



**NCME Board Meeting Minutes
July 19-20, 2016
Philadelphia, PA**

In attendance:

Officers & Board Members

Richard Patz, Immediate Past President
Mark Wilson, President
Randy Bennett, President-Elect
Luz Bay, Board Member
Kristen Huff, Board Member
Won-Chan Lee, Board Member
Dale Whittington, Board Member
Derek Briggs
Walter (Denny) Way

Committee Chairs & Staff Members

Mark Shermis, Budget & Finance Committee Chair
Vicki Scott, Director of Membership Services - Fernley & Fernley
Joe Casey, Executive Director - Fernley & Fernley
André Brousseau, Associate Director - Fernley & Fernley

Welcome; agenda; approval of Minutes; review of action items

J. Casey presented the minutes and action items from the April 8, 2016 and the April 11, 2016 Board meetings.

Action: HQ will add the Presidential Addresses from Laurie Wise and R. Patz to the Archives section of the website.

M. Wilson called for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 8, 2016 Board meeting.

Motion: R. Patz moved to approve the minutes from the April 8, 2016 Board meeting. This was seconded, and approved

J. Casey presented the action items from the April 11, 2016 meeting. L. Bay noted that there was no update for the Graduate Student Issues Committee (GSIC) discussant email because the GSIC Chair had to step down. Brian Leventhal will be taking on the chair position again.

Action: L. Bay will continue plans for GSIC discussant email.

K. Huff and D. Briggs reported that Rose McCallin has been active in her outreach with Editors and the

Publications Committee.

M. Wilson reported that there is still discussion to determine where the video shoots will take place for the Assessment Literacy storyboard videos production. D. Whittington reported that they committee is researching the approval process for shoot sites.

M. Wilson called for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 11, 2016 Board meeting.

Motion: R. Patz moved to approve the minutes from the April 11, 2016 Board meeting. This was seconded, and approved.

NCME Initiatives (Part 1)

- 1. Assessment Literacy**
- 2. Classroom Assessment**

Assessment Literacy

D. Whittington reported that that all of the Assessment Literacy storyboards were reviewed, however, just one was deemed ready to proceed to production. However, because there are several resources that are already accessible that might meet the need, NCME could provide an online resource that highlights the collective resources in one consolidated location.

K. Huff reported that there are several states which have collaborated with measurement institutions and companies to create effective content. In her opinion, NCME's membership is not the ideal demographic to write storyboards for this project. She told the Board that there are professionals who have the skill set to craft compelling stories to relate the story that NCME is trying to tell.

D. Whittington responded that it is important for writers to understand the content, as well as how to disseminate the content, thus bringing the need for "two kinds of experts". In her the opinion this process should be a collaboration of two types of expertise.

D. Way spoke about a former goal to highlight videos through YouTube, and noted that with NCME potentially taking on a more policy-related role, this direction could be positive for reaching the goals of the project.

K. Huff noted that while there is high-quality content out there, NCME is committed to creating a module.

R. Patz emphasized the importance of NCME's role as an authority on Assessment Literacy. He believes that after the first project is completed, NCME should see how the output is received and determine how to move forward from there.

D. Whittington stated it is important for legislators, children, educators, and parents to gain knowledge of measurement. R. Patz reminded the Board that the projects should not be over-generalized. M. Wilson noted that if the first project is done well, then that could serve as impetus for better proposals in the future.

J. Casey reported that the project timeline completion date is September, with shoots in August. M. Wilson suggested that it will be good to have a product for further discussion in October.

Classroom Assessment

K. Huff and D. Whittington presented a PowerPoint on the NCME Initiative: Promoting Coherence between Large-

scale and Classroom Assessment.

K. Huff reported that by the end of July, the task force will review the initiatives and goals if needed. The efforts identified will be approved by the Executive Committee, and there will be an update by the October meeting.

K. Huff said the goal is to broaden the expertise within the NCME membership to have a greater balance of research/theory, classroom/large-scale, and she would like NCME to have an impact on the curriculum for educators regarding educational assessment.

For further information, please see the PowerPoint presentation.

K. Huff reported that NCME will provide more balance through the journals and meetings for the membership. She stated the data that are available have greatly increased and changed with the transition from paper/pencil to digital platforms, and that the types of research and hypotheses has been greatly impacted.

D. Whittington spoke about the development of weekly and benchmark goals, but questioned how much progress has been made in preparing this type of information in a palatable package for educators.

R. Patz said that the objective of this kind of research is to positively impact education. M. Wilson noted the importance of NCME's influence on labels and certain terminology, especially in relation to other disciplines within education.

M. Shermis reminded that Board that measurement education is dictated by state laws and standards. He noted that if NCME wants to have an influence, it should make its case for what assessment training would be, would look like, and how it should be taught to teachers; all at the state level.

<p>Action: K. Huff volunteered to connect with a colleague who has worked with the New York Department of Education and the Washington, DC Department of Education to determine how to approach working within the state level, and to formulate a plan for moving forward together.</p>

K. Huff reviewed the steps for completing Goal 1. She reported that there will be new types of training sessions that will be at different times. R. Bennett noted that there is much work and research around process analysis, as well as the implications that certain practices have on students. He reported that there is a large amount of collaboration among disciplines.

K. Huff suggested a plenary session for the 2017 Annual Meeting that would serve to set the tone for the conference and reinforce the theme. The goal is to showcase NCME's position and its impact on classroom assessment and raise awareness of it within the NCME membership. Who would present the address is still TBD.

Another session will focus on how educational technology data impacts classroom assessment. There is collaboration on a formative assessment systems theory with regard to the classroom by SRI and ACT.

K. Huff said that holding a slot for someone in the field who works with teachers in the classroom and can speak about what the influx of ed-tech data means on the day-to-day basis would be important. She continued that it would be beneficial to have someone from an ed-tech organization who can speak to current research and data, as well as what is needed to further the field. She recommended that M. Wilson and R. Bennett could serve as discussants. D. Briggs noted a colleague of his who is familiar with education assessment in the classroom, could serve as a potential speaker. He said the Center for Assessment had a colloquium regarding the advancement of

technology within the classroom.

D. Whittington said that psychometric challenges around constructs needs to be better researched. R. Patz said that NCME should focus on what data and information is important.

M. Wilson pointed out that given the discussion, there is the apparent need for these initiatives to go beyond one year. J. Casey reported that the last strategic plan for NCME was ten years ago and suggested that this discussion could lend itself to the beginnings of a new strategic plan.

D. Whittington said that NCME could partner with AERA Divisions C, H, and K moving forward.

K. Huff noted that the taskforce is interested in hosting a small conference aligned with the 2017 Conference theme. A Northeastern group expressed interest in co-hosting a small conference with NCME.

M. Shermis noted that NCME can afford such a conference, though NCME would have to do so carefully. He agreed that coordinating with an already-existing conference would be a more feasible route to go. He reminded the Board that the timing should be considered for this potential new conference, given the limitations of professionals who attend the Annual Meeting. This new conference could potentially be a competing event for the Annual Meeting. He recommended that because of this, maybe planning for another year would be more suitable for NCME attendees. D. Whittington suggested that it would behoove NCME to partner with a University to potentially offer credit for attendance.

M. Shermis noted that Rich Stiggins has a learning institute and could serve as a resource and potential speaker for this type of event. He suggested Dr. Stiggins could also relay a suitable target audience for this sort of conference.

Action: M. Shermis will reach out to Rich Stiggins to determine if he can highlight a suitable audience for this potential conference.

L. Bay noted that larger companies could sponsor attendees to come to this type of meeting. D. Whittington said that if this conference is targeting teachers, the best time for the conference would be outside of the school year due to the concerns with pulling teachers away from the classroom.

Goal 2

Publishing and Dissemination

K. Huff reported that NCME would seek sponsorship for special issues of the journals. NCME would also research publications consumed by policy-makers, who might serve as potential collaborators. She recommended that a portion of the NCME website could be dedicated to online resources that are publicly available regarding assessment, and the connection would serve as a notification that NCME agrees with the findings of the resources.

R. Patz re-emphasized the importance for consistency in terminology. K. Huff feels that Editors of the journals would be open to special issues. R. Bennett noted that “definitions” would make a valuable a special issue subject.

K. Huff and D. Whittington expressed that the following goals might be beyond the scope of this taskforce:

- Synchronization of Assessment Literacy initiative
- Approaching NRC / BOTA about sponsoring a committee and publication on this topic
- Refocusing the Brenda Loyd Dissertation Award on work that better reflects her legacy

R. Bennett noted that Brian Clauser as editor of the NCME Book Series could be open to the development of a new title on this issue for the series.

W. Lee expressed concern that changes to the Loyd Award might be a challenge as there's already a small pool of nominations for the awards each year. M. Wilson suggested that perhaps the Awards are not competitive enough, though the culture of the NCME membership is not a highly competitive one. W. Lee added that making the qualifications even more specific could further limit the number of proposals.

R. Bennett observed that dissertations related to the specific qualifications of the Brenda Loyd award are more common outside of the United States.

K. Huff recommended that an ad hoc committee may be needed for many of these goals. She mentioned that it would also be helpful to have guidelines for how many people should be on the committee, adding that NCME not be so insular, approaching those close to NCME (but not necessarily members) to be advisors and serve as representatives to the development and progress of goals for these committees.

Action: K. Huff will take questions from the last slide and create a Google doc for sharing and follow up.

R. Bennett stressed that the outcomes are part of domain practice, not just general practice. He said there are principles from measurement that make sense in the classroom assessment context.

NCME Initiatives (Part 2)

1. Opt-out and other Organization Position Opportunities

M. Wilson reminded the Board that NCME should aim to live up to its Mission to Advance the science and practice of measurement in education by striving to become a recognized authority in the field. He believes NCME must have a say in the direction of the field, and that it should take a stance within certain debates.

R. Bennett emphasized that the work started in at this meeting will lead to an "NCME Position", as well as a set of NCME Guidelines for positions on certain issues.

K. Huff reminded the Board that should NCME begin taking positions, that there must be sustainability around the practice so that NCME can continue the practice, rather than start something, put resources behind it, but then stop.

L. Bay noted the importance of the marketing behind this sort of practice. D. Way suggested that there needs to be a focus on what NCME's membership specializes in.

R. Bennett said that with Opt-Out, there is a classic conflict between the notion of individual rights and the collective good. Opt-out is an organized effort to refuse to take standardized tests and other state-mandated exams. In his opinion, Opt-out can distort results. He also noted that Opt-out presents an opportunity for NCME to take a policy-related position.

For detailed information, please see R. Bennett's PowerPoint presentation.

R. Bennett continued, stating that due to the demographic statistics, Opt-out has become a Civil Rights issue. He noted that a number of organizations have issued policy statements regarding Opt-out. He challenged the board to

consider if there is a policy statement that NCME could, or should, release in relation to Opt-out, and if there is subject matter expertise within NCME to competently advise on the issue.

D. Briggs noted that Opt-out is a nuanced issue and that it cannot be broken down simply. He stated that much of the frustration is being taken out on state tests, citing surveys that have attempted to quantify how much time is allocated on instruction in preparing for tests, and taking the tests. He emphasized the importance of attempting to highlight the reasons students are opting out.

M. Shermis stated that many of the people opting out of the tests do not perceive any benefit from actually taking tests. R. Bennett added that it is important to make a distinction to whom the policy statements are directed: policy-makers, parents, etc.

D. Whittington said that while NCME may “oppose” Opt-out, it needs to provide a detailed clarification as to why it believes things are the way they are, because Opt-out is a result of several other factors.

D. Briggs suggested that the statement needs to be linked back to what makes a quality test, and that these tests have certain base criteria that are important. D. Whittington pointed out that not all state tests are up to par in the design of test questions.

D. Briggs continued that if a certain process of test design is followed, then it can provide valuable information about performance. He said that Opt-out can skew the quality of assessment performance based on various demographics.

K. Huff noted the importance of acknowledging the real concerns for those people who are opting out. She said that there can be a lack of trust in assessments and that a majority of the complaints referenced the rigor of the actual test, and that students were not prepared for the rigor of taking the test.

R. Bennett continued with his report, discussing the factors that led to the rise of Opt-out.

R. Patz asked, given the various positions that different groups are taking, what is the role of NCME? He noted that ACT published a very strong statement regarding Opt-out. D. Briggs suggested that NCME should position its message in a way that asks “Why should parents opt in?”

R. Bennett asked if the preparation for standardized tests is causing teachers to instruct differently than they would if they did not have to provide instruction to pass a test?

M. Wilson shared that one of the difficulties for the argument to opt-in is that what is perceived to be for the good of everyone is not always good for the individual. J. Casey reminded the Board to begin with the end in mind and consider what the desired outcome for releasing a statement would be.

D. Briggs suggested that if the end goal is to bring more people to understand the Standards, then the Standards need to be publically accessible.

M. Wilson recommended that there could be a town hall style session for membership at the Annual Meeting, as well as a draft position open for comment from the membership.

R. Bennett offered that the length of testing window can cause parents to feel that testing can go on for much longer than is desired.

R. Bennett suggested that responsibility falls largely on testing companies to begin turning words and rhetoric into deeds. Making tests worth preparing for is of great importance, and the focus of the preparation needs to shift from passing the test to the addressing the Standards. He added that tests must be more engaging, with more actionable results, and he concluded that the issues around opt-out weren't so much about the tests themselves, but rather the use of tests.

D. Briggs offered that there could be opportunities to highlight the potential negative outcomes that stem from opting out of the tests. R. Patz noted that the states are important stakeholders as well, as each can have their own sanctions and opt-out policies.

M. Wilson believes that NCME is positioned to release a statement on Opt-out. R. Patz added that the Board will learn as this initiative progresses, observing that NCME is likely not fully aware of what hurdles may present themselves.

Action: R. Bennett will take the "energy" and points made during the discussion to create a draft policy position on Opt-out. He will work with M. Wilson to create an Ad Hoc committee to undertake this task.

K. Huff recommended that the Outreach and Partnerships Committee would be a good starting place to identify contributors.

Strategy and Reports by Area

Administrative – President

1. Handbook Update

J. Casey reported on the status of the Handbook. At the Monterey meeting in January, the board approved a reorganization of the Handbook into three sections on Administrative, Operations & Meetings and Historical & Legal Governance. Emphasis was placed on frequency of review/updating as to the content of each, (for example J. Casey stated that the Articles of Incorporation will remain unchanged forever, and bylaws are infrequently changed, however he suggested that NCME the by-laws are due for update).

Other documents should be periodically reviewed (for example J. Casey noted that it might be beneficial to assign review dates to the various policies within the Handbook, so that the policies can be reviewed in the future). Still other documents require frequent update and review (for example, the NCME budget and a calendar of activities for the conference require annual updates).

Action: The Board was asked to review the Conflict of Interest policy, as the Board Members will be required to sign that they have received and read it to facilitate the filing of the IRS Form 990 for 2015.

Documents within each of the Handbooks were reviewed on screen. This generated several questions.

M. Shermis provided some insight as to how to read through the financial information.

J. Casey reviewed the Annual Calendar in the Operations & Meetings Handbook to provide a framework of the work that is done throughout the year. The timeline contains working items from the Board, Committees, and Staff.

Action: Certain items within the calendar, including the selection of Invited Sessions for the Annual Meeting, need to be hyperlinked and easily-referenced online.

J. Casey reminded the Board that the Handbook in its current state is a working document and that it is not in its final stage. The Board will play a significant role in approving the content and how they would like the final Handbook(s) to look.

Several observations and suggestions were made regarding the contents of the Handbook documents. Regarding the Administrative Handbook:

The following changes were requested for the Organizational Chart

Action: For the organizational chart, staff will add the names of the volunteer Chairs of each Committee and ensure that the elements in the chart are properly aligned.

Action: The Diversity Issues in Testing committee will be edited to read Diversity Issues **in** Testing, not Diversity Issues **&** Testing.

Action: Staff will make ampersands or “+” signs consistent on organizational chart.

Regarding the Orientation information: L. Bay asked if there was a formal procedure for the transition between outgoing and incoming Committee Chairs, especially Annual Meeting Program Chairs and Training Session Chairs. J. Casey responded that there is an orientation session scheduled at each Annual Meeting for all incoming volunteers and pointed to the materials in the Handbook that were used in 2016. He also noted that specific to the Annual Meeting Program Chairs and Training Session Chairs, there are funds approved in the budget for a formal orientation during each Annual Meeting, though those meetings didn’t occur in 2015 or 2016.

Another highlighted change was the merging of the Elections and Nominations Committee. R. Patz reported that Wim van der Linden and Suzanne Lane agreed to serve. The 2017 election will be further addressed at the October Board meeting.

M. Shermis reported that Rosemary Reshetar has agreed to become the presumptive Budget and Finance Committee Chair.

J. Casey noted that significant work is needed regarding the Digital Presence Committee that was proposed to replace the Website Management Committee. The proposal presented in April was never acted on by the board; the current chair has been appointed to serve as a 2018 Program Co-chair and is rotating out; and there are no current volunteers on the roster. J. Casey was asked to contact April Zenisky to ask for recommendations regarding a new chair and additional details on a charter for the committee.

Action: J. Casey to contact A. Zenisky to discuss the outstanding issues and report to the EC at its next meeting.

K. Huff noted that the Publications Committee terms were updated to reflect the model of the Budget and Finance Committee

There was a brief discussion about the information found in the existing Handbook regarding the Committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice. K. Huff noted that the committee included herself and Scott

Marion as co-chairs, however no committee members were ever identified. K. Huff and J. Casey shared the opinion that the Committee not be included in the updated Handbook.

D. Whittington suggested that the text for Standards & Test Use Committee be updated and to consider addressing some of the work of the Committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice in the text.

Action: Update text for Standards & Test Use Committee in the Administrative Handbook Committee description.

D. Whittington asked what the formal process was to establish a standing committee. J. Casey answered that no provisions exist in the bylaws, so the Board has the authority to name, modify and/or disband Committees.

Action: L. Bay will share charter from Social Media Taskforce with K. Huff.

J. Casey reviewed the Board Orientation documents within the Handbook. R. Patz expressed concern that the Administrative Handbook is too large, and not easily navigable.

D. Way suggested that removing the roster and the PowerPoint Board Orientation presentation documents would significantly decrease the size of the Administrative Handbook.

M. Wilson requested that the Board members continue to review the draft Handbooks, with the purpose of improving the working document moving forward.

M. Wilson also suggested that there should be a Committee Portal for document sharing on the website. J. Casey reported to the Board that Committee documents are housed in the Board Portal and on an internal network. They are distributed through the staff.

M. Wilson reiterated to the Board to review the working Handbook documents located in the Board Portal and suggested that he and Joe Casey will work through assignments for each board member.

Action: M. Wilson and J. Casey will assign review tasks for each Board member to the Handbook content.

Budget & Finance

1. Building the 2016-2017 Budget

M. Shermis thanked J. Casey and Fernley & Fernley for their stewardship of the NCME finances and for their efficiency. He spoke about the 2015 Audit conducted by RKG. He noted that the association ended the 2015 year in a deficit, which was remedied by using monies from the portfolio. M. Shermis reminded the Board that the monies within the portfolio are not to be used for operational expenses per the Handbook; however there are circumstances which necessitate the use of portfolio funds which the Board did agree to do last October when the deficit was projected. Technically, portfolio funds are earmarked only for initiatives but as good stewards of the organization the board made a prudent call for 2015 and may need to do so again.

He continued that as reported in the April Board Meetings, the auditors require verification that the Board members review the Form 990 filing and agree that they are both aware of, and in compliance with, NCME's Conflict of Interest Policy.

M. Shermis distributed a document for signature to the 2015-2016 Board members present to confirm their awareness of these requirements which they signed and returned. The document also addressed NCME's Retention Policy. J. Casey noted that NCME does not have a Whistleblower Policy, which is strongly encouraged by

the IRS, and that will need to be addressed in the future.

J. Casey reminded the Board that the 990 filing was distributed with the Board book and is available in the Portal.

M. Shermis requested a motion to approve the Audit Report as presented.

Motion: M. Wilson moved to accept the 2015 Audit. This motion was seconded and approved.

M. Shermis introduced the outline for the 2017 NCME Annual Budget, to be reviewed and finalized by October. He noted that the primary challenge for the upcoming year will be regarding revenue.

M. Shermis cited a decrease in membership numbers, and therefore revenues, YTD. He also expressed concerns that there are certain cities that present a large draw for the Annual Meeting for attendees while others hinder attendance. NCME's challenge in being tied to AERA is having no control over the Annual Meeting location.

San Antonio isn't as popular as Chicago or Washington, DC, so a projected decrease in attendance will impact revenue for the 2017 Annual Meeting. In the first draft of the next budget, the overall projected deficit for 2017 is \$76,612.43, and that includes incorporating a dues increase. Facing lower attendance will have a big impact on the bottom line.

L. Bay said if the goal is increasing revenues, there should be a focus on attracting potential attendees from outside of the testing companies. D. Way, L. Bay, and R. Bennett noted that because of the busy time of year, and declining professional development budgets, some testing companies would be unable to send representatives.

R. Patz reminded the Board of the importance of doing things that members find valuable, and suggested incorporating more contemporary marketing tactics in promoting NCME and the Conference. K. Huff recommended increasing the paper acceptance rate as way to increase attendance.

J. Casey reported that the Membership Committee has discussed plans to reach out to non-renewing members and non-member Conference attendees to boost membership and help decrease the losses from non-renewals.

D. Whittington suggested reaching out to school districts which are local to Annual Meeting communities to attract Annual Meeting attendees and potential new members.

Action: Board Liaisons need to remind their Committees to send in their 2017 budget requests by the end of the July.

R. Bennett asked about the status of the printed programs at the Annual Meeting. It was noted that because the app was well received in 2016, NCME could apply an up-charge for the paper program, and print fewer paper programs to save on costs.

D. Briggs suggested that any potential saved resources could be applied towards making a more user-friendly Annual Meeting interface, including the paper repository.

R. Patz noted the lessons learned in 2016 and suggested that moving forward, the repository will be required for all paper submissions, and the discussants will be able to retrieve the papers from the repository.

R. Bennett suggested that there are other options for managing NCME's Investment Portfolio that may reduce the amount of fees NCME is currently paying the investment advisor at RBC.

Action: The Budget & Finance Committee will look into other options for portfolio management to potentially reduce fees.

R. Bennett inquired about the President's Fund, and if it could be cut to limit expenses. M. Shermis noted that historically the fund was used for ad hoc initiatives, as well as speakers for the Annual Meeting, which makes it variable and a challenge to predict. R. Bennett suggested that every year, the incoming President could propose the amount of money that he or she would like to use for the year to implement initiatives. The proposed fund would have to go to the Board to be approved. Then, the approved amount would be taken from the reserve fund and tracked on the balance sheet rather than the reporting on the operating budget.

Action: J. Casey and M. Shermis will discuss how to properly allocate the President's Fund moving forward.

Committee Reports

- Program
 - M. Wilson reported that the Program Co-Chairs have sent out the 2017 Call for Proposals. If anyone has any ideas for Invited Sessions, please send them to M. Wilson. Invited sessions and invited speakers are still being actively discussed; and the chairs are planning two invited sessions on classroom assessment. One session will be on assessment for higher education, and one will be for policy. The number of plenary sessions has not yet been decided.
- Training & Professional Development
 - Sun-Joo Cho has also begun exploring the possibilities for invited sessions. L. Bay suggested a training session about the peer review process. NCME members showed a lot of interest in learning about the subject when a call for Peer Reviewers was forwarded earlier this year.

Action: K. Huff volunteered to reach out to the US Department of Education to determine if they would be able to provide speakers to facilitate such training.

- Annual Meeting
 - Updates of the Planning Guide documents regarding the Annual Meeting have been completed. Andrew Ho and Matt Johnson have provided several suggestions for the next Annual Meeting Program Co-chairs, which Billy Skorupski and Lydia Liu are taking under advisement.

Administrative – President Elect

- Committee Reports
 - Membership
 - R. Bennett reported that the Committee is working with the staff on securing mailing lists to survey non-renewing members and send them solicitations with incentives in attempt to get them to renew. The Committee is also planning to continue the NCMentoring program introduced in Washington, DC in 2017.
 - Website/Digital/Social Media
 - To be addressed with the Publications Committee report. This area needs the most guidance.
 - Archive
 - The Committee is continuing to work with Fernley & Fernley on creating a more concise and intuitive website archive search function.

Administrative – Past President

- Committee Reports
 - Nominations & Elections
 - R. Patz reported that the Committee is in place and has convened to begin the 2016 Election process.

Action: Nominations will be gathered and a slate of candidates will be presented as soon as possible.

- Sponsorships
 - R. Patz has taken on the task of soliciting sponsorships for the 2017 Annual Meeting. R. Patz will follow up with J. Casey to begin the outreach process.
 -

Action: R. Patz will follow up with J. Casey to begin the Sponsorship outreach process.

- Publications
 - Committee Report
 - D. Briggs reported that his training with Wiley was helpful when he became the Editor of EM:IP. It gave him an opportunity to understand how to adjust the templates for responses that authors receive, and it also helped him learn about all of the different services that Wiley can provide.

K. Huff asked who funds the Wiley training session Derek experienced. J. Casey responded that he contacted Elizabeth Matson at Wiley and she reported that it took place before she joined the company, so there is no record of such a program being funded by the company in her experience. K. Huff suggested that it would be valuable for NCME Editors to attend the Wiley training and recommended that it be funded through NCME.

K. Huff noted that Rose McCallin could work with Wiley to advocate for a virtual training session to save on costs. R. Patz stated that if there is anything NCME could do to better support Editors, then NCME should do it. Perhaps there could be a meeting of NCME Editors convening in Boston in conjunction with the Wiley training.

Next, K. Huff raised the issue of how to best manage the NCME website content. The term for the current Website Content Editor ends in October. The challenge is that NCME's digital footprint has grown so there is more content to monitor than what is on the website. The current description for the Website Content Editor is outdated and K. Huff said that the description needs to be adjusted to reflect the new approach of a Digital Presence Committee. There was a discussion as to whether or not the Website Content Editor should be directly responsible for generating and soliciting new content, or simply aggregating content generated by NCME's Committees.

K. Huff noted that there is the option for Website Content Editors to take on an Associate Website Content Editor, though the current Website Content Editor did not take advantage of that.

L. Bay recommended that there should be a Committee in charge of what is featured and what represents NCME positions on the website. R. Patz noted that there should be a marketing element applied to the practices of the Website Content Editor, with a mind to include items that would be valuable and exciting to

NCME members.

R. Bennett asked if there should be any external content on NCME's website. For example, information regarding political platforms and other potential member interests. L. Bay pointed out that similar to this question, NCME's social media platforms feature links to existing content rather than creating brand new content. She expressed concerns over associations between NCME and the content that is shared. R. Bennett expressed the need for guidelines for what content to share, and R. Patz noted that the Editor should present an annual editorial plan to the Board, per the job description. L. Bay asked if there was a mechanism for anyone to provide submissions to the website. K. Huff noted that while the Committees produce content, there has been no strategic cohesion in transmitting the content to the Website Content Editor.

Action: R. Bennett will begin the foundation for the Digital Presence Committee by appointing a Chair and working with the Chair to fill the Committee roster.

Professional

1. Committee Reports

- Outreach & Partnerships

- L. Bay reported that the Outreach & Partnerships Committee is seeking approval from the Board to begin a Wikipedia page for NCME. She noted that one of the caveats is that the page can be edited by anyone and once it is up, it can't be taken down.

K. Huff asked who would be monitoring the page. L. Bay responded that the Outreach and Partnerships Committee will monitor it in perpetuity. K. Huff would like to know their specific monitoring plan, and would like to ensure that the Website Content Editor(s) and the Digital Presence Committee is directly involved, once those roles are formally in place.

There was general agreement by the Board to approve the Committee's creation of an NCME Wikipedia page, though no vote was cast.

- Diversity Issues and Testing

- L. Bay asked about demographic data, and J. Casey responded that while we ask for the data on membership and renewal applications, members do not typically provide it.

K. Huff observed that there seems to be a shortage of psychometricians, especially of diverse backgrounds. The question was raised if NCME should attend other conferences in similar fields to attract membership. M. Wilson agreed that NCME should certainly pursue any ideas to bring about more diversity within NCME for both demographics and skill sets.

Action: M. Wilson asked that the Committee formulate a plan to bring about more diversity and report back to the Board.

- Graduate Student Issues

- L. Bay reported that the GSIC would like to have their own Facebook group. She asked if the Board should permit them to open their own Facebook group with the social media guidelines suggested by the Social Media Task Force that was

discharged after completing its task in April. M. Wilson agreed that if the group were to receive the current social media guidelines and if L. Bay were to be an active part of the group, then that would be suitable. R. Patz said that the Board is supportive, though it should not be an official NCME-sanctioned activity.

R. Patz noted that because there is a fair amount of social media activity going on by non-members, NCME can post more intentional links and ads through Facebook. He suggested that with very small costs for ads, the process should not have to go through a committee and then be recommended to the Board; it should just be done.

Standards

1. Committee Reports

- Standards and Test Use

D. Whittington reported that the Committee has reviewed the story boards and approved one for production. The Committee has identified a videographer (Milk Crate Productions) and initiated site selection for a classroom setting for the video. M. Wilson asked that the Committee thoughtfully evaluate the scope of the storyboards projects so that they are more manageable and that the Board could determine how best to assist the project.

Recognition

1. Committee Reports

- W. Lee reported that email announcements for 2017 Award nominations has been sent and the website has been updated. Due to the quickly approaching deadline, W. Lee recommended that the deadline be extended for nominations.

W. Lee noted that the J. Millman Award Committee members said that they will have challenges securing applications. W. Lee reported that September 1 would be a better deadline for next year. M. Wilson agreed that it would make sense for all of the awards to have a later deadline in September.

W. Lee reported that some Committee Chairs are reporting challenges in some volunteers' participation with some current committee members not responding. J. Casey recommended that W. Lee, as the Board Liaison, consider reaching out to the Committee members to add some gravitas and urgency. Additionally, J. Casey said that polling the Committee members as to how and when they can best be reached might increase responses.

K. Huff expressed concern over the small number of applications. There was some discussion that practitioners in the field can be quite humble and that there are few self-nominations. It was suggested that personal outreach to department chairs, professors, deans, etc. might increase the submissions. Perhaps submitting only the abstract or curriculum vita, as well as requiring just one letter of recommendation from a professor would yield more submissions. R. Patz agreed that if there was something that is easier to submit, then submissions may rise and that the committee can request additional information as needed as the process continues forward.

M. Shermis noted that there could be a correlation between the drop in membership and the drop in awards submissions/nominations. D. Whittington suggested that with increased recruitment for these awards within universities, NCME could see increased membership

and more engagement.

W. Lee observed that with increased visibility, the prestige of the awards could be raised. M. Wilson stated that remarks by the awards winners could help increase the awareness, as would public gratitude expressed to the winners' professors, loved ones, and colleagues. K. Huff agreed. D. Briggs also agreed, noting that it's especially important for the winner of the Career Award to have time for remarks. R. Bennett observed that the Career Award Winner session often competes with other sessions, so time at the Breakfast might be beneficial.

M. Shermis pointed out that a downside to giving everyone more time to speak, would be that the event would take longer.

D. Way asked if NCME's meeting planner could do an analysis to determine exactly how much time would be needed.

W. Lee asked if there was a policy for presenters/discussants who did not show up for their sessions. M. Wilson tabled the discussion for another time.

Mission Fund

R. Patz reported that the effort has struggled throughout the year. He noted that there were several questions around the fund: What is it for? What efforts are worthy of support from the Mission Fund? How should the funds be raised?

In the first year, the Mission Fund raised approximately \$37,000, which was short of its \$50,000 goal. In the past year, the fund-raising was not as successful, raising less than \$10,000. Of note, the NCME membership is a small group to raise donations from and the Fund Development Committee elected to support Graduate Student participation in Training Sessions at the Conference as their project for 2016.

R. Patz noted that there is little momentum around fund-raising, and the alternatives suggested to extend the mission of NCME overlap with already present activities. One of the intentions was to provide a means to memorialize colleagues that passed on. K. Huff stated that the message from the Committee about the idea of donating money in honor of someone else did not stand out, and therefore the Committee missed an opportunity to highlight donations could be made for that purpose. She said she would be in support of petitioning large endowments and organizations for potential donations to the Mission Fund. She does not support petitioning the membership for donations to the Mission Fund as NCME's volunteer donate so much time to the organization.

M. Shermis suggested that rather than spending donations to the Mission Fund as they are collected, perhaps collecting over time for a larger goal could bring about great potential to garner funds through philanthropic trusts and larger groups. This could build to a large holding that would allow NCME to operate off of the interest.

J. Casey reported that there were 67 donations to the Mission fund from 6/1/2015 to 7/20/2016.

R. Patz agreed that meaningful monies should be raised through foundations, and that if there is not a viable plan to raise \$50,000 by October 2016, then NCME may not be well-positioned to continue the Mission Fund.

M. Wilson noted that small honorary contribution amounts would be suitable, though the bulk of the funds should be from external sources. K. Huff said that she is not supportive of a mailing campaign to membership, but that if NCME wanted to raise awareness through the Newsletter, or as a capital campaign for a specific project, she would support it.

Action: M. Wilson to contact Cathy Wendler to report on the board discussion and explore a path forward.

AERA Relationship Update

2017-19 Annual contract

- J. Casey reported that the contract with AERA is still being worked out. There is a new meeting manager at AERA, who has done a site-visit in San Antonio. They will provide their recommendation for hotels soon. There was some language in the contract regarding the non-compete slots and food/drink minimums that the NCME meeting planners wanted to address before finally signing the contract. There was also concern about the 20% increase in fees from NCME to AERA in the first year of the contract.
- There was discussion about a requested non-compete slot being for the AERA President's Address rather than for the Awards Luncheon.
- M. Wilson noted that a more detailed definition for "non-compete" would be helpful.
- J. Casey confirmed that NCME would agree to one non-compete with preference for the President's Session. M. Wilson noted that NCME will still commit to one table at the AERA Awards Lunch.
- M. Shermis reported that the full increase is reflected in the 2017 draft budget.

Other Business

Management Company Evaluation

- R. Patz reported that a survey has gone out to all NCME volunteers to aid in the formal evaluation of the management company.
- J. Casey reviewed the dates for the next Board meeting. It is in Berkeley, CA on October 20-21. One of the priorities will be for the new NCME Meeting Planner to have further details for the 2017 Annual Meeting. A meeting room in on campus will likely be more cost-effective than at the hotel. The Faculty Club on Berkeley campus is a lodging option as well. The Board agreed to a one day and one half day, format.
- K. Huff recommended that there be a timeslot for New Business on future agendas. This was agreed to by the board.

New Business

L. Bay discussed her video interview with Mark Reckase. She said that it was quite informative and would be helpful for younger people within the field. The interview is posted on the NCME Facebook page..

K. Huff asked about the need for recruitment efforts and noted that when NCME pursued those efforts in the 2000s, there was a shortage in psychometricians. She asked to what extent this was still true, and asked how to evaluate and address the various skill sets that psychometricians have today versus a decade ago.

She suggested a survey to membership, or to large companies within the field, to determine what skill sets are required nowadays. R. Patz suggested it would be good to analyze if membership grew with the introduction of the No Child Left Behind legislation.

J. Casey congratulated the Board for their direction of the Board meeting, and commended them as great stewards of NCME's resources.

M. Wilson called for the adjournment of the meeting at 11:55 a.m.