

NCME Board Meeting

July 13-15, 2011

Hyatt Regency O'Hare, Rosemont, IL

In attendance:

Dr. Linda Cook, President

Dr. Wayne Camara, Past-President

Dr. Gregory Cizek, Vice President

Dr. Sherry Rose-Bond, Board Member

Dr. Deborah Harris, Board Member

Dr. Michael Rodriguez, Board Member

Dr. Bruno Zumbo, Board Member

Dr. James Wollack, Board Member

Dr. Mary Pommerich, Board Member

Dr. Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee

Chia-Lin Tsai, Graduate Student Representative

Dr. Jennifer Kobrin, Recording Secretary

Plumer Lovelace, Executive Director

Committee Chairs

Anne Fitzpatrick, Budget & Finance

Kris Waltman, Website (Thursday & Friday)

Dr. Scott Bishop, Co-Chair of Recruitment Committee

Lora Monfils, Recruitment (Thursday & Friday)

Edynn Sato, Diversity (Thursday & Friday)

Neal Kingston, 75th Anniversary (Thursday & Friday)

Cindy Searcy, Standards and Test Use (Thursday & Friday)

Scott Marion, Assessment Policy & Practice (Thursday & Friday)

Ada Woo, Outreach & Partnerships (Thursday & Friday)

Chia-Lin Tsai, Graduate Student Representative (Thursday & Friday)

Kristen Huff, Assessment Policy & Practice (Thursday, via phone)

Jason Nicholas, Outreach & Partnerships (Thursday, via phone)

Min Li, Membership (Thursday, via phone)

Joanna Gorin, Program Co-Chair (Thursday, via phone)

Heather Buzick, Training and Development Program Co-Chair (Thursday, via phone)

Chad Gotch, GSIC (Friday, via phone)

Terry Ackerman, Webinar committee (Friday, via phone)

Wednesday, July 13

Dr. Cook called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Introductions and welcome. Scott Bishop and Chia-Lin Tsai are guests today and were encouraged to contribute to the discussions, but are not eligible to vote.

Linda reviewed the agenda and 2011-2012 initiatives and asked the Board to keep these in mind as we think about the work we're doing, and funding. The following initiatives were mentioned:

- Revisit NCME strategic plan – this will be topic of the fall (October) Board meeting
- Develop strategic financial plan for NCME (Anne Fitzpatrick requested removing the term “strategic”)
- Form the NCME foundation
- Finalize contracts with TRG and Wiley/Blackwell
- Finalize plans for the NCME edited book series
- Improve committee processes including volunteer software – in progress. Linda will continue throughout the summer to send out notices to members to encourage them to volunteer. The Board will be involved in reviewing committee chair selection. Linda may be able to demonstrate software at the Fall (October) Board meeting.
- Use BaseCamp – coming along. Committee chairs posted their reports on BaseCamp but the reports are not consistent in terms of details. None of the committees put in any requests for funding, which is a bit worrisome. We need to improve this process so that next year at this time we will get requests for funding from the committees.

- Make improvements to Annual Program and Planning
- Plan the 75th anniversary
- Design and execute membership campaign in conjunction with 75th anniversary – this is one of the goals of the recruitment committee.
- Revamp website – moving along really well
- Build new search engine for NCME database – this has not been started yet. We do not have cost estimates for that work
- Develop opportunities for outreach and partnerships with other organizations – this initiative needs more work
- Develop strategies for informing assessment policy and practice – going well
- Increase mentoring for graduate students and early career scholars
- Increase international participation in NCME – this is not reflected in the current goals of committees.
- Develop uses of technology to support outreach and training – the webinars are a good step in this direction.

Linda reported that overall, we are doing well meeting our objectives, but there are some areas that have not been addressed. The Board may decide to carry these over into Gregory Cizek's term as President.

There are two goals that are common for all committees: 1) explore use of the NCME SharePoint site: BaseCamp and 2) work with the NCME website committee to provide and review content for the new NCME website. The website is going live in December, and Kris Waltman and John Wilsee sent each committee chair a list of goals. It is important that committees address these goals to ensure that we have content for the website.

Sherry asked whether there will be outreach to the membership to make them aware of the new website. Anne indicated that in Kris Waltman's report, there are two communication "blitzes" planned for this purpose.

Review of Minutes and Action Items from the April Board Meeting

Linda asked the Board to indicate whether there are any revisions requested in the Friday April 8 Board meeting minutes. Michael indicated that at the top of page 6, USAID provides a lot of technical support to education in developing countries. This organization should be added to the minutes.

Mary Pommerich indicated that she did participate in the meeting by phone and should be added to the list of attendees.

Jim Wollack noted that in the description of the Committee on informing assessment policy and practice Andeas' last name is not included.

Bruno Zumbo makes a motion to accept the minutes. Sherry Rose-Bond seconded the motion. Nine board members voted to approve the minutes.

Linda asked the Board to indicate whether there are any revisions needed in the Monday Board meeting minutes. There were no comments. Bruno made a motion to accept the minutes. Wayne Camara seconded the motion. Nine board members voted to approve the minutes.

Jennifer Kobrin reviewed the action items that were generated at the April Board meetings. One of the items was for all Board members and committee chairs to review the handbook. There was some discussion of whether the Board should review the entire handbook or just review selected parts that are relevant to their areas.

ACTION ITEM: It was decided that Board members should review the entire document but pay particular attention to the sections that pertain to their area/committees, by the beginning of October. Board members were also asked to make sure that committee chairs also review their sections by this deadline.

Gregory Cizek asked whether there will be a final version of the handbook at some point. Linda said that the process of editing the handbook should finish by beginning of October and the handbook will be posted on the website in December.

ACTION ITEM (Jennifer): The procedure of reviewing and revising the handbook should be documented in the Handbook.

Wayne suggested that the Recording Secretary be the business owner of the Handbook. His idea is that the Recording Secretary would propose changes to the handbook based on discussion at the Board meetings and send out for confirmation to the Executive Board and/or relevant Board members.

Report on Blackwell Contract

Wayne provided an update on the contract with Blackwell. An item that was discussed was providing electronic access to JEM and EM:IP to members via the NCME website – Blackwell believes that they have done their job and TRG is now working on their end to make this possible.

There was some discussion about changing the format of EM:IP. More discussion on this issue is needed.

The editorial expense rate was re-adjusted to \$32000 in 2011, with an annual increase of 4%. NCME will continue to receive 25 free copies of the journals. There was discussion of individuals who would receive the free copies. Wayne suggested that these go to each state department of education's assessment director. Gregory Cizek mentioned that the list would need to be updated each year, but Wayne indicated that he hopes that CCSSO would take on this task. Linda suggested that this task could also be part of the responsibility of one of the committees (perhaps Publications). Sherry suggested sending the journal with a cover letter to encourage the assessment director to read and share with staff.

ACTION ITEM: NCME is to provide Blackwell with a list of 55 individuals who will receive complementary issues of EM:IP.

In a separate contract, it is specified that NCME will publish an ad for the test standards each year in one issue of EM:IP and JEM. Someone needs to be appointed to make sure this happens. Bruno said that it should be put into the contract that this will be Blackwell's responsibility. Greg suggested making consistent which issue the ad appears in every year (e.g., Issue 2 of every year)

ACTION ITEM: Bruno, Linda, and Greg should schedule a meeting with Blackwell to discuss what else they can do.

Anne went over the budget with respect to royalties, total revenue, editorial stipend for our publications. This year we will see a net of approximately \$87,000. In 2012, we would have net of about \$107,000. None of this is seen by the membership; they are not charged for the journals. Greg asked if we know anything about their revenue. Anne estimated that it would be \$321,452. Bruno noted that we need to be clear that it is 35% of the same thing that it was 25%. What is the base of the percentage? This should be fixed.

Wayne is prepared to counter the proposal and wants to guarantee royalties at \$55-60,000. He will ask Blackwell to accept \$15 per member (it was \$10 in 2011 and Wiley wants \$20 in 2012). If he cannot get this, he will ask to increase the royalties (to about \$5-6,000). Wayne asked for 5 year and 7 year terms but there was no difference. The consensus of the Board was to go with a 5-year term; however, Linda noted that during negotiation we should mention that we would go with 7-year term if our requests are met.

It was noted that the contract should include a provision for limited re-use of materials by authors. This is stated in the Handbook, but it may not be in the contract.

Wayne asked the Board to keep in mind that we are being asked to spend \$10 more for member publications, so this should be considered during the later discussion of member dues.

Appointment of Newsletter Editor

Linda discussed the process of appointing a new newsletter editor. The Board was given CV's for three candidates. Linda rank-ordered the candidates in order of preference. Thanos Patelis, the current editor, will end his term at the end of December. It is important to select a successor soon so that the person can shadow Thanos before the end of his term. Linda thinks that all are strong candidates. Mary thought that it would be good to have more Asian representation in leadership positions in NCME. There was some discussion of whether to consider having co-editors instead of a single editor. There was also discussion of whether the candidates that are not selected could be asked to serve on the newsletter editorial board.

ACTION ITEM: The Diversity committee should contact the new editor to ask him/her to keep diversity in mind when selecting their editorial board.

Linda asked for a motion to accept the rankings of newsletter editor candidates. Greg made the motion, and Bruno seconded it. Eight Board members voted to accept the rankings, and one Board member abstained.

Report on TRG Contract

Anne provided a brief report on the TRG contract. The numbers were received from TRG on Friday, and some re-estimates were requested. The negotiation should wrap-up soon and a contract should be complete.

Report on Edited Book Series

Wayne reported on the NCME edited book series. Michael Kolen will be the editor of the book series. Bob Brennan, Ed Haertel, Suzanne Lane, Rebecca Zwick, and Wayne will comprise the editorial board. The title of the series will be “NCME Editorial Book Series in the Application of Educational Measurement and Assessment”

NCME will not go with Wiley-Blackwell because they would not entertain a combined contract for our journals and the book series. Lane Akers from Taylor-Francis was very interested in the series. Mike Kolen and Wayne will meet with him in August. Lane thought that a 50-50 royalty split between the authors and NCME would work well.

The titles of the individual books would come from the Board at first, to clearly define what we are looking for. The tentative topic for first book is accountability models for assessment. Ed Haertel is working with this proposal. Lane Akers suggested that while the main focus will be on the first book, the editorial board should also be aggressive with the process for starting the second book in the series so that there won't be a long lag time between publication of the first two books.

Bruno thanked Wayne for his efforts in getting this effort going and thanked Michael Kolen for accepting the role as editor. He also mentioned that we should ask Lane Akers about an option of repackaging and bundling as a special readings book to use in instruction.

ACTION ITEM: Ask Lane about options for repackaging chapters in the edited book series.

There was some discussion about issues with regard to accepting proposals for book series topics and chapters. If the editorial board and NCME Board decide to go with a model of not accepting any formal proposals or reviews, this should be clearly communicated to members. It is the editorial board's charge to determine the topics. Jim suggested that another potential model is that editorial board can pick topic then accept proposals on specific chapters. Deborah agreed that the Board needs to be involved as the series is first developed, but that all content decisions should be the domain of the editorial board.

ACTION ITEM: Wayne or Linda to ask Michael Kolen to write an article for the NCME newsletter announcing the book series and describing the process for determining topics.

Deborah made the suggestion of possibly waiting to announce the book series in conjunction with the 75th anniversary. Michael Kolen would need to agree.

Compensating Editors

The Executive Committee made a proposal to replace the interim policy for compensating editors with the following: We will provide support of up to \$6000 for each of our editors for support (any administrative or secretarial support). Individuals requesting this support would have to apply. The interim policy provided up to \$10,000 which included a \$5,000 stipend. That policy would require NCME to hold \$40k in our budget each year. Many people thought that many others in the organization do a great deal of work and are not compensated. The publications committee made their initial recommendation because NCME was not competitive in how we compensate our editors. We were not getting the same kinds of nominations for editors. The Board revisited the proposal last fall and a number of issues were brought up. Wayne brought this up at the Past-President's luncheon at the Annual Meeting, and many of the past-presidents didn't approve of the interim policy.

There was a lot of discussion among the Board about the nature of volunteering and the benefits. There is great variability across institutions in whether there is support for professional service. NCME cannot be specific in the compensation. The revised policy specifies that NCME will provide money for support, and is not meant as compensation for volunteer work.

Wayne thought the policy should be amended, so that the amount (up to \$6000) can be increased if needed. Linda was concerned about morale of publications committee and the editors, and wants to make sure that their feelings are considered. Deborah supports the policy but is concerned about how it is communicated to other volunteers so it doesn't look like there are two levels of volunteering. Jim thought that people will recognize that there are different levels of volunteering and that being an editor of a journal is a much bigger commitment and that the support is warranted if needed.

Linda called for a motion to approve the policy in section 9.5.4.3 of the Handbook. Sherry made the motion, and Jim seconded the motion. Nine Board members voted to accept the motion.

ACTION ITEM: The Executive committee should communicate this policy to the publications committee (Mark Gierl), and also notify Krista Breithaupt and Jacqueline Leighton.

Linda notified the Board that the January Board meeting in Los Angeles is cancelled. She may call a phone conference and asked the Board to hold 12-3 EST on January 26-27.

Budget and Finance Committee

Anne Fitzpatrick presented a report on the Budget & Finance Committee and reviewed NCME's financial planning, revenues, costs, and plans for the future. The B&F committee is in process of developing the 2012 budget, and is hoping to finish it by Aug. 15, to get comments in September.

There are two components of NCME's financial picture: 1) Operating budget, including revenues and expenses and 2) Investment portfolio. The operating budget includes membership services, annual

meeting activities, publications, and administrative work. These appear in the monthly reports from TRG. The convention is that routine operating activities will pay for themselves (revenues will roughly equal expenses).

Anne showed data indicating that NCME's expenses are going up, but revenues are staying flat, so our net operating income is declining and getting close to zero. If we don't change the trend, we will start operating in the red, which is not acceptable. That is why we are now focused on reducing costs, and considering additional resources for revenue.

NCME's Investment portfolio is managed by the Royal Bank of Canada, which also manages AERA's investment portfolio. The investment policy is in the Handbook. NCME has done really well, as the value of the portfolio has increased from 327,767 in 2006 to 798,761 in 2010. We haven't yet drawn on any revenue from the portfolio. Each invested dollar has great value because of its great earning power.

The Board discussed increasing dues and registration fees to increase revenue. The current dues for NCME are \$60, compared to \$150 for AERA. The dues were last raised in 2003, from \$45. Linda presented a proposal to increase dues for active members by \$10, and by \$5 for the other categories, every two years.

Jim asked for the distinction between active members and associate members. If we only raise dues by \$5 for active members it may encourage people to join as associate members. Associate members cannot vote or hold a position within NCME.

Anne noted that the associate member category was left in the By-Laws in 2008 because there were members in this category. Currently there are 44 members in this category. We may consider changing the By-laws, but it would probably be best to accumulate a few changes and put all of the changes to vote at the same time. We can take the option for Associate members off of the registration sheet and migrate members into Active status.

Deborah felt that increasing dues by \$10 every 2 years seems like a lot without knowing exactly how it is going to be spent. Anne indicated that we will know how the money will be spent. A schedule was designed so that we wouldn't have an erratic schedule of dues increases. Some felt that one dues increase would be more comfortable and easier to communicate to members. Linda noted that it may be better to increase by a larger amount now and increase less frequently. Wayne said that when you increase dues you do lose members. Conceptually, there are many reasons for instituting a built-in dues increase. The Board can elect to suspend the increase for any given year.

Bruno also felt uncomfortable with an increase of \$10 every two years, but noted that he would feel comfortable with a policy to revisit dues every 2 years. The policy should give guidance as to how an increase should be considered.

Sherry suggested that we offer options of paying two years at a time (but Anne said this would be difficult for accounting purposes).

Wayne said that if you consider annual inflation, it is not unreasonable to raise dues regularly. He offered the counter-proposal to increase initially by \$10 then increase by \$10 every three years instead of two.

Greg supports some sort of regular increases and thought that a one-time increase may not fix the problem. Any Board in the future can revisit and change the policy if needed. Bruno would prefer that we specify the increases in percentages, rather than fixed dollar amounts. Deborah wants to see the whole picture (upcoming initiatives) to determine the amount that is reasonable for a dues increase.

Wayne felt that if the Board is not comfortable putting in place a mechanism for an automatic dues increase, the Board should review this every single year as the primary fiduciary responsibility of the Board. Linda noted that the Budget & Finance committee should bring this issue to the Board every year.

Linda made the following motions:

1) I move that NCME increase annual dues for active and associate members by \$10 and for student and emeritus members by \$5 for 2012 and again in 2014.

2) I move that the Board charge the B&F finance committee with the responsibility of bringing to the Board, on an annual basis, any recommendations that they have for the review and possible increase in membership fees.

Discussion:

Mary asked whether the proposed increase will be enough to cover our expenses. Anne replied that this is just one piece of the solution, and that we couldn't increase to the amount that would cover all of our expenses. The upcoming initiatives will be covered by drawing on our investments; the increase in dues would cover operating expenses.

Wayne and Jim are in favor of \$10 increase for all member categories. Jim suggested staggering increases in dues and fees every other year.

Sherry seconded Linda's first motion. Eight members voted in favor of the first motion, and one Board member was opposed.

Greg's suggested an amendment to second motion: I move that the Board charge the B&F finance committee with the responsibility of bringing to the Board, on an annual basis, results of a review of membership and registration fees and corresponding recommendations.

All nine Board members voted in favor of the second motion.

Anne called for a motion to increase registration fees for the annual meeting by \$5 in 2012 and 2014.

Deborah suggested a bigger increase for non-members, but that we should not lock in for 2014. Greg likes the idea of a larger conference fee for non-members to encourage these individuals to become

members. Linda added that AERA is not going to raise conference fees for members but will be raising them a large amount for non-members. We get new members from non-members who attend the conference. Wayne said that in the future we may have to institute a policy to offer waivers for conference speakers. Jim asked about category for non-member international. We will keep the rate the same to encourage international participation.

Michael indicated that after discussion, the motion that was on the table is sufficiently different from the original, so the B&F committee was asked to retract the original motion. Anne agreed.

Anne called for a motion to raise non-student registration fees for the annual meeting by \$20 for NCME members and non-member international attendees, and \$45 for non-NCME members. For students increase the registration fees by \$5 for NCME members and \$25 for non-NCME members. If not achievable in 2012, then implement for the 2013 annual meeting.

Sherry made this motion; Deborah seconded the motion. All nine Board members voted in favor.

ACTION ITEM: (For Anne) Calculate effect of these changes on income.

ACTION ITEM: Linda will contact AERA to determine whether the fee increase can be instituted for 2012. These changes need to also be made in the joint membership categories. We will provide all of the numbers.

Anne presented the second proposal related to the returns and presented a table with the estimated portfolio values for 2010 (actual) and projected for 2011-2013. We currently have about 1 million dollars in the portfolio- that value could decrease if the market drops. We want to maintain this value because of the earning power of the invested dollars. We want to have an increase at the rate of inflation; any surplus could be used for initiatives. We would use returns from prior years to fund that year's initiatives. If we have lower reserves in a year, and not enough to cover our expenses, we will use cash. The Board must approve the use of the reserve to pay for NCME initiatives.

Wayne asked whether it would be possible to carry over a reserve and combine with funds from the next year. Jim noted that if the reserve doesn't meet the 3% criterion the policy does not specify what will happen.

ACTION ITEM: Jennifer to insert new policy statement in the Handbook (See Board report from B&F committee). #3 is the policy [add "(3%)" after inflation], while points 1, 2, and 4 are part of the rationale. Before #4, add "As a general rule"

Linda called the question. All nine Board members voted in favor.

Anne presented the B&F committee's last proposal which has to do with developing a charitable arm of NCME. This encompasses two possibilities: setting up a legal entity (a foundation), and establishing a giving arm (which could be a committee within NCME).

Linda shared the rationale that NCME has a lot of initiatives, and we cannot fund these out of our operating expenses, so it would be useful to have another source of revenue. In addition, we have members who want to contribute to a fund in honor of a deceased NCME member, and given the current number of awards, we cannot establish any more.

Deborah felt that people want the name of the person honored. She suggested naming the Annual Award after individuals in the foundation. A segregated fund (with a threshold) can be established.

Our awards can be funded by the foundation, and not come out of our operating expenses. Anne said that we need a legal perspective of what the foundation can and can't do. Sherry thought that we could begin this within NCME and then eventually move it over to a foundation. Linda noted that the B&F committee listed a set of next steps that will get us to point of making additional decisions at the October Board meeting. Linda suggested that it would be useful to have a proposal. Anne said that she cannot do this; it will eventually have to go to another (ad hoc) committee with individuals who are interested in the initiative. Mary added that NCME should be very careful about how we solicit; this should not be construed as fundraising in any way. Deborah noted that it would be nice to get this started in the 75th year (we can ask for \$75 to kick it off).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Thursday, July 14, 2011

Linda began the meeting at 8:34 a.m.

Plumer provided background information about the Anti-Trust Statement. Each year as part of the organization's tax cycle, NCME is provided with an independent audit. The last report included the recommendation that NCME provide guidelines regarding anti-trust. Last year, Plumer and Wayne worked on policy and the Board accepted it. Plumer read the Anti-Trust Statement. The statement will be posted on BaseCamp.

Linda reviewed the agenda. She acknowledged Wayne for beginning the practice of inviting committee chairs to the Board meeting, and she asked for introductions.

Kris Waltman will be meeting with Recruitment, Diversity, and Graduate Student committees to discuss getting content for the website, during the time that the program chairs give their report.

Update on 75th Anniversary Plans

Neal Kingston, Chair of the 75th ad hoc committee, presented his committee's ideas and plans for the 75th anniversary. There are three categories of activities: general, which includes a communication plan, editing interviews of emeritus and new members/graduate students, and establishing an NCME archive (see report). Sub-committees working on each activity submit preliminary budget ranges for the Board's review.

The committee began a pilot study at last annual meeting of taping interviews with past presidents, new members and graduate students, and will be editing these videos. The committee is still planning exactly how it will be done. More interviews will be gathered at the next annual meeting, and the committee might need to reach out to members who don't attend the annual meetings.

The initiatives for the 75th anniversary also include establishing an NCME archive. The committee has been in contact with an organization that helps build archives. There currently is no complete collection of NCME programs. Linda added that we're trying to digitize much of the archive material.

Wayne mentioned that there is a major archivist center at the University of Akron, which maintains the archives for psychology in America. It may be useful to put out a call on the website to see if members have recommendations. Greg thought it would be useful to touch base with the Buros Institute. Linda noted that Barbara Plake is on the 75th anniversary committee, and someone should mention this idea to her.

Neal thought that a university center might do this if the archive is purely digital. It is not necessarily establishing, but the maintaining of the archive that is the issue. Kris has been in contact with John Hoffman at TRG, and it may be in our best interest to have TRG do this if possible. Linda said that there was discussion about using the NCME website as portal, but the actual archive would reside someplace else. TRG is reluctant to house the archive. Neal noted that Gretchen Anderson is leading the effort on the archive.

Bruno asked whether the committee has investigated whether there is a national archive; they would have an automatic system with advice and guidelines. He also noted that we should be careful to present this as NCME's (American) history of measurement, because it will not include international history of measurement.

At the 2012 meeting the committee is planning an invited session on NCME past, present, and future, and will have many announcements throughout the meeting. The 2013 meeting is where most of the activity and cost will occur. Among the activities will be NCME logo bags, display of the NCME archive, a measurement time capsule, and measurement-themed comics.

Wayne said that to increase corporate sponsorships, we may allow organizations to insert materials into the NCME logo bags. Greg reported that Jane Shephard provided samples of bags, and is going to provide cost estimates. Samples of bags were passed around. We should be unique and visible and it would be very nice to have our own bag to differentiate us from AERA.

Mary wants to make sure that there isn't an increase in registration fees that seems to be tied to offering the bags. Linda clarified that we may need to have some surcharge, which will be discussed later.

Neal continued his report and spoke about displaying the time capsule and measurement comics (the committee is looking into any copyright issues related to the comics). His committee will need display locations, and areas for mounted photographs. Jim asked whether the rooms used for display would count toward our room allotment (Plumer noted that we have begun discussions with AERA that this is a special year and we will require additional space).

Greg said that there needs to be some sensitivity to the fact that old photos and interviews will not reflect the current diversity and future directions for NCME. Neal noted that there were many women who had a huge impact on measurement, for example, a book by Julia Petersen on the Iowa Testing Program discusses women doing test scoring. Sherry suggested taking photos at the 2012 meeting so that we can highlight "NCME Then and Now". Neal added that the committee is planning a review of NCME programs and they can focus on the gender and ethnicity of presenters.

Bruno suggested commissioning a critical review of our history, a scholarly analysis looking at gender and race in measurement history. Kris would like to incorporate segments from graduate students, including photographs, about what they would like their life to be like in the future, and would like the GSIC to take responsibility for this task; the recruitment committee should collect information about how people got into the measurement field.

The committee would like to have a separate reception from AERA-D (Gala) for the 75th anniversary and they are thinking of interspersing music and entertainment with time for socialization. Not having the reception in conjunction with AERA will save money. It will be important to make sure there are not conflicting events during the Gala. We will have to work with AERA and key organizations to avoid schedule conflicts.

Jim asked whether there has been an effort to reach people who were very active but who have not attended for many years, and who may be interested in coming back for the anniversary. Neal suggests that each member contact their own advisors.

Neal reported that the NCME breakfast would have minimal activity related to the anniversary because of the very tight schedule. Finally, Neal said that the committee discussed showing movies where testing plays a significant role (or movie clips) throughout the conference showing how testing is portrayed in the media.

Assessment Policy and Practice

Scott Marion and Kristen Huff provided an update from the Assessment Policy and Practice committee. The committee members are: Cornelia Orr, Judy Koenig, Christy Schneider, Joseph Martineau, and Zachary Warner (graduate student representative). Edynn Sato (chair of Diversity Cte.) has regularly attended the committee meetings. The committee's goals are to provide measurement/technical expertise to the policy world; increase the visibility of NCME; and form strategic liaisons with other groups and organizations.

The committee's activities started with an invited Presidential session at the 2011 meeting, focusing on comparability. Papers from the session will be reviewed by Robert Brennan, Deborah Harris and the rest of the committee; these will be synthesized into a single report (short policy paper). Kristen participated in a session at CCSSO presenting a synthesis of the papers from this session. Three papers and discussant reactions can be posted on the NCME Website. The committee still needs other ways to reach out because some key audience members will not visit the NCME website.

The Board discussed the need for the committee to coordinate with the publications committee. Kristen was approached by Kurt Geisinger to publish papers in AME; but we may want to go through an NCME publication, and we may want to also publish a shorter version in *Ed Week*. The committee has been in communication with the 2012 Program Chairs to get a slot on the 2012 program; and they are thinking about topics for future years.

Wayne said that once the synthesis is complete, we can do a lot with it. We have a good relationship with CCSSO – they can mail it to every state assessment chief, commissioners, and will post it on their website. How do we delegate this work and sustain it? Wayne described the model from SCIOP, which is the expectation that each committee member has ownership of a topic; the next year another two members come up with the topic, and so on.

Kristen said Duncan McQuarrie wants to explore a partnership between NCME and TILSA (technical issues in large scale assessment). Linda noted that the Outreach and Partnerships committee has also had communication with TILSA, so it would be useful to coordinate the efforts.

Scott noted that it is too soon to determine whether the committee is having the intended effect, but we have to monitor and evaluate.

Kris asked the committee to consider more carefully the dissemination plan; she would like the document posted on the NCME website and for CCSO provide a link to it. If it is on our website we can monitor the number of hits, etc. Linda added that it would also be good to have a summary published in EM:IP to increase the readership of policy people and call their attention to NCME as a resource.

Kristen thinks more powerful impact comes from conversations rather than dissemination of a document, and doesn't see how we will achieve the goal of having an impact without those conversations. But she is not sure how those conversations will occur.

Linda asked the committee to think about ways to use additional people/resources from NCME to help carry out the goals. Scott thought that one discussant role can be to capture the take-home message of the papers presented in the session and provide synthesis; that would be a good start.

Lora added that the Recruitment committee wants to reach out to organizations not focusing on measurement. NCTM would be interested in the papers and there may be people you may want to consider involving in future symposia.

ACTION ITEM: Scott asked the Board for ideas for focal topics for future symposia

Outreach Goals and Plans

Ada Woo and Jason Nicholas presented a report from the Outreach and Partnerships committee. They had meeting in Orlando last October with CCSO. There was initial conversation but no follow-up. The committee has been meeting regularly to develop criteria for strategic partnerships with other organizations. The committee seeks direction with regard to the structure of outreach activities and the Board's desired path to organizational contact.

The committee asked the Board for guidance - do they just cold call organizations to introduce NCME and what we can do for them in terms of our expertise; or do we have to have something in hand to "sweeten the deal"? The main concern of the committee is lack of time for individuals to create an "outreach product" that we can take to organizations. Is it OK for the committee to make outreach endeavors without the approval of the Board/Executive committee? What are the parameters that the committee should operate under?

Linda felt that the committee cannot take on the task of developing materials. We do have membership materials, journals, and materials from the Assessment Policy & Practice committee that may be useful. Bruno added that the new book series is a potential resource as well. Kris said that most of our resources are not written for the type of audience the Outreach committee would reach, but some of the ITEMS modules may be appropriate.

Sherry suggested asking the organizations what measurement issues they are facing to help guide what type of materials we should provide. Linda hopes that EM:IP may be useful. She envisions the Outreach committee as the liaison/contact, not necessarily the "doer". The committee can think about what they would need to start reaching out to organizations and come back to the Board for guidance and

assistance. Linda suggested thinking about continuing the relationship with CCSO and to identify one other organization to approach, with suggestions on how to use our expertise to help them.

There is a good deal of overlap with the Assessment Policy & Practice committee, and some overlap with the publications committee. There should be more communication and collaboration. Jim added that the National College Testing Association has been working with the Measurement Services SIG of AERA; they are preparing to launch an online journal, with the goal to get measurement ideas out to individuals who work at college testing centers.

ACTION ITEM: Linda, Jason, Ada, Jim and Sherry will talk and help give the committee more direction; will talk more about plans at the October Board meeting.

Website Goals and Plans

Kris provided an update on the website development. There is a finalized signed contract with TRG for development of the website. The schedule of events/tasks are included in the report to the Board; they are already a month off schedule. John Hoffman is designing the content management system (CMS), which is taking more time than anticipated. There are three stages of design work; migrating existing contact, new functionality for December, and new functionality for a March release date. The website committee is planning on a t-shirt design contest for members as a way of getting people to the website on a regular basis.

The Website committee provided ideas to each NCME committee on possible content for the website. These ideas were used to provide goals to the committees; some committees have incorporated these goals into their report but others have not.

Deborah asked how the committee will coordinate the selling of t-shirts and other items. Kris said that these would not be sold to make a profit; it would be only to promote the website. The website will have a storefront – this would be used to sell the t-shirts. The price would be enough to purchase and ship the t-shirts. There was discussion about whether the Board should approve the t-shirt contest. Can the committee collect money as opposed to NCME? The Board needs some overview about what is going to be sold on the Website. This can be part of the Website committee's report, or shared via email.

ACTION ITEM: The Website committee should develop policies of use of the Storefront on the website, and that policy should include description of Board involvement.

Kris said she has been thinking about different way to get measurement-related content written for a lay audience. Linda suggested that the website committee contact the ITEMS editor; the current editor term ends in December. Deborah suggested offering the position to the individuals who were interested in the newsletter editor position. There was also mention of the possible use of ITEMS as the basis of Webinars.

Diversity Goals and Plans

Edynn Sato, the Chair of the Diversity Committee, provided an update on the committee's activities and plans. The committee will sponsor an invited symposium at the 2012 meeting focusing on equitable assessment, and is in the process of recruiting speakers.

At the April 2011 Board meeting, there was the suggestion that the Diversity committee assign liaisons to each of the other committees. Edynn has been attending meetings of the Assessment Policy and Practice committee.

Deborah asked whether the liaisons would be involved in reviewing the award candidates. Michael expressed concern that it is a different function of the committee that wasn't part of its original goals. The committee is going to take on issues of diversity in NCME, where the goal is to focus on diversity in testing. The diversity committee should not be responsible for making sure the other committees are taking diversity into consideration, and he expressed concern that the committee is transforming its function. Edynn clarified that the Diversity committee members would be more of a resource, and Linda concurred, stating that the Diversity committee would not police the other NCME committees. The description of the committee in the Handbook was rewritten and is not the same as when Michael was Chair.

Wayne gave some background perspective on the Diversity Committee; during his Presidential term he found that this committee did not have a concrete purpose or tasks. There was idea of sunseting the committee but it didn't seem appropriate. Linda agreed that diversity should be "owned" by everyone. Sometimes committees get caught up in their work and it is useful to have somebody to use as a resource. Perhaps we can make it optional. Perhaps one person can work with Deborah and the award chairs. Having a diversity committee member help with nominations for the awards would be very helpful. Sherry suggested that we think of the Diversity committee as resource members rather than liaisons to make clear that they are not serving the role of overseer.

<p>ACTION ITEM: Edynn will go back to the Diversity committee and more clearly define their role as resources.</p>

Awards Goals and Plans

Deborah presented the award committee reports. The main goal of all 6 award committees is to get high quality applications. The award winners reflect on NCME so it is up to everyone to provide recommendations for nominations. A second goal is to ensure consistency across the six award committees. Deborah is working on the criteria and description of the awards in the Handbook, and wants all awards to have a common due date, and have more similarity in the calls and nominations process. She also suggested collecting photos and information for the breakfast brochure early on so that we don't have to go back to the winners. The 2012 meeting will feature a special session highlighting the award recipients (this will be the second year of this session). The 75th anniversary committee may want to interview the award winners for their video clips. Finally, Deborah mentioned that she would like to follow up with early career award winners to see how they do in the future.

Membership Goals and Plans

Min Li presented the Membership Committee report via phone. The committee's annual goals include coordinating membership activities at the annual meeting, conducting a lapsed member survey, and developing proposals for policies, procedures, and initiatives to maximize membership renewals and retention. The committee is also writing a narrative for the newsletter profiling an NCME member who discusses the benefits of NCME membership.

The committee worked with TRG to construct and conduct a lapsed member survey online. The survey received an acceptable response rate. In the coming year, the committee will finish the analysis of the survey results and will prepare a report with recommendations. The committee will also prepare a technical report detailing the procedure for conducting a lapsed member survey so that this can be repeated about every four years.

The committee has three proposed activities for the coming year. The first is to increase mentoring for graduate students and early career scholars; the committee will work closely with the GSIC to come up with plans. The second goal is to develop a short piece describing the benefits of being an NCME member, and membership profiles to highlight particular members (8-10). The committee will work with the other committees to select the members for the profiles.

ACTION ITEM: Linda asked for a timeline and costs associated with the proposed activities. She was most concerned about the activities involved in the initiative to increase mentoring, and she asked for this by the middle of August.

Min said that the committee doesn't yet have a clear picture of the tasks involved in the mentoring initiative, and suggested that the GSIC may have better idea regarding the timeline. Chia-Lin added that the GSIC doesn't have a timeline yet but will get back to Min about that.

ACTION ITEM: Min will talk with Kris and John to finalize plans for getting the member profiles on the website.

Recruitment Goals and Plans

Lora Monfils and Scott Bishop presented the report from the Recruitment committee. The committee will collaborate with the 75th anniversary committee regarding the recruitment campaign at the 2013 meeting. The committee will also begin to develop "path to membership profiles" describing how we all came into the measurement field. Lora also described a social media initiative that Scott is leading. The committee will develop a proposal to the Board because there are implications for cost in maintaining the social media sites. Lora reported that very few organizations provide links to NCME website, and the committee would like to work with the Outreach and Website committees to get this link on other organizations' websites.

Lora mentioned the idea of collaborating with affiliate-type organizations to offer a "buy one get one free" membership. Other ideas included: somehow developing a network where our membership offers services to go in to public schools/community colleges to speak and bring people into the

measurement field; devoting recruitment efforts to non-education and non-psychology graduate and undergraduate programs; and co-sponsoring summer internships for undergraduates.

The Board discussed the development of social media sites. Lora showed how the NSTA website is using social media. Wayne suggested asking an undergraduate student to set up the social media sites. Linda suggested sending out a message to the membership to see if anyone is interested; this could be a new position in NCME. Plumer said that it is easy to set up the social media sites initially; but that the ongoing maintenance and continuity of communication is key. Linda said that it would be helpful to determine how younger people would use this (and suggested a discussion with the GSIC). She would want to ensure that it would be used by graduate students.

ACTION ITEM: Lora and Scott to come up with cost estimates for the Recruitment Committee's work by August.

Deborah asked about the "Two for One" membership idea and cost implications. Lora said this is an initial idea and more thought and discussion is needed. Wayne doesn't think this would work; but thought that we could have a special campaign offering school districts a very low initial rate for membership.

There was some discussion that title of our organization implies a focus on Education which may put off individuals involved in measurement in other fields. Linda added that some individuals stay away from NCME because they believe that the focus is only on methodology (DIF, etc.) In recruitment we should make it clear what NCME is about. Board members going to other conferences should bring copies of the NCME brochure.

ACTION ITEM: Lora to send email to membership to find out what conferences they are attending and ask them to bring NCME brochures.

ACTION ITEM: Kris asked for the text of the brochure to use for the website. Lora will post it on BaseCamp.

Jim suggested finding out if other organizations have done surveys to determine what organizations their members belong to. AERA Divisions D and H have about double the membership as NCME, so these are good groups to target for recruitment.

There was some discussion about recruitment of international members. Linda mentioned that there has been prior discussion about this, and ideas for increasing international members include having an international member chair a committee; having an invited session for international members; and providing stipends. Linda also mentioned a new AERA program that brings undergraduate students to AERA. This program would like to have additional support and would welcome NCME involvement.

ACTION ITEM: Lora will get in touch with George Wimberly who coordinates the undergraduate AERA program and get cost estimates to provide to Anne.

Annual Meeting Program

Joanna Gorin presented the report from the Program Co-chairs (via phone). Andre Rupp was unable to attend.

Changes were made to the call for proposals. The program co-chairs were responsive to the results of the membership survey which indicated the need for a better balance between technical and practical or applied papers, and sessions enabling greater interaction. Joanna reported that the proposal review system now has the ability to identify the graduate student reviewers.

The conference will continue to include several standing sessions associated with committees: A plenary session will be held the morning of the first day of the conference. John Easton of IES will be the speaker, and this session will be followed by a coffee break. The GSIC will have two sessions. A session for PARCC and SBAC consortia will focus on assessments of students with severe cognitive disabilities. This session will be set up similar to a structured poster session, with stations set up with PowerPoint or video feeds so that presenters can demonstrate their work.

There will be two additional structured poster/demonstration sessions that give the opportunity for the audience to get engaged. These may be scheduled on the same day in the same room, or these will be held the first session of the day. The program co-chairs are hopeful that they will receive proposals for other innovative session types. Other invited sessions include Testing Around the World, Funding Agencies Panel, Canadian Assessment, Advances and Psychometrics, China's Educational Testing System, and Looking Forward to NCME's 75th Anniversary.

Greg asked about possible overlap in the sessions about testing around the world, and testing in Canada and China. Joanna clarified that the Canadian session will be more about issues in language assessment. By August 1st they will have confirmation of the titles. Joanna needs to talk to Terry and the other session organizers about possible overlap.

Joanna asked the Board to review the report to identify if there are any other areas of possible overlap in the program.

Training and Development Goals and Plans

Heather Buzick (via phone) discussed the Training and Development Committee report. Heather asked the Board for suggestions for soliciting training proposals. Heather and her committee will work with the new ad hoc committee on Webinar Development to expand the webcast sessions. There needs to be additional discussion to determine the specific roles of the T&D committee and the ad hoc committee.

The webinars need to be condensed into 30 or 60 minute chunks so it will not be necessary to download 3 hours of content.

ACTION ITEM: Jennifer to add this ad hoc committee to the governance roster

Heather reviewed the evaluation survey results from last year's workshops. The results indicated that participants enjoyed having the notes ahead of time and having the opportunity for hands-on activities during the workshops.

Heather reported on two survey questions from the membership survey pertaining to training and development: the most popular reason for not attending training session is the timing, and 44% of respondents indicated that they would be more likely to attend if the session was during the annual meeting.

Jim asked for the length of time of the session that is held during the meeting. Heather thought it would probably be one or two 4-hour sessions. Deborah asked whether these sessions could be held during the evening. This should be added to the evaluation survey and considered the following year.

ACTION ITEM: This year, Jane Shepherd at TRG is responsible for the survey. Plumer/Linda will follow-up on getting this item added to the survey. Ask question 38, and add evening session as an option.

Standards and Test Use Goals and Plans

Cindy Searcy presented the report from the Standards and Test Use committee. The most visible goal of the committee is to provide input to the Board regarding the Standards. Last year the committee's purpose was expanded. The current role includes: developing and implementing a process for reviewing standards-related products and establishing timelines; and identifying any new materials or guidelines that don't exist and facilitating their development. Timelines are going to shift because many of the activities are contingent on the Standards being complete. In addition, many of the documents/guidelines have joint owners or the owners are no longer in existence (e.g., Joint Commission on Testing Practices).

Cindy said that the committee needs to know which documents are NCME-endorsed. When guidelines have multiple authors, the committee will require their support in the review process. Cindy and her committee will propose a review process and bring to the Board for review and input.

All NCME-endorsed products should be posted on the website and all copyright dates should be correct. The website should also post information for members on the process and timeline of the Standards review process. The information for the website will need to be ready before October. Cindy asked Kris to describe process for updating content on the website. Kris indicated that any new updates or content is sent to the web content editor and it is put in the queue for uploading. Updates on the Standards can be posted on the website on a regular basis.

Additional Budget Items

Anne gave an update on the implications on revenue and costs due to the Board's recent discussion of planned activities. An increase in dues and fees, and an increase in the Wiley reimbursement would provide approximately \$56,660 in revenue. Total expenses based on initiatives discussed are estimated at \$48,900 so far.

Linda adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

Friday, July 15

Bruno Zumbo, Board Member was not in attendance

Linda began the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

GSIC Goals and Plans

Chia-Lin Tsai and Chad Gotch (via phone) presented an overview of the GSIC report. At the last annual meeting, 75 graduate student proposals were received for the poster session, and 50 were accepted. The committee recruited graduate students as peer reviewers – 81 volunteered. Chad recruited measurement professionals to give students feedback on the posters, and received 42 volunteers. The Call for posters for the 2012 meeting will go out soon, and the deadline will be October 1st.

The GSIC's invited symposium will be on significant shifts in policy and practice related to national education reform efforts. Chad reported that so far two panelists – Pheobe Winter and Diane Henderson-Montero – have agreed to participate.

The GSIC will continue to work on development of website content. Committee members are updating the list of internships, and compiling a list of organizations that employ measurement professionals. The website's threaded discussion forum will allow students to post and answer questions to get to know more about the field. The committee will discuss how to manage and monitor/update the web content.

Organizations that are listed will not be charged. There was discussion about the criteria for including/excluding organizations, since not all organizations that hire measurement professionals can be listed. Sherry suggested including a disclaimer that indicates that there are not necessarily job openings at the organizations that are listed, and that not all organizations are listed. Jim suggested perhaps just listing categories of employers rather than specific organizations; and indicate different roles/positions within the organizations. Michael suggested looking at the NCME program to see where members/presenters are located.

Wayne said that database used in his study that was published in EM:IP on measurement professionals can provide very helpful information to the graduate students. Wayne also mentioned that one of his planned activities is to have the member database include search by location, organization, etc.

ACTION ITEM: Lora will stay in touch with GSIC to find out if they find organizations that do not have NCME members; these organizations may be targeted for membership recruitment.
--

Deborah asked whether the GSIC had a proposal for breakfast tickets that needed to be discussed by the Board. Chad replied that it is usually the Membership committee that handles this. There was discussion about the criteria for awarding the free breakfast tickets. Last year, tickets went to students who reviewed for the poster session or served on a committee.

Greg asked to clarify the purpose for giving away the free breakfast tickets. Is the purpose to award students for participating/volunteering for NCME, or is it to help needy graduate students? Linda said that the original purpose was to encourage graduate students to attend the breakfast; it was a reasonable criteria to give the tickets to students who participated/volunteered, but we may decide to change that criteria in the future. Wayne added that we can ask graduate students to staff the NCME booth or help evaluate the sessions, and in return are given a free breakfast or reduced/free registration. This is a longer term plan. Wayne would like to see a travel awards program for graduate students in the future. The Recruitment committee would partner with GSIC in a longer term plan of this type.

Linda said that this year we will set aside 30-32 tickets (same number as last year), but perhaps we will give them to students who work at the conference.

Chad noted that we have to consider the logistics and possibility of having to give refunds to students who purchase their breakfast ticket.

Kris mentioned a challenge in the GSIC report about the submission review system. Chad described the challenge: the poster session submission process is separate from the main submission system. John Hoffman built a system and updated it with the website maintenance hours. Linda asked why the poster session could not use the main system. Does the number of submissions for the poster session warrant the time it would take to fix the system, or has the main system developed enough to be able to integrate the GSIC system? Linda suggested that next year we will pursue having the systems integrated, but we need to figure out what to do this year.

<p>ACTION ITEM: Linda, Chad, Kris, Jim, and Chia-Lin will schedule a conference call with John Hoffman to discuss strategies for integrating the GSIC poster submission/review process. They will determine what temporary fix to implement this year, and a longer-term strategy for next year.</p>

Update on Expansion of the Webinars

Terry Ackerman joined the meeting by phone and talked about expanding the webinars. Linda, Michael, and Plumer were all involved in this initiative. Terry reported that NCME should continue this effort and be more strategic to ensure its success. In the first year we focused on school district staff; and in the second year we focused on international groups. This year we will focus on three target audiences: developing countries, domestic organizations, and individuals who are not able to attend the annual meeting.

The webinar committee is having a discussion with George Wimberly from AERA about a partnership on some training sessions. The committee would like to create library of past sessions, after editing the sessions to 30-60 minute segments so that they are more attractive and beneficial. The sessions can be edited into MP4 files, and an estimate from Sonic Foundry was \$150-\$450 to edit one session. Once we identify target groups we need to constantly stay in contact with them to make sure that we meet their needs and continue to get new topics. We can identify through our membership individuals to conduct the sessions.

The implementation and timeline leading up to the Annual meeting in Vancouver is provided in the report. Anne asked for confirmation of the budget. The report indicates that we spent approximately \$20,000 for two days of live streaming/recording. The current budget has about \$8,000. Plumer indicated that we don't have a cost associated with streaming the webinars online (what we would be developing). Linda said that the cost estimates in the proposal right now are very preliminary.

Sherry asked about the content of the webinars and whether there has been any discussion with users/subscribers regarding the topics. Terry replied that we have had discussions with some people internationally, but within the U.S. we need to investigate what the needs are. Linda noted that Step 2 in the committee's timeline is to survey the target audiences.

Sherry asked about possible charges for the webinars. Terry replied that there may be a graduated scale so that if professors wanted to use these for their courses there would be one price, but testing companies could be charged a little more. Deborah suggested that this may need to be re-evaluated if we then ask these companies for content and staff to provide the training. Kris suggested it would be easier to have one price for members and another price for non-members. Linda added that the webinar series is a mission-driven initiative; if we make money we could expand, but that is not the primary goal.

Plumer said that the costs from Sonic Foundry are pretty solid. Once the live streaming is over, the physical recording is part of the contract. Some editing is usually needed. The shopping cart feature is the other piece. It is difficult to get a real cost estimate until we have a solid plan. Will the webinars be a member benefit? Wayne said that we need to budget a one-time cost to build the infrastructure and house the system; and two variable costs for each production and the maintenance. Then we can discuss revenue. Anne noted that it is very important to evaluate before we develop too much infrastructure, because this is a pilot program. Terry ensured the Board that all of the issues that are being discussed have already been brought up by the committee.

Sherry suggested the need to establish a format and commonality across the webinars so that there is a sense that the webcasts are part of a larger set and there is unity in appearance.

Linda said that AERA is interested in collaborating with us; they do not have online training now. Linda asked the Board their feelings of a possible collaboration. Kris would prefer that this be an NCME initiative, so that it could be used as a recruitment tool, but the others thought it would be a good idea to collaborate.

<p>ACTION ITEM: Anne asked Terry to provide ballpark cost estimates based on the plan right now, by August 15th. The committee will need to flesh out the plans and develop a first draft of costs for the rest of this year, and what will be incurred next year.</p>
--

Funding Prioritization

Anne revisited the budget and asked the Board to look at the new operational costs and costs for new initiatives and voice any concerns about any of the expenses. Anne thought that we may be able to

cover our operational costs in 2012 with the increase in revenue due to an increase in dues and fees. It is hard to determine whether the location of the annual meeting (Vancouver) would have an impact. AERA is also making these projections and will share with us.

Plumer reminded the Board that everyone has responsibility to forward any information about expenses (from committees) to the B&F committee as soon as possible so they can be put into the budget.

Anne said that she is not sure whether sponsorships can cover the expenses for the 75th anniversary. The estimates provided by the 75th anniversary committee may be adjusted. The Board needs to provide guidance. The numbers right now are probably too high. We need to balance the opportunity of the 75th anniversary to recruit new members and increase sponsorships with the need to keep the budget down.

Sherry thought we should be careful about purchasing/selling merchandise for the 75th anniversary because we won't be sure what the members will want and how much to order. Kris said that Café Press can produce merchandise on demand, if the merchandise is going to be available off-site.

Linda is going to send out a letter to the membership about the increase in membership dues and conference fees. She wondered whether this letter could also ask for donations at this time. The Board felt that the focus of this first communication should be on the increase in services as the rationale for increasing dues and fees and should not mention the 75th anniversary.

Anne suggested that each committee conveys costs to its area director, and the area director can decide if those are reasonable costs and can approve or disapprove of those costs. All agreed that the 75th committee needs to prioritize costs, refine them and reduce the spread and provide a more definite figure by Aug. 15th.

Deborah said she would prefer to put a cap on the Gala, rather than combining all of the other components of the 75th anniversary. There is a need to determine whether the costs other than the Gala can be put under 2012 or 2013. The Board asked to separate costs of the Gala from the other activities/initiatives for the 75th.

Linda asked the Board for any other topics for discussion before ending the meeting. Kris announced that she is now the contact for modifying the member search engine to find members by geographic region.

Linda thanked the Board and committee chairs for their participation in the meeting, and adjourned the meeting at 11:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer L. Kobrin