial plan, Annual Meeting program & process improvements; improvement in committee processes; including volunteer processes; planning for 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary – tie in membership campaign and communication campaign; increase mentoring; increase participation of international members; identify new ways to partner with Wiley-Blackwell; improve use of technology; and develop a communication plan.

Linda will need help with: prioritizing work; support for initiatives; and suggestions for a theme for 2012 conference and ideas for speakers and invited sessions.

Kadriye mentioned that there will be a shift in the assessment arena; and suggested that we draw attention to this shift in the 2012 program.

Bruno asked what role the theme plays in the conference. In the past, the theme has not really played a big role in shaping the program. Perhaps the theme can tie into the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

Linda said that the theme needs to be broad enough so that a variety of sessions can fit in. Invited speakers/sessions usually address the theme.

Deb suggested the theme "looking back, looking forward" - How we're looking at things differently.

Michael noted that the program chairs indicated that there would be more favorable review to topics that address the theme.

#### **14. Annual Meeting Task Force**

Linda appointed a task force to improve the quality of NCME meetings. Rosemary Reshetar and Cheryl Cardell are the co-chairs. The charge of the task force is to evaluate the quality of the meeting and make recommendations for improving the process and the program. The task force members include past, current, and future program and training chairs, and a graduate student representative (Chad Gotch).

Timeline: Aug-Sept. 2010 gathered input from committee members and developed a survey; Nov. 2010 will conduct online survey of membership; Spring 2011 - proposed meeting improvements will be presented to NCME Board. Changes will be implemented at the 2012 Annual Meeting.

The areas of focus on the survey (including suggestions for surveying logistics of the meeting provided by Drew Nelesen) are: the registration process (preconference, on-site, and reserving hotel room); the quality of proposal review process; the quality and format of meeting sessions; satisfaction with training sessions; satisfaction with the annual meeting breakfast; coordination of meeting activities with AERA; grad student and career scholar involvement; enhanced use of technology; and increased international focus.

It was noted that questions about onsite registration should differentiate between AERA and NCME since there is separate registration.

New session formats were discussed. Several Board members like AERA's new roundtable format that includes a chair and/or a discussion. This format fosters a great amount of interaction. Can AERA allow NCME papers to be uploaded? To get papers in advance- this would enhance interaction and discussion at the conference.

Wayne noted that it would incur extra costs to have a session of roundtables or poster session one period and taken down in time for the next session.

Linda said that the changes should be rolled out gradually. We would like to have guidelines on the percentage of sessions of different formats, to offer a variety of sessions. It will be important to evaluate the changes that will be made this year.

Terry asked how many NCME graduate students participate in the AERA job placement service. Is there anything that NCME can do to support/supplement this? Scott Marion added that we should ask faculty members whether they encourage their students to participate.

Linda asked Board to give comments on the survey; will email out an electronic version. She asked the Board to think about other areas of concern and things that would enhance the conference.

Kris asked how the survey will be administered. Plumer said that the TRG has a marketing tool called MyEmma that provides data on how many are accessing/completing survey.

#### **15. Membership Status and By-Laws**

Wayne showed a chart indicating the membership renewal/removal process. There should be three outcomes if an individual does not pay dues. Member access to the website should be shut off, they should be removed from journal list, and should be removed as an active member in dB and receive no conference discount. This may not be in place. If AERA doesn't have our dB, how do they know who is an NCME member? Wayne will have his daughter register for AERA and say she is an NCME member to see what happens.

How long after a person does not pay dues do they still get the journals? Wayne wants to understand the process and make sure it represents what NCME wants.

Wayne proposed a change to the by-laws and pointed out areas where we are not adhering to the by-laws. Wayne suggests a temporary fix – there would need to be a committee to go through the by-laws in detail to identify these areas.

The Board discussed of the qualifications for associate and active members. Scott read the AERA descriptions of membership levels.

Do we want to encourage high school teachers to join NCME? There was disagreement. Bruno would like to see NCME open to this. Wayne suggested getting a group together to decide on this issue – how

exclusive vs. how broad do we want our membership? This would be a by-law change that the Board wouldn't be able to change.

Emeritus membership status – we can't verify whether a member meets the qualifications as listed in the by-laws. They have financial implications – are we comfortable with self-report? Kris thinks it may be a problem to increase the age to 65.

Membership in the by-laws is for graduate students, not students. Application says you must be endorsed by an Active or Emeritus member; but not online. A lot of our current student members would not qualify if we held to the by-laws.

There are numerous issues where our by-laws are not being enforced and are inconsistent. Wayne wanted to raise these and to perhaps form a separate committee to look at all of these issues. That group should include someone on the Budget and Finance committee to model the different options and financial implications.

## **16. Membership Recognition**

At the last Board meeting we talked about ways to recognize members. Linda, Wayne, Terry, and Lee worked on a plan including both current and proposed recognition for award winners, committee members, committee chairs, Board members, past-presidents, editors, program chairs, proposal reviewers, longtime members, new members, and graduate students. Linda gave the Board an overview of what we do now and a proposal for what to add.

Chad was asked to provide feedback on the idea of designating special tables at the breakfast for graduate students. Kristen suggested that tables be reserved for graduate students so they don't feel intimidated. Current members may be asked to stop by and say hello.

NCME should be able to keep free rooms at their hotel (the comp rooms) and use them. AERA gives suites to all of the VP's of Divisions. We can give the comp rooms to graduate students.

Wayne is opposed to giving free rooms and breakfast tickets. There was a lot of discussion about whether or not to provide free breakfast tickets. It was decided not to provide breakfast tickets, except for graduate students.

Michael suggested making it more widely known that it is possible to not come to the breakfast but come to the meeting.

<p>Sherry made a motion for the Board to approve \$2,000 to fund certificates, ribbons, and mementos for member recognition. Kadriye seconded the motion. All were in favor; none opposed. Motion carried.</p>
--

## **17. Assessment Policy Committee**

Scott Marion and Kristen Huff led a discussion on the formation of a permanent committee on assessment policy. They distributed an EPI Briefing paper, "Problems on the Use of Student Test Scores to Evaluate Teachers" and suggested that this is the kind of paper that we have been talking about for

NCME. How can we convince people to write a paper like this? How many issues can we take on? They would like to identify a key policy idea and organize an invited symposium at the annual meeting. Participants will have to deliver a paper. The papers will be structured so that they are coherent, and will include a synthesis document.

Kristen reminded the Board that the action items from June meeting were to come to the Board with an issue, rationale, and intended first product/suggested approach; and to create a mission statement for the committee. We need a way to collaborate and synthesize our expertise and put in usable form for policy-makers. And we need a form for dissemination and outreach. Creating a product is not enough. We don't have the entrée into policy arena to be at the table.

The issue that was chosen is comparability and the common core assessment. The product would be a series of short papers. An invited session at the conference would be the lever to get people involved. The committee would synthesize, edit the papers that came out of the session, and create an outreach/dissemination plan.

Kadriye asked what would our membership think of this? What is the added value? She voiced concern that the work is already being done individually.

Terry noted that the goal is to inform policy makers, provide the pro's and the con's, not necessarily to take a position. Kristen added that the product would outline the trade-offs required when various types of comparability are the goal.

Bruno – authors can write from their own perspective. A third group (non-NCME) takes both positions and synthesizes. Point/counterpoint format.

Wayne - We're looking for topics where the policy makers and the public are moving in a direction that measurement specialists disagree.

Sherry suggested that the cover letter needs to say that this is the first in a series of this type of document.

Wayne is hoping we can try this. All Board members agreed with the charge of the committee, but there was discussion on the content and NCME's endorsement.

Bruno asked whether the product would be endorsed by NCME, and would be considered a policy statement by NCME. He's very concerned about putting an NCME stamp on papers that may fundamentally disagree with members' organizations.

Kadriye added that the more we move away from policy briefs the more comfortable she would be. Perhaps include a peer review process.

Bruno suggested that the objective is a communication device to point to Standards, which NCME does endorse. Linda - the standards do not go far enough. What does research tell us and inform us about this issue? We may not agree, but that should be pointed out.

Kristen added that if it is too academic, it won't be helpful.

Wayne – ACTION item is to approve the committee to do what was outlined. If approved, Kristen and Scott would be asked to come up with recommendations for committee members. Terry, Linda, Wayne, and Michael would approve the committee members.

Deborah made a motion to approve a standing committee on Assessment Policy and Practice; Bruno seconded the motion.

Discussion: This committee would not be appointed like other committees. The Handbook description would need to be revised with committee structure. Possible committee members should be members of NCME in good standing. Phoebe Winters thought the membership should have the opportunity to volunteer for this committee. But Linda said that this is an ad hoc committee so it doesn't have to conform to rules we use to establish standing committees. Wayne noted that this committee requires special qualifications. The name of the committee was changed to Committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice.

VOTE: All were in favor; none opposed. Motion carried.

### **18. Outreach and Partnership Committee**

Pheobe Winter and Jason Nicholas presented the report on the Outreach and Partnership committee. The annual goals for this committee are to: develop criteria for outreach to other organizations; partner with recruitment committee; and expand resources promoting assessment literacy.

A committee meeting was held on August 9<sup>th</sup>, where the committee discussed the scope of the committee and achievable goals and tasks. The committee constructed criteria describing the parameters of organizations to outreach.

The committee engaged in outreach to CCSSO regarding joint projects; CCSSO invited the committee chairs to a meeting to discuss common interests. The meeting will take place in Orlando in November. They will discuss Gary Phillips work, meta-analysis on test accommodations; partnership with NCEO. There are many joint issues.

Bruno noted some confusion about the distinction between Kristen and Scott's committee and this committee. The two committees should communicate and make sure there is no conflict.

The Outreach committee's goal is to provide measurement knowledge and assessment literacy to people at different levels. Knowledge translation is a big part of NCME's role. Bruno will find links and share with the Board.

### **19. Graduate Student Issues Committee**

Chad Gotch presented the report on the Graduate Student Issues Committee. The GSIC will sponsor an invited symposium at the 2011 meeting on translating technical material for lay audiences.

Oct. 1 is the deadline for submitting poster proposals. Posters that are accepted are assigned professional mentors (outside of their institution).

Kris, Plumer, and Chad are discussing developing a threaded discussion forum on the NCME website.

Kris said that the Website committee is considering this a pilot that will potentially replace the current Listserv.

Two committee members will update the internship opportunity spreadsheet. Two committee members will develop a roster of companies and non-profit organizations that employ measurement professionals. The suggestion was made to include international testing organizations.

A motion to approve breakfast tickets for graduate students will be covered tomorrow.

Wayne asked Chad to consider what would be of most assistance to graduate students if additional funds are available (e.g., travel funds)

Meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Friday, October 1<sup>st</sup>

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 a.m.

Wayne asked to Board to approve the minutes from the June, 2010 Board meeting.

Lee Scott pointed out that on page 8, the Board did approve that we give ribbons to members in the 2-5 year range. We now give ribbons to everyone.

Terry made the motion to accept the minutes. Sherry seconded motion. Bruno abstained because he was not in attendance at the June Board meeting. All were in favor. None opposed.

Wayne reported that the next Board meeting will be a conference call in Jan/Feb, 2011. Bruno and Susan will present a proposal for journal editor support, reimbursement, and stipend. A temporary policy is in place, but we need to formalize it. Bruno will present several different options. At that meeting Jerry will also present a budget update, particularly on the upcoming conference. Drew Nelesen will have a site visit and by the time of the conference call we will have information about the floor plan for the NCME Headquarter Hotel. Terry will give update on the AERA contract.

APA has provided staff support for the joint committee (logistics, travel, copying). AERA does the same for the management committee. There was the suggestion that NCME should pay for the interface. We have an estimate from TRG, but we are not sure if this is what the joint committee wants, and the scope may change. Jerry will obtain a cost estimate.

**19. Graduate Student Breakfast Tickets (continued from 9/30)**

Lee Scott reported that last year the Membership committee wanted to encourage more graduate students to come to the breakfast. We raised \$500 which funded 20 tickets. The membership

committee would like to raise that much again this year, and possibly increase to 36 tickets (3 tables/12 students). The tickets would be given first to students who are on committees or served as reviewers. Students would have to confirm that they will attend the breakfast before receiving a ticket. The money would come from sponsors, but would come from NCMEs operating budget. Students would be chosen randomly to receive the tickets.

Wayne/Plumer – if we hold the ticket and give to them at the breakfast, it would not change the cost.

This request is coming from both the Membership and Graduate Student Issues committees jointly.

Tables will be set aside for graduate students, and available for those with or without a free ticket.

Sherry suggested that students be asked to pick up the ticket the day before at the NCME table. If they are not picked up, they can be given to someone else.

Wayne asked the Board to think of different criteria for awarding tickets in the future (e.g., students who are first authors of papers). In the future we may consider giving all graduate students a free breakfast ticket. Over time, we will need to increase the cost of the breakfast.

Kadriye made the motion to approve \$2,160 to fund 36 tickets; Terry seconded motion. All were in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.
---

Lora Monfils – the testing companies can support the breakfast.

Bruno thought we can offer recruitment/advertisement opportunities at the breakfast by allowing organizations to leave brochures at the tables.

Lee Scott reported on the Membership committee's survey of lapsed NCME members. The survey is ready for field test. We are planning to use SurveyMonkey, but can now use MyEmma as a backup. Survey Monkey has fees; but there are other options that are free. Lee asked the Board to field test the survey and provide comments.

Bruno noted that data ownership may be an issue, and this needs to be examined. Any survey software that is managed by a third party stores the data. Plumer said that John Hoffman has done proprietary software before. We should look at surveys that are planned and work with TRG to get it done. TRG will determine the best solution.

## **20. NCME Edited Book Proposal**

Wayne asked the Board to discuss the NCME Edited book proposal and establishment of a book series oversight group. A 3-5 member group would be selected based on qualification (hand-pick people with experience in publication, contracts, editing, financial). These people would have to persuade individuals to publish with NCME rather than with other publishers. The members would include a journal editor, book editor, past-president, and those with commitment to the idea and time to implement and shape it. This group would report through the Publications committee. After the first 6

months, there would be extra involvement by Susan, Bruno, Plumer, and Wayne in shaping the process. The royalties would be split about 50/50; with possible change as recommended by committee.

Susan and Bruno were surprised that they were not involved in early discussions with Mark Gierl. An NCME sponsored book series suggests that we don't own the book series. We need to be clear in wording – NCME wouldn't just sponsor and stamp our name on it. We need to decide first whether we want a book series. We should deal with the book series in the same way we deal with the journals. We need to consider whether we want to go with just one publisher .

Wayne asked the Board to consider making a motion for NCME to establish an NCME book series.

Bruno made the motion for NCME to establish an NCME book series; Deborah seconded the motion.

Discussion: this book series would be owned by NCME and treated in the same way that we treat our journals.

All in favor; none opposed. Motion passes.

Susan suggested that we come up with recommendations for how the edited book series proposal should be revised, or confirm/approve the current recommendations.

We can have multiple publication agreements. We have met with 3 publishers already. We should know exactly what we want then present to publishers. Routledge, Sage, Guilford, and Wiley-Blackwell are the main publishers to talk to.

Do we want to approve a topic (Bruno says no)? We can recommend topics to the committee. Susan wants to make a distinction between an edited book and an edited book series. Wayne sees it similar to what SCIOP does. Different editors/topics for each book.

Bruno/Susan will identify a publisher and appoint membership of the oversight group. Bruno will begin to set up interviews with publishers, and will bring information and a proposal to the next Board meeting. The chair of the oversight group should be identified quickly and become involved right away. The current journal editors don't need to be involved.

Bruno suggested selecting a publisher independently and not selecting an editor tied to a publisher.

## **21. Membership Issues and Changes in Volunteer Process**

Linda and Lora presented a proposal on a system to change the volunteer process. We need a process in place to maintain/keep current our committee volunteers. The volunteer process should be fair, easy and inexpensive. The core of the process is development of a volunteer dB. The process should provide an archive for volunteer positions held by NCME members.

Why change the current process? Some members feel that they volunteer and never are selected, and/or are not informed if they are not selected. We currently don't have a good way of keeping track

of who has and who has not served; and have no good way of collecting background information on volunteers.

The key elements of the new volunteer process: fixed volunteer time period (Annual meeting to mid-September). Db design would draw some personal information from the membership database; will serve as archive for committee rosters, and members would need to re-volunteer each year. NCME president would own the process. GSIC will have a separate process.

Michael said that it is important to keep information about how many times they have volunteered. Linda said that the dB can ask whether the person volunteered before.

Lee said that the Membership committee was confused by time limit; they assumed that people volunteering would be immediately placed on a committee and start work by September.

Linda hopes to begin this process at the 2011 conference. The first year will be a pilot.

The dB would know whether a person served on another committee, the Board, or won an award.

Linda will work with Lora and Chad on the GSIC volunteer process. The roster of graduate student volunteers is not available until Jan/Feb.

The new system will collect background information, including previous positions held in NCME. Volunteers will be asked to rank order their preference for a maximum of 4 committees. Volunteers will be asked to provide a short statement about their interest/qualifications for serving on a particular committee. We can possibly ask for CVs; this can be unwieldy, but could be helpful. Kris noted that John Hoffman said it won't be a problem to store CV's.

The dB will have a flag to identify graduate students. Deborah added that the system needs statement that person is not already serving on another committee. It is important to make sure that committee chairs do not get overlapping lists of volunteers. There will be difficulty with people volunteering for more than one committee. There will be a pre-written email for notification of selection or non-selection.

John Hoffman has estimated 16 hours of IT work for a total of \$2,000. Linda thinks this may be an underestimate. This would go under the Members-only section of the website. There will be pieces that will likely change as we go through the software development. Linda asked the Board to read the proposal and identify if there are any red flags. Committee chairs have already seen this.

Sherry added that when people sign up for committees, it should be made clear that they can volunteer for up to 4 committees, but they can only serve on one at a time.

## **22. Awards Committee Update**

Kadriye gave a report on the awards committees. The committees have been trying to elicit nominations for awards. Kadriye asks the Board to nominate award winners.

There will be a session at the annual meeting highlighting last year's award winners. The session will be evaluated and considered again for future years. Kadriye will chair the session; there will be no discussant. She will acknowledge the two awardees that are not at the session. It will be a typical paper presentation session for the 4 awardees. Brochures will be available with information about the awards. The attendance will be monitored.

ETS is now funding the Cascallar Award for 5-7 years. Kadriye will get in touch with Diane Benson at TRG about where the money is to be sent. The Board gave note of gratitude to ETS and Ida Lawrence for their support of the Cascallar Award. Linda noted that we can ask ETS for more money if desired. The Board agreed to ask ETS for \$10,000 for the next ten years. This would need to be segregated.

### **23. Recruitment Committee**

Lora Monfils gave a report on the Recruitment committee, following up on the two proposals from the June meeting. Committee members have been assigned to each task. Lora is waiting for the results of a gap analysis, which will tell us who we're missing in NCME.

There is a proposal to foster online/virtual NCME communities. To gather information about a LinkedIn community, Lora had a conversation with Lew Schumacher from ETS. He has offered to disseminate NCME information via the Educational Measurement LinkedIn, e.g., flyer about NCME, measurement careers. The LinkedIn community was initiated by ETS but it is public and open to everyone. The Board agreed that Lora can send information to be posted on LinkedIn.

The committee has not yet pursued a Facebook account. LinkedIn is more geared toward graduate students and professionals. NCME can develop its own LinkedIn account. The Board approved that the Recruitment committee will continue to pursue establishing an NCME Facebook and LinkedIn account. Plumer noted that the biggest challenge is determining the content and marketing calendar, or schedule for communicating information and target groups. There are software tools to accomplish this.

Kris asked for clarification on the Recruitment committee's "path to membership" survey and how this information would be used. Lora said that the purpose of the survey is to determine how people became involved in psychometrics and measurement. This information will help tailor recruitment efforts and materials.

Kris asked whether it makes sense to survey the entire membership, or just a segment? She is concerned with the number of surveys going out. The survey can perhaps target new members (up to five years)? Lora would like to target all members. Wayne thinks a survey won't work because the questions are more open-ended.

Kadriye suggested organizing a focus group at the annual meeting, inviting students and new members. Other possible vehicles to gather the information include online bulletin boards, or a threaded discussion forum on the website. Some of the questions can be appended to other surveys.

Wayne said that we will need to screen all surveys and pay attention to when surveys are going out. Can existing membership data help? Lora would like to use all of the above (existing data, online communities, and focus group) to get information to inform recruitment efforts. Lora will contact professors to find out how they are recruiting students.

#### **24. New Business/Announcements**

Plumer will send out possible dates and times for the Jan/Feb conference call.

Board Liaisons were asked to make sure committee chairs submit their reports on time.

Plumer requests that any questions having to do with hotel reservations and travel be directed to Drew Nelesen. All Board reports should be sent directly to Nate Ehresman. Plumer may be cc'ed.

Plumer would like the Board to examine their confidentiality policy. Plumer can pull together samples for the Board to review.

The 2011 NCME annual meeting will be at the Westin Hotel in New Orleans. AERA will not be using the convention center this year.

We've never made any effort to market the conference. The conference is one of the best sources of new members. Plumer encourages the Board to think about this. We can look at materials and put together a marketing calendar.

The meeting is adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin

NCME Recording Secretary