

National Council of Measurement in Education Board Meeting

Wednesday, June 16, 2010

Minutes

The NCME Board met for two days, Wednesday, June 16, 2010 and Thursday, June 17, 2010, in Madison, Wisconsin. Each day ran for a full 8 hours.

Attendees:

Terry Ackerman  
Sara Bolt  
Cara Cahalan-Laitusis  
Wayne Camara  
Greg Cizek  
Linda Cook  
Nate Ehresman  
Kadriye Ercikan  
Deb Harris  
Amy Hendrickson (Thursday only)  
Kristen Huff  
Mark Gierl (Thursday only)  
Chad Gotch  
Jackie Leighton (Thursday only)  
Susan Loomis  
Plumer Lovelace  
Scott Marion (Wednesday only)  
Jerry Melican  
Lora Monfils  
Drew Nelesen  
Michael Rodriguez  
Sherry Rose-Bond  
Lee Scott  
Sandip Sinharay (Thursday only)  
Kris Waltman Frisbie  
Phoebe Winter (Wednesday only)

**Welcome & Introductions**

Wayne welcomed the Board members and Committee Chairs to Madison, and invited Plumer to introduce the Rees Group staff (Nate and Drew). Plumer then reminded Board on two important matters: First, that all required forms from Board members had not been turned in (i.e., document retention form, conflict of interest form, and whistleblower form). Second, Plumer instructed Board members on returning their reimbursement forms. Wayne reviewed the agenda and noted changes.

### **Anti-trust Guidance**

Wayne reviewed the draft language. The intent is for the Board members to sign once completed. Before the fall meeting, an attorney and an editor will be recruited to review and finalize. See action items from May 2<sup>nd</sup>, item #22.

### **NCME Initiatives: Survey and membership database**

*See page 16 of 163 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

Wayne quickly reviewed the list of new initiatives, noting that most had dedicated slots on the agenda. Wayne and Plumer then discussed how they want to instantiate the membership survey as the primary source for a membership database. The essential idea is that a routine membership survey would allow the database to be maintained and updated. For example, when members renew membership, they will update their information in the database through the survey mechanism.

This led into a discussion of membership issues regarding graduate students. A discussion item to discuss all by-laws related to student membership was noted for the fall meeting. Topics that were discussed included: (1) the by-laws currently indicate that student members must be graduate students; not only is this not being enforced, some on the Board questioned whether this was a necessary requirement; and (2) the by-laws currently indicate that the student fees should be half of full membership, but this only applies to graduate students who are not employed full-time; how is this being enforced?

### **Review of Action Items**

*See page 37 of 163 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

Next on the agenda was a review of the action items from the April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Board meeting. Three action items were discussed in a bit of detail.

First, the action item regarding (#3 from June 2010 and #8 from April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010) whether NCME is covered under AERA's disaster recovery plan (i.e., what happens regarding contracts, fees, etc., if the meeting must be cancelled) was assigned to Terry and Linda.

Next, the action item regarding whether the names of committee chairs and members should be added to the annual conference program was discussed (#11 from April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010 list of action items). Deb supported the idea of adding this information to the website; Linda supported the idea of adding this information to the NCME Breakfast program; and Kadriye supported the idea of not only adding this information to the conference program, but adding this information to the website and Breakfast program as well. There was general agreement from the Board that this would occur.

Finally, action item #4 from the May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010 list was briefly discussed (i.e., giving 2011 Program Chairs access to reviewer dB asap) and added to the list of immediate action items (see #4 from June 2010 action item list).

**Sara Bolt: Diversity Committee Update**

*See pages 43 – 50 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

The Committee first proposed that one action that could be taken would be for the Diversity Committee to identify potential candidates from diverse backgrounds who could potentially qualify for an award, and encourage colleagues and/or mentors to nominate them, and/or make recommendations to Award Committees. A discussion then ensued as to whether this was an appropriate course of action, as Deb cautioned that race/ethnicity cannot be a criterion for an award.

Wayne Camara suggested that simply raising awareness of lack of diversity would be helpful, and that the Diversity Committee should consider posting descriptive statistics of awardees from the last several years.

Sara then agreed to the suggestion from Wayne that the April 2011 report from the Diversity Committee should have a descriptive analysis of demographic information with regard to committees, governance, etc. contingent on what is available in dBs.

The Committee then suggested that travel and/or dissertation stipends for under-represented groups may be helpful, and the Board indicated that a proposal would need to be developed for consideration.

Michael suggests that the role of the Diversity Committee is “BIG”; and suggested that every committee should have diversity as a strand. For example, the role of the Diversity Committee could be to support other committees in this effort, e.g., recommend to other committees action items related to diversity and the specific role of that committee. Michael stressed that the issue of diversity should permeate throughout organization.

Wayne noted that the value of having Committee Chairs – especially from the Diversity Committee – and grad students attend the Board meeting is that it helps make the Board and all other committees aware of issues related to both (diversity and graduate students), and by continuing Chair and graduate student attendance at Board meeting, these issues should start to permeate throughout the organization.

Terry suggested that we make it a responsibility of each committee to say how they are addressing diversity, and asked if “diversity” was well-articulated? Terry suggested a newsletter article or an EM:IP article to start discussion of what “diversity” means in context of NCME.

Two other ideas were offered. First, it was suggested whether the Board should consider a fee-waiver for under-represented minorities to attend training sessions. Then, Kristen suggested that the Diversity Committee may want to speak to folks at ETS regarding “lessons learned” with regard to the Psychometrics Program at Morgan State University.

Terry suggested that Committee consider metrics that can help evaluate how things are changing in NCME with regard to diversity. In other words, how do we know we are being effective?

An action item was added to the June 2010 list (# 5) that Sara would work with Kris to streamline the mission statement for the website.

### **Kadriye Ercikan: Awards Committee Update**

***See pages 51 – 64 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)***

Kadriye provided an overview of the various Award Committees reports. Kadriye expressed concern on behalf of the Committee that there has been a shortage of nominations; the Committee plans to review NCME and AERA Programs from 2010 and seek out nominations from individuals. An idea was offered from the Board that the Committee investigate

establishing a web-based procedure for nominations and other ways to streamline the process, as a more streamlined process may encourage more nominations.

Two action items were added to the June 2010 list (#6 and #7) regarding providing information to Kris regarding the 2008 and 2009 award winners and making updates to the handbook. Regarding the latter, Kadriye asked if making changes to the handbook requires Board vote. The decision was that these changes to the handbook do not require a Board vote, as they are of the nature of making procedures operational and making ongoing improvements to procedures. The changes to the handbook involve details regarding how to deal with “carryovers” (e.g., persons who are nominated for an award and do not receive it can be automatically “carried over” for nomination to the next year) and when such “carryovers” expire.

**Kristen: Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment Policy**

**See pages 51 – 64 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)**

Kristen and Scott presented issues regarding the new Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment Policy. The initial members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment Policy were charged by Terry and Wayne to develop a strategy and process for NCME to advise on a national scale regarding contemporary educational assessment and measurement issues. Kristen and Scott indicated that although the charge was helpful, it still did not provide a strong rationale for why NCME should “throw its hat into the policy ring.” Discussion ensued that NCME should be seen as a seminal source to inform policy-makers on best practice and research on the science of educational measurement. It was questioned how NCME’s role in advising on policy issues related to educational measurement would differ from BOTAs’.

Scott and Kristen also presented other discussion items re: expansion of committee to include diversity of viewpoints and expertise; ways to monitor, identify and prioritize national assessment policy issues (e.g., focus only on assessment? accountability? E.g., ESEA); ways to identify and recruit NCME members to work on specific issues who can represent Board and Membership; options for developing and executing a strategy for each policy issue; obtaining final sign-off such that results represent NCME Board and Membership.

Terry recommended that the Committee start with “baby steps” by choosing a first issue strategically to show strength of organization.

Discussion ensued that indicated that the output/advise from Committee should be neutral, i.e., inform but not advocate or support one person’s position.

Wayne indicated that the output of the committee should be to present the research and industry best-practice on the measurement issues related to the policy, and that would be the best way to mitigate controversy.

Terry suggested that the website be used to present the issue to full membership for comment once it is identified; that such an action would be proactive in diffusing a hot-button issue.

Linda concurred, and recommended that we think through membership reactions and develop a strategy so that there are no surprises.

Wayne cautioned that the landscape changes quickly so the Committee should not spend too much time on strategy.

Sherry reminds us that the white paper (or issue brief, or whatever the Committee produces) must be targeted to a particular audience.

Scott concurs, and cautions that the paper must not be readable and understandable by policy-makers.

Kadriye cautions that the Committee choose not just safe issues to address, but important ones.

The gist of the presentation was that the mission of this committee needed to be better defined, and that the scope of potential work for the committee needed to be limited to a reasonable amount.

**Break for lunch and small-group discussions on membership, NCME mission statement, and the new ad hoc assessment policy. See page 65 of June 2010 Board handout for small-group discussion assignments.**

After lunch, brief updates from the three small-group discussions were provided.

**Kristen: Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment Policy**

Kristen and Scott reported that at the September Board meeting, they will have a mission statement to present to the Board, and will identify a potential policy issue, rationale for that policy issue, and intended first product and suggested approach for addressing the policy issue. See action items #8 and #9 from the June 2010 list.

**Linda: Membership, Recruitment, Outreach and GSIC Committees.**  
***See page 67 – 70 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)***

These Committee representatives focused on ways to ensure collaboration across their functions. The Board approved the requested change to the Recruitment Committee's charge, that is, the

Committee is no longer charged with retaining graduate students in the organization through graduation.

**Michael: Update on NCME Mission, Vision and Goals Statement.**

**See page 66 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)**

This group will edit, format and present the revised mission statement to Board by June 17 for vote/acceptance.

**Chad: Graduate Student Issues Committee**

**See page 72 – 75 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)**

Chad requested that if any Board members have suggestions for the 2011 GSIC-sponsored session, please send them.

**Lee: Membership Committee**

**See page 76 – 83 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)**

Discussion regarding changing the image of the Breakfast, specifically, getting more students there. Phoebe says that she only saw NCME as a meeting not an organization until attending the breakfast. An idea was offered to assign tables that combined graduate students with distinguished members. Also, the President could welcome them during the remarks and ask them to stand for recognition. Plumer noted that he is not satisfied with overall low attendance at breakfast. To further investigate this issue, Lee and Chad will work together to cross-reference member registration with breakfast registration to figure out the percentage of graduate students who attended breakfast. This task will require Lee and Chad to use actual names for matching as breakfast tickets do not track membership status. See action item #10 in June 2010 list.

Additionally, the Board requested that the newsletter publish an article aimed at the benefits of attending the breakfast (see action item #11 in June 2010 list).

Lee then presented the Board the survey the Committee would like to send to previous members whose membership has lapsed. The Board encourages the Committee to move forward pending (a) Board approval of survey; and (b) Board approval of cost. See action items #12 and #14 in the June 2010 list.

During discussion of the survey, a concern emerged about ensuring coordination among communications to membership. The Board requested that the Committee work with Plumer provide a list of all planned communications (see action item #13 from the June 2010 list). The Committee noted that at the last two years of the conference, no ribbons have been provided to members in the 2 – 5 year range. Purchasing ribbons for this group for the 2011 conference was approved by the Board.

**Lora: Recruitment Committee**

*See pages 84 – 102 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

Lora is working with the Committee to finalize the goals and add to the handbook (see action item #15 from June 2010 list).

Lora noted that there had been very little action by the Recruitment Committee in the last few years, and that she had little to no documentation from previous committees. Kristen offered to send Lora committee reports and the recruitment brochure that was developed while she was Recruitment Committee Chair.

Lora offered four proposals to the Board.

Proposal 1: Discussion of free introductory graduate student membership (current is \$30, which is consistent with by-laws).

Three board members voted yes; four Board members voted no.

It was noted that there was inconsistency between the NCME online website for membership versus the .pdf re: graduate student dues and requirements for endorsement. The Rees group can make the corrections, but the Committee must send content. See action item #16 from June 2010 list.

It was suggested that a discussion occur at the Fall Board meeting regarding different issues related to graduate student eligibility, dues, trial membership, etc.

Proposal 2: was approved; three free memberships via raffle will be available at the 2011 conference.

Proposal 3: Board approves in spirit, but implementation needs to be detailed (e.g., changing membership form). See action item #17 from June 2010 list.

Proposal 4: Survey on career paths. The Board noted that it was likely that two different surveys – one to individuals, one to organizations – were needed. It was also noted that the various

surveys needed to be coordinated and streamlined, as there are at least two under consideration: (1) this one from Recruitment Committee; and (2) Linda, Cara, Sandip are considering one regarding the conference. The Board requested many more details on this at the Fall Board meeting (see action item #18 from June 2010 list).

Kris noted that if the survey needs to be linked to membership dB, then that will impact methodology so that matching by hand is avoided. Wayne then suggested that for some of these issues, that a “push” survey may not be needed; rather, just allow members to volunteer information through the website. Terry then suggested that this could be expanded, e.g., add “hot buttons” to website re: “ideas for future meetings,” “ideas for training sessions,” “ideas for awards,” etc. It was decided that Kris and Lora would work together on a web strategy (see action item #19 from June 2010 list).

**Phoebe: Outreach Committee**  
*See Committee Report from June 2010*

The first issue that Phoebe discussed was the annotated bibliographies that were developed and posted to the website. Phoebe asked whose responsibility was it to keep bibliographies updated?

Kris suggests that adding front matter to bibliographies could be helpful to non-NCME members. She asked who is the intended audience for the bibliographies, and questioned why there was no methodology about how articles were included versus excluded. Terry suggests that we solicit feedback on “how useful was this [the bibliographies]?” Terry suggests that we try to track who is using it (not necessarily individuals but organizations).

This discussion indicated the larger issue that although the Outreach Committee needs to post useful resources on NCME website, it begs the questions: For what use? For what audiences? Is Outreach Committee responsible for the content? It was clear that the Outreach Committee needs coordination with Website Committee. Phoebe stresses need for framework, roles, responsibilities.

Kadriye suggests considering a “depository” of information with minimal screening, e.g., articles, reports, free software. NCME Outreach can add disclaimer regarding quality.

Kris indicated that the Website Committee has a group working on process/procedures for uploading content; Kris and Phoebe will touch base on this.

The Board supported the efforts and direction for Outreach Committee as outlined in the report.

The Outreach Committee will develop plan for developing resources for particular audiences (see action item #21 in June 2010 list).

**Kris: Website Committee**

*See June 2010 report to the Board.*

Kris presented an overview of the Website Committee's recommendations for structure. The discussion was to continue the next day as the meeting required adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15pm.

**Thursday, June 17**

**Meeting convened at 8:15 am.**

**Jerry: Finance Committee Report**

*See pages 122 – 146 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

See revisions to **policy on reserves**, pg. 145. Susan Loomis asks what is the "range"? Jerry says that at one time in the past, "year + 20%" was discussed. Susan suggests specific criterion rather than range. Sherry asks if the most expensive year would be a good indicator, if it would ever be over 20%.

Deb **moved** to change the language to "the target (the year's expense) plus 20%" and leave out "range" in all other places.

Kadriye **seconded** the movement.

Wayne called the vote. **Results: all supported, no opposed, and no abstains.**

Jerry will check to see if the same attorney that is reviewing the Board insurance issue can also review the Finance Committee's anti-trust draft (action item #21 in June 2010 list).

Wayne asked if the Finance Committee could review Section 7 in the Handbook. Jerry agreed that the Committee will do so, and also draft guidelines for funds disbursement (e.g., who has authority to authorize funds). Jerry will recommend whether to integrate into Section 7 of Handbook or have as an attachment (action item #22 in June 2010 list).

Jerry indicates that either the standing Finance Committee needs to be expanded or an Ad-hoc Committee needs to be formed to look into foundation idea. Wayne indicates that in SIOP, they found a member who had worked on a similar foundation project by word of mouth. Also, former (current) Deans also have experience with this.

## Discussion: Member Recognition

Wayne initiated a discussion continuation from the previous day regarding what the Board's "philosophy" should be regarding recognition of Committee Chairs, Committee Members, Editors, Students, etc. The following is a list of current practice and ideas:

### Students

- Recognize their involvement in NCME governance (chair, cmte membership)
- Recognize that they don't have same finances as full members
- Idea: Subsidize breakfast
- Related: Do something for ALL Students

Kadriye tries to simplify: Student members should get breakfast discount (e.g., \$10) and students in governance should be treated the same as full members.

Another idea: Reduce student fee to \$10 (or \$5 or free?) for breakfast (change on registration fee) for every year that they are student members.

Another idea: Find any reason whatsoever to give students a free ticket to Breakfast (Linda suggests NCME review the guidelines for graduate students re: AERA Div D lunch).

Michael suggests that we spend our energy selling a "value proposition" to students for the breakfast; maybe developing this value proposition should be developed by GSIC. The GSIC could also come up with new ideas to attract graduate students to the breakfast, such as mentoring tables. Either way, it is important to find out why students do or do not find the breakfast meaningful.

Award Recipients: Do we want to do more? Now, they get printed certificate. All awards have some financial bonus component.

Board Members, Committee Members, Editors, Committee Chairs, and Program Chairs: Most get a printed certificate. Do we want to do more?

Plumer suggests that whatever is done, it should be done at the conference, so that expenses are consolidated at the conference.

Deb reminds us that volunteering is in and of itself its own reward. Plumer says research supports this.

Wayne asks how is the cumulative list of volunteers is being used? Also indicates that it is out-of-date, and it doesn't show who was selected already. The volunteer list takes an extra step to identify student members. Opportunity to volunteer should be made available at multiple times and places (multiple channels).

Sherry suggests that a computer is made available at the membership booth and breakfast for member sign-up, volunteer, etc.

Kadriye suggests that Membership Committee send out a couple of emails a year remind folks to volunteer.

Wayne cautions that we need to update the membership database before any real analysis can be done; suggests that the dB is purged and we start over. This is a project to create infrastructure.

Terry indicates that right now the membership dB does not capture the committees/roles people have served on previously/currently.

Plumer emphasizes that engaging members is critical for longevity and growth, and that having a database that tracks committee membership is critical for tracking this.

Terry asks is the Membership Committee should take these issues on for analysis and make a recommendation?

Kris suggests a change to the membership survey on the web.

Cara suggests that we find out what folks would want, e.g., Program Chairs may want more, whereas Committee members may be satisfied as-is.

Linda suggests an **ad hoc** group that works on these two separate issues, but needs to be worked on together: (1) fix the process (defining multiple channels) and dB (try to leverage committee roster reports?); (2) membership recognition. See action items #24 and #25 from June 2010 list.

**Kris: Website**

*See June 2010 report to the Board.*

A concern was voiced regarding Kris' proposal for an advisory/editorial board as it would create more work for Committee Chairs. However, Kris says that the Content Editor supports the Chair. It could, however, add work to the Committee members. Once content is posted to the website, the Committee that posted it still "owns" it and is responsible for keeping it up to date. This may limit the scope of what committees can do once they take on this responsibility for their content.

Terry reacts to Kris' suggestion for a "call" for a website editor, and says that it is more effective to talk to people and find out who would do a good job, and talking to folks. Terry cautions to not wait for nominations; but be more pro-active.

The job description for a website Content Editor was reviewed by Board.

Michael **moved** that Board approves the proposed structure for website governance, that is: position of Website Content Editor; creation of the Advisory Board and the creation of the Editorial Board. *Note: This is the preliminary step of the development of the overall plan; the Board will receive update on the plan at each Board meeting.*

Sherry **seconded** the motion.

Wayne called the vote. **Results: All supported; no objections; no abstains.**

### **Michael and Terry: Discussion on NCME Mission, Vision and Goals**

Terry **moved** to endorse as current mission, vision and goals in spirit that this is living, dynamic document.

Michael **seconded** the motion.

Wayne called the vote. **Results: All supported; no objections; no abstains.**

### **Cara & Sandip: 2011 Program**

Cara and Sandip presented some changes they made to the Program and submissions process. For example, they are waiting to identify invited sessions until October when they see which sessions are submitted. They reduced the number of key words from 98 to 38; they changed some topics but still have 20 in total. They are also exploring different, new session formats: they are considering having Joanna and Andre (Program Chairs for 2012) suggest the top three new (for NCME) session formats they would like to try out, and in 2011 have one invited session with each kind and then issue survey to inform Joanna and Andre.

The theme this year is innovation. Cara and Sandip will aim to accept papers in proportion to the number per topic submitted.

NCME will co-host a reception w/ AERA-D again this year with a New Orleans theme.

Cara and Sandip are considering an invited session for awardees from previous year, and ask the Board to support a trial year to evaluate attendance and success. All Board members voiced support. See action item #37 from June 2010 list.

**Amy: Training Session**

*See pages 147 – 157 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

Amy indicated that her Committee needs direction from Board on two issues:

**(1) Scope and purpose of webcast sessions. International? State Departments? How many sessions?**

Terry indicated that in 2010, there were approximately 314 individual computers that accessed distinct sessions.

Terry suggests that we query international “groups” about topics of interest to them.

Terry brings up an issue: If permit webcast for free to people in the US, is that fair to people who attend and pay for conference? Terry recommends that we provide this service for free only to “third-world” countries. If a group wants to tackle this as a money-making issue, let them; but for him, it is about reaching people outside of the country and cannot afford to come. So, this is a service that NCME is providing. Plumer supports this.

Deb mentions: What about opening this to grad students who can’t afford to attend the conference? Terry says potential is limitless but let’s start small.

Wayne also likes idea of restricting to international.

Amy mentions one complaint from webcast attendees: They did not receive handout materials.

Plumer notes that there was not enough discussion about impact of instructional design on webcasts. E.g., what if there had been small group break-outs? That’s the next evolution of this idea. Plumer notes another goal of the 2010 pilot was information-gathering so that NCME can think about our vision for this, say, five years from now.

Michael, Luz and Terry are “leads” on webcast coordination.

Michael suggests that some thought is given to locations to target, and send an inquiry to them about topics. He notes that it happened so quickly in 2010 that they didn’t have time to think strategically about a framework for selecting sites.

**(2) Conduct training sessions outside of annual conference?**

Amy asks: Is this an initiative for generating revenue?

**Break for lunch.**

**Mark: Publications Cmte**

*See pages 103 – 121 (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

Terry **moves** that NCME provides funds to support all editors, including Website Content Editor, up to a maximum of \$10K per year. These funds can be used for editors' stipend, teaching release, secretarial, editorial, and/or clerical assistance, subject to approval by the Board. Payment of indirect costs (overhead) to institutions is not permitted. NCME Editors should also attempt to receive some support from their respective institution during their terms.

Deb **seconded**.

Wayne called the vote. **Results: all support; no objections; no abstains.**

Kadriye suggested that Newsletter Editor gets some sort of stipend. Wayne will talk with Thanos. See action item #27 from June 2010 list.

**Mark, Jackie and Greg: NCME Book Series Ad hoc Cmte**

The ad hoc Committee indicated that what they have drafted is a recommended set of procedures but not recommendations. An updated draft will be shared with Wayne immediately (see action item #28 from June 2010 list).

It was discussed that the primary purpose of the book series would be to generate income for NCME, and also some royalties for those involved (like the author).

Kadriye recommends consideration of e-book dissemination.

Kadriye asks: Have we considered NCME publishing the book versus going through a publisher?

The ad hoc committee will resume discussion at the Fall Board meeting (see action item #29 in June 2010 action items list).

**Susan: Update on issue re: journal contract renewal with Blackwell**

Terry recommends that an RFI is developed and released by end of calendar year. Indicates that releasing RFI does not reflect poorly on Wiley/Blackwell, but rather is due diligence on behalf of NCME. Plumer has already informed Wiley/Blackwell that NCME will be releasing a RFI. Plumer has template for RFI. Action items include: compiling a list of publishers to receive the RFI, and developing a process to evaluate the proposals. Plumer suggests that we re-conceptualize the publisher from a "vendor" to more of a strategic partnership with joint outcomes. See action items #30, #31, and #32 from June 2010 list.

Terry indicates that the issue is that we don't have a way to really understand if we are getting a good deal from Blackwell. Terry indicates that there are a wealth of services from Blackwell of which NCME is not taking advantage.

Critical decision from responses to RFIs: Is it worthwhile to do a competitive bid, or should we just stay with Blackwell?

**Greg Cizek: Standards Committee**

*See pages 158 – 161. (page numbers refer to the packet created for the June 2010 Board meeting)*

On behalf of the committee, Greg made four recommendations; see Committee report for elaboration on recommendations. The first two required votes from the Board.

**Recommendation 1:** Move from Ad Hoc to Standing

Michael **moved** to transfer the Committee from Ad Hoc to Standing.

Kadriye **seconded**.

Wayne called the vote. **Results: All in favor; no objections; no abstains.**

**Recommendation 2:** Increase student membership to two years.

Sherry moved to increase the student membership to two years.

Linda seconded the movement.

Wayne called the motion to a vote. **Results: All in favor; no nays; no abstains.**

**Recommendation 3:** Clarify role of Committee versus NCME liaison to Standards Committee.

A related need was also identified; that is, NCME needs a process for the organization to review and comment on the developing Standards. See action items #33, #34, and #35 from action items list.

**Recommendation 4:** Expand mission and charge to committee. For example, the ABCs; the Code; the Standards for Professionals; etc. could all use dusting off and updating. See action item #35 from June 2010 list.

The meeting adjourned with attendees who were able to stay dividing into two break-out discussion groups: One on the program and a second on finance issues.