Members Present:  Mark Reckase
Terry Ackerman
Anne Fitzpatrick
Larry Rudner
Susan Loomis
Leslie Lukin
Todd Rogers
Kadriye Ercikan
Steve Sireci

Staff Present:  Bruce Wheeler
Plumer Lovelace

Call to Order

Mark Reckase called the meeting to order 8:30 AM and welcomed Board members

Approval of the Minutes from March 2008 Board Meeting Minutes

Several small corrections were requested. Anne Fitzpatrick made a motion to approve the minutes from March 24-25, 2008 meeting of the Board of Directors as corrected; Terry Ackerman seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Electronic Vote on The Proposal to Upgrade NCME’s Submission/Review System

On Thursday July 24 2008 Anne Fitzpatrick made a motion that NCME spend $6500 to upgrade the proposal submission and review system in the manner outlined in the proposal distributed to the board. Leslie Lukin seconded the motion. The motion was passed via electronic vote.

Consent Agenda Reports

Dr. Lukin made a motion to approve the committee reports submitted for the consent portion of the agenda; Dr. Ackerman seconded the motion. Dr. Reckase called for discussion.

Handbook

Dr. Fitzpatrick told the group the work on the revision of the NCME Handbook was approximately 85 percent completed, and said that it would be reformatted for ease of use. She also suggested uploading the Handbook to the NCME website to make it more widely available.
The group discussed the challenge of keeping the Handbook updated once the revision is completed. Specifically, Mr. Wheeler questioned who would have the authority to make changes to individual sections, noting that the consistency currently being sought would be difficult to maintain once numerous individuals were requesting updates and changes. He suggested that a formal procedure be adopted that would address how and when changes would be made. Larry Rudner cautioned against the Board of Directors taking on responsibility for approving content changes.

Mr. Wheeler suggested that committee chairs be allowed to update timelines, but that other changes require some additional level of review; Dr. Reckase noted that policies should be handled differently than timelines or other procedural activities.

Dr. Rogers suggested letting Dr. Fitzpatrick continue her work, with the final draft of the Handbook to be reviewed by the Board prior to its next meeting. Dr. Fitzpatrick said she thought that timeline would work.

**Award Committee Report**

The group discussed the number of awards and whether there should exist a hierarchy within the award structure. Specifically, the question was asked if one award was clearly more important than others. The group agreed that the Career Contribution Award represented the highest honor given by NCME. The group also discussed the fact that some awards are not given every year, due to lack of qualified nominations. No consensus was reached, and it was agreed to raise the question at a future meeting.

**Graduate Student Issues Committee Report**

Dr. Rogers presented the question of whether there should be a graduate student representative on the board. As he explained, this individual would serve as a liaison to this core constituent group, and provide much needed input on issues that affect graduate students. The Board discussed whether or not this action would this require a by-laws change. Mr. Wheeler suggested that a graduate student could be invited to the meeting as a guest without a by-laws change. However, he said that if the intent was for a graduate student to be a voting member of the Board, a by-laws change would be required.

The discussion concluded, and the motion to accept the Consent Agenda Reports was approved.
Nominations Committee Report

Dr. Fitzpatrick referred the Board members to her report, which identified the slate of candidates for the 2008 election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 NCME Election Slate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The NCME Nominations Committee is pleased to announce the following nominees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Vice President (to become President in 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wayne Camara  
College Board  |
| Rebecca Zwick  
*University of California, Santa Barbara*  |
| For Board of Directors from a Local Education Agency |
| Joe O’Reilly  
*Mesa (Arizona) Public Schools*  |
| Sherry Rose-Bond  
*Columbus (Ohio) City Schools*  |
| For Board of Directors at Large |
| Krista Breithaupt  
*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants*  |
| Michael Rodriguez  
*University of Minnesota*  |

Submitted by Anne R. Fitzpatrick, Nominations Committee Chair

Steve Sireci made the motion to approve the slate of candidates. Dr. Ackerman seconded the motion. The motion was passed. Dr. Sireci praised the quality of talent on the slate.

Election Committee Discussion: Is the Committee necessary with the move to electronic ballots?

Dr. Reckase offered historical perspective on the traditional duties of the Election Committee.
Mr. Wheeler provided examples of how other TRG clients using electronic voting software formally tally the votes, noting that no other TRG-managed association group using electronic voting has retained an Election Committee; rather, the respective association’s Executive Director confirms the vote.

When it was suggested that staff, as a vendor, needed supervision when dealing with an issue as important as confirming the election of officers, Mr. Wheeler reminded the Board that the Executive Director serves as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member of the Board. The concern was withdrawn.

Dr. Sireci made a motion to disband the Election Committee and place responsibility for verifying election results with the Executive Director, with the expectation that a report would be provided to the Board that would include the total number votes for each slated position without providing actual results by individual. Dr. seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

**Budget Committee Report**

Dr. Fitzpatrick provided an update on activities by the Finance Committee including a review of NCME’s insurance coverage, investment portfolio and a revision of the NCME Chart of Accounts.

Dr. Fitzpatrick said that the Finance Committee had considered several options for a policy on the expenditure of unbudgeted funds, which she presented to the Board:

**Version 1 of Policy for Unbudgeted Expenses**

**Paragraph 1**: All requests for unbudgeted expenditures must be submitted in writing to the Executive Director.

**Paragraph 2**: A request for an expenditure of less than $1000.00 in a fiscal year must be approved by the President.

**Paragraph 3**: If the request is greater than or equal to $1000.00 in a fiscal year, the request should include a rationale for it. The Executive Director will forward the request to the chair of NCME’s Budget and Finance Committee for review and a written recommendation. The request and recommendation then are sent to the President.

**Paragraph 4**: If the requested amount is greater than or equal to $1000.00 and less than $3000.00, the President submits the request to the NCME Executive Committee for review and approval. The recommendation of the chair of NCME’s Budget and Finance Committee should also be provided to the Executive Committee.

**Paragraph 5**: If the requested amount is greater than or equal to $3000.00, the President submits the request to the NCME Board for review and approval. The recommendation of the chair of NCME’s Budget and Finance Committee should also be provided to the Board.
Version 2 of Policy for Unbudgeted Expenses

Paragraph 1: Same as Version 1.

Paragraph 2: Same as Version 1.

Paragraph 3: Same as Version 1.

Paragraph 4: When the request is greater than or equal to $1000.00, the President submits the request to the NCME Board or the Executive Committee for review and approval. The recommendation of the chair of NCME’s Budget and Finance Committee should also be provided to the Board or the Executive Committee.

Dr. Rogers suggested some consideration for determining when a request would be brought to the attention of the board and when the request would be brought before the executive committee, noting that the Executive Committee would be more accessible should time be an issue.

Dr. Rogers made a motion to accept version 2 of the proposed policy. Dr. Ackerman seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Definition of “Sponsorship”

Dr. Fitzpatrick explained how the topic of NCME sponsorship of a publication had surfaced while updating the Handbook on Teacher Evaluation and presented for the Board’s consideration the following:

Definition of Sponsorship: NCME may sponsor a project if it will advance the science and/or practice of educational measurement. This sponsorship may involve verbal support for the project, or it may involve some financial support or work done on behalf of the project. Sponsorship does not imply formal endorsement or approval of the project or the outcomes of the project by NCME.

Dr. Ercikan made a motion to approve the definition; Dr. Ackerman seconded the motion. Dr. Reckase called for discussion.

After discussion of the ramifications of NCME Sponsorship, Dr. Sireci recommended the following alternative: “Sponsorship is support for a product or activity that is consistent with that of NCME. Sponsorship does not constitute a formal endorsement or approval of the project or the outcomes of the project by NCME”.

Dr. Reckase called for the vote. The language suggested by Dr. Sireci was approved.
Page increase for JEM and EMIP

Mr. Wheeler provided supporting documents from Blackwell regarding the increase page count for JEM and shared background information. Earlier this year staff was contacted by Blackwell, informed of a proposed increase in the cost of institutional subscriptions that would cover the cost of increasing the number of pages in each issue of JEM; NCME was given approximately one week to approve the cost increase. The group discussed why and how the need for additional pages could have occurred.

The board also discussed a number of options for addressing this concern moving forward, including more careful selection of manuscripts, further expanding the page count, eliminating book reviews and increasing the number of issues per year.

The Board concluded that more information needed to be secured in order to make any decisions. The Board concluded that two questions needed to be answered, a. what is the current overall status of paper approvals for publication, and b. what kind of policy should be in place in order to avoid problems in the future.

Dr. Sireci offered to work directly with the editors of JEM and EM:IP, to better clarify the problem and potential solutions. Additionally, the suggestion was made to have staff facilitate ideas from Blackwell.

Handbook of Teacher Evaluation

Dr. Sireci reported that he had secured five nominations for an Ad Hoc Steering Committee to oversee the revision of the Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Gary Natriello has agreed to co-edit, along with original co-editor Greg Cizek. A conference call will be scheduled to allow the committee members to be introduced.

Gratis List

Dr. Sireci said that in early August, a list of addresses for the organizations identified to receive free NCME publications was sent to the NCME central office and Dr. Reckase finalized a letter to accompany the journals. The mailing will take place in September.

ABC’s of Testing

Dr. Sireci summarized the plan the revision of the ABC’s, which included 1) seeking 4 volunteers to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee (Note: two people have already volunteered); 2) providing a clear mission and direction for the group and 3) informing the committee of the availability of funding ($26,000) for the project.
Top Three Articles that Blackwell Promotes

Mr. Wheeler reminded the Board that he had been asked to follow up with Blackwell about the subject of the “top three” articles listed on Blackwell’s website to promote NCME journals. He said that the issue was moot for the time being, as the platform that Blackwell was using to market its journals was being updated and would probably not be live until January of 2009. Once the new platform was available, the top three articles would be automatically listed, based on the number of times each had been accessed electronically, which meant that NCME would not be able to select the articles.

However, Mr. Wheeler said that Blackwell would be interested in learning from NCME which articles would best represent the journals, and those would be used in other marketing activities undertaken by Blackwell.

Newsletter Mailing

The Board discussed pros and cons of mailing the newsletter, verses viewing it online. In support of mailing the newsletter was the idea that some portion of the membership would likely prefer print, rather than reading an article on the computer. Additionally there was some discussion regarding the convenience of transporting a print document. In support of offering the newsletter online were concerns about the destruction of trees and the need to recycle the discarded newsletters. The idea of sending members an email containing a brief summary of articles, with a hyperlink that would launch the reader to the actual article was discussed in detail.

This summarized email would also provide additional web traffic. A request was made to add some newsletter related questions to the upcoming online survey. Mr. Lovelace volunteered to investigate cost estimates.

Web Management Committee Change

provided an update on the Website Management Committee, noting that the Committee’s progress had been limited. Dr. Reckase said that he had received a rough draft of committee activities from George Engleheart, which he was no longer able to locate. also said that Dr. Englehard had requested that he not be appointed to the chair position of the new committee. Mike Bunch has since agreed to assume the chair position, but would require guidance from the Board regarding the direction of the committee and content of the website.

Mr. Wheeler suggested that the committee consider what content may be relevant for the public and (or) government sector. As part of this strategy the committee would focus on defining the end user prior to committing to content. Dr. Reckase agreed to contact Terry Ackerman to discuss who should be on the committee.
**Membership Committee Report**

Dr. Ackerman explained that he had provided a copy of the membership survey to Jennifer Kobrin for review. There was some discussion regarding whether to send the survey out with the membership renewals or to send it separately. There was also some discussion as to whether or not the groups that were identified in the survey accurately reflected the membership.

Dr. Rudner offered a motion to have the Executive Committee design an interim survey for new members and renewals. Steve Sireci seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

**Outreach Committee Report**

Dr. Rudner provided an update on the “No Child Left Behind” meeting that he attended and agreed to generate a report for the board. The group would like to begin to address the issues that were identified in the Phase I survey summary. Dr. Rudner recommended that the committee focus on accomplishing two goals specified in the report, items B. help bridge the gap between policy and measurement, and C. Extend the outreach survey to target testing organizations with an interest in many of the same topics as NCME. from the report. During the discussion the board observed that this would change the role of NCME to more closely resemble a clearing-house. An additional observation was made that there was a natural connection between this committee and the Publications Committee, as it relates to the work being done with revising the ABC’s of Testing videotape. The recommendation of the Executive Committee was to get these two groups together.

**Program Committee Report**

Mr. Wheeler told the Board that AERA’s meeting planner had quit unexpectedly. He and Drew Neleson have established a relationship with AERA’s new meeting planner. As discussed during the March Board meeting, AERA staff agreed to share AERA’s list of accepted authors as soon as it is available and the preliminary program with NCME at the same time it is shared with key AERA staff and members. Dr. Fitzpatrick asked that staff find out how many rooms have been contracted in the hotel assigned to NCME by AERA since there had been problems in 2008. Mr. Wheeler said that Mr. Lovelace and Ms. Neleson would talk with the hotel, and conduct a site visit later in the year. He also said that NCME would have to hold its Welcome Reception and Breakfast at the San Diego convention center, as the hotel assigned to NCME was not large enough to accommodate those events as well as the rooms needed for the five concurrent breakout sessions each day.

**Standards & Test Use Committee Report**

Dr. Reckase introduced discussion regarding the Standard & Test Use Committee report. Dr. Reckase explained that although progress had been slow, the committee had submitted a revised document with well-developed content.
Additionally, NCME was the first to submit responses. However, all three organizations had officially signed off on it. Additionally Dr. Frisbie had requested that another person be added to the project. In response, Dr. Reckase had recommended Doug Becker. Currently Mr. Becker is leading the group. Dr. Reckase suggested the idea of publishing this for libraries.

Dr. Sireci suggested revising a statement on page 2 under Tab 12. Instead of "validation is not a never-ending task," the suggested revision would read, "validation need not be envisioned as a never-ending task."

The consensus of the Board was to approach Mr. Becker with a request specific to that language change outlined.

The Board concluded discussion by suggesting that a 1-page preface be created to explain NCME's role in developing these guidelines and that a subsequent version of the document might be useful for a secondary audience, such as a library.

Call Back to Order – Day 2

Dr. Reckase called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM

Proposal for an NCME/Division D Joint Social Event in San Diego

Dr. Reckase provided an update. Dr. Reckase explained that he had received a proposal from Linda Cook to change NCME’s traditional activity to a combined NCME/AERA Division D social event. Bruce Wheeler shared that AERA Division D is willing to contribute $6,000. In comparison, NCME had spent an average of $11,000 (alcohol not included). Additionally, AREA would be willing to forego the event that it normally schedules. Bruce Wheeler explained that space for the event was not available at the hotel. As a result, the combined event would need to take place in the convention center. Another option would be to consider an outdoor setting.

Dr. Reckase made a motion to accept the combined NCME/AERA Division D social event with understanding that the Central Office will follow-up and provide options for locations. Dr. Leslie Lukin seconded. The consensus of the Board was to try this for a couple years.

JCSEE Report

Dr. Reckase provided background information. Dr. Reckase explained that Don Yarbrough is a sponsored member of JCSEE. NCME will need to appoint a new sponsored member to replace Don Yarbrough in time to participant in a scheduled fall 2009 meeting. Dr. Lukin shared that she was deeply interested in the work carried out by the JCSEE. Dr. Lukin also noted that she would be rotating off of the Board of Directors soon.
Dr. Fitzpatrick noted that with regard to expenses, some effort should be made to establish a cost estimate, rather than a cost range.

**Executive Director’s Report**

**Staff Update**

Bruce Wheeler provided the Executive Director’s Report. Mr. Wheeler introduced Plumer Lovelace, a recent hire at The Rees Group as his replacement for the position of NCME’s Executive Director. Mr. Wheeler explained that he would be continuing his employment with The Rees Group, and could be reached for any outstanding needs.

**Online Proposal System**

Mr. Wheeler indicated that the Online Proposal System enhancements have been completed as outlined in the original proposal dated July 29, 2008. The application is operating perfectly.

**Questions from the Media**

Mr. Wheeler explained that on occasion the central office does receive requests from various media outlets for a representative from NCME to respond to questions. Mr. Wheeler asked if the Board had any desire to establish guidelines or protocol for these situations.

The Board generated discussion on this topic. Some questions that surfaced included

1. What types of questions has NCME received to date?
2. Is there a risk of providing the impression that NCME endorses the organization represented by the member who responds?
3. What type of “conflict of interest” scenarios are possible?
4. Should NCME have a communication liaison?
5. Should NCME have a list of individuals available for contact by the media and 6. should a link to an NCME contact person or persons exist on the website? No conclusions were reached.

Mr. Wheeler agreed to continue forwarding such requests to the Board President.

**Non-Member Presenters in NYC**

Mr. Wheeler indicated that the index of the NCME Conference booklet was used to determine member verses non-member presenters in NYC. Of the total number of individuals list, 397 were members and 266 were non-members. The board discussed whether or not a person presenting needed to be required to be a member and if the case of more than one presenter, if at least one person should be required to be a member. No conclusion was reached.
The request was made to ask central to 1. follow-up after the conference with all presenters that were not members and provide membership information, 2. add a statement promoting NCME membership into the presenter acceptance letter and 3. review best practices in other organizations.

AERA Staff Update/San Diego Report

Mr. Wheeler indicated that Laurie Cipriano, Director of Meetings, is NCME’s new AERA contact. Mr. Wheeler explained that the central office’s Meeting staff would continue to request hotel room block information from AERA until the information was secured. The Board expressed a desire to avoid any inconvenience to conference attendees by communicating to them any need to investigate other hotels in the immediate area. Mr. Wheeler also indicated that Ms. Cipriano has been invited to the fall NCME Board meeting.

Online Journal - Practical Assessment. Research & Evaluation

In preparation for this discussion, Dr. Sireci circulated copies of the one-page proposal outlining a plan for NCME to publish the online journal “Practical Assessment. Research & Evaluation.” The Board discussed various aspects of the proposal including 1. Compatibility with existing NCME journals, 2. Potential revenue stream; and 3. The value to membership. After extensive discussion the board decided that there was not adequate value to the organization to warrant support for the proposal.

Review of Financials

Dr. Fitzpatrick supplied copies of the budget for Board members to review. The Board generated extensive discussions regarding the status of NCME's financial reserves. The organization currently has approximately three years of operation budget in reserves. Considerations included 1. a review of the reserve policy; and 2. the potential to fund of various member benefit initiatives with a portion of the reserves. Bruce Wheeler reminded the Board that a good precursor to funding initiatives with reserve funds is the development of a reserve policy. The latter would help indicate the amount of funds available for repurposing.

The board expressed general support for the idea of an effort to provide free membership to first year graduate students. Mr. Wheeler reminded the Board that any membership related initiative would need to be decided relatively soon in order to coordinate with the annual membership renewal effort. Additionally, Mr. Wheeler explained that annual dues are outlined in the NCME bylaws and as a result can be waived by the Board.

The board agreed to waive dues for first year graduate students for one year. Dr. Reckase requested that the idea be sent to Finance Committee to confirm that the organization has the money. Dr. Reckase asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Rogers made a motion to conclude the meeting. Dr. Ackerman seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.