

NCME Board Meeting

October 26-28, 2011

College Board Offices, Washington, DC

Wednesday, October 26, 2011

In attendance:

Dr. Linda Cook, President

Dr. Wayne Camara, Past President (Wednesday)

Dr. Gregory Cizek, Vice President

Dr. Sherry Rose-Bond, Board Member

Dr. James Wollack, Board Member

Dr. Deborah Harris, Board Member (Wednesday, Thursday)

Dr. Joseph Martineau, Board Member (Wednesday, Friday)

Dr. Anne Fitzpatrick, Chair of Budget & Finance Committee

Dr. Kris Waltman, Chair of Website Committee

Dr. Neal Kingston, Chair of 75th Anniversary Committee (Wednesday)

Dr. Andre Rupp, Program Co-Chair (Wednesday, Thursday)

Dr. Krista Breithaupt, Publications Committee incoming chair (via phone, Wednesday)

Dr. Steven Ferrara, Liaison to the Joint Committee on Revising the Standards (via phone Wednesday)

Dr. Amy Hendrickson, Webinar Committee (via phone, Thursday)

Dr. Terry Ackerman, Webinar Committee (via phone, Thursday)

Chad Gotch, Graduate Student Issues Committee Chair (Thursday, Friday)

Gretchen Anderson, 75th Anniversary Committee (via phone, Thursday)

Dr. Heather Buzick, Training Program Chair (via phone, Thursday)

Dr. Kristen Huff, Committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice (Thursday)

Dr. Mark Gierl, Publications Committee Chair (via phone, Friday)

Dr. Min Lee, Membership Committee Chair (via phone, Friday)

Plumer Lovelace, Executive Director

Dr. Jennifer Kobrin, Recording Secretary

Not present:

Dr. Bruno Zumbo, Board Member

Dr. Michael Rodriguez, Board Member

Linda Cook called the meeting to order at 8:58 a.m.

Linda thanked the Board for the time they take for NCME and reviewed the agenda for the day.

Deborah Harris asked that the minutes reflect the Board's condolences for the death of Dr. Leonard Feldt. Linda suggested sending a card to the family on behalf of the NCME Board. Deborah and Linda will work on a statement.

Jennifer Kobrin asked for changes to the July Board meeting minutes. Linda noted a change on page 6, and Jim Wollack noted that the titles for the attendees (Dr.) should be made consistent. Jennifer changed the minutes to reflect these changes.

Deborah Harris made a motion to approve the minutes. Sherry Rose-Bond seconded the motion. All Board members present voted in favor of accepting the minutes.

Jennifer Kobrin reviewed the action items from the Board meeting held in July 2011. There was discussion with regard to the action item of sending free copies of EM:IP to state/district representatives. The discussion included whether or not to send a personalized letter to accompany the journal, and who would be responsible for sending out the letter. Wayne Camara will compile the list of individuals to whom to send the journal. For the first issue after the list is compiled, we will ask Blackwell to send the copies to TRG and have central office repackage with the letter. For future issues, Blackwell can send the journals directly to the identified recipients. Gregory Cizek suggested checking the NCME database to determine how many assessment directors are already members of NCME. Linda suggested sending out a questionnaire with the first journal to find out what articles/topics they would be interested in. Sherry suggested putting a sticker on the journal so whoever ends up with the journal knows the purpose of the outreach. Anne mentioned that Chad Buckendahl conducted a survey of state testing directors when he was chair of the outreach committee.

ACTION ITEM: Linda will ask the Outreach committee to develop a plan for sending out free issues of EM:IP. Joseph Martineau should be part of this conversation.

There was discussion about the focus of EM:IP in that many believe that this journal should be more applied. This needs to be discussed with the publications committee.

There was discussion of the appropriate place for publishing news of the passing of Leonard Feldt. It was decided that the NCME newsletter is the appropriate place to publish such news, and EM:IP publishes obituaries.

ACTION ITEM: Deborah and Kris will determine who will write the obituary. Jennifer will add policy of including an obituary in the newsletter in the Handbook.

75th Anniversary Committee Report

Neal Kingston presented the report from the 75th Anniversary committee. The committee has begun collecting video interviews of distinguished senior members and new members, and Neal showed examples of the videos. Kris would like the videos of the new members also sent to John Willse for posting on the NCME website. Neal would like to continue collecting the videos at the 2011 annual meeting even though there are no concrete plans for what to do with them. There was some discussion on whether to recruit a student to edit the videos, but some felt that the quality of student work could not be guaranteed. Linda would like to see the videos available on the website after the 2013 meeting. Plumer recommended getting a cost estimate from a production company. Linda noted that there may be people at ETS who can do this, and also wants to make sure that the archive group (which has not been formed yet) has the collection of video material as part of its charge.

ACTION ITEM: In January, 75th anniversary committee will come back with plan, timeline and budget for producing a tape that will be shown at the anniversary meeting and put permanently on the website.

The Board discussed whether or not to put out a call to NCME members to ask for volunteers to submit their own videos for inclusion in the collection. Linda expressed hesitation because it will be work to keep track and review these, and the formatting of the videos will be an issue. It would also be important to get consent for any person involved. Greg suggested having some Asian members on the video who can include comments in their native language.

Neal indicated that the budget for the Gala is in question because we don't know the city the meeting will be held in. The call for Rock and Research bands should be sent out shortly before the 2012 meeting.

Linda provided an update to the Board on the location of the 2013 meeting. Due to the new immigration law in Georgia, AERA is considering not holding the meeting in Atlanta. The council is meeting over the upcoming weekend and will vote. The two alternatives under consideration are Baltimore and San Francisco, however if in San Francisco, the meeting will be held at the end of April/beginning of May.

Blackwell Contract

Wayne presented an update on the Blackwell contract. The contract was signed on Aug. 24th, and it is very similar to the previous contract. One new aspect of the contract is providing electronic access to journals. For every member of NCME, we pay \$20 per member, per volume. That \$20 drops to \$10 per member for those electing to receive the journal online only. We can estimate 20-30% of members will elect online subscriptions. Wayne asked the Board to consider how we want to approach this. Anne suggested leaving the issue open. If finances are tight, it would be clearer what to do. This may be an issue to delegate to the Publications committee.

Joseph Martineau joined the meeting at 11:00 a.m. Linda welcomed Joseph and thanked him for joining the Board after the departure of Mary Pommerich.

Edited Book Series

Wayne provided an update on the edited book series. He indicated that the contract has been signed and the editorial advisory committee will work with editors and the publisher to determine topics for the books. The books will focus on issues related to the application of assessment. The idea is to publish one book per year. Royalties will be 10%, 12%, and 15% based on sales. The books will be available in both hard and soft cover.

Linda noted that the contracts will be posted on BaseCamp under the Board of Directors project, but these are confidential. Linda thanked Wayne for leading the Wiley contract and edited book series contract.

President's Strategic Plan Update

Linda provided an update on the 2011/12 initiatives, which are to:

- Revisit the NCME strategic plan;
- Develop a financial plan for NCME;
- Form an NCME foundation;
- Finalize contracts with TRG and Wiley/Blackwell;
- Finalize plans for NCME Edited Book series;
- Improve committee processes including developing committee volunteer software – NCME members have used the software, and the next step is to get the piece of software in place for committee chairs to use. Lora Monfils is working on this initiative with Linda. Chairs will each have a list of volunteers for their committees.
- Introduce improvements to the Annual Meeting Program;
- Plan 75th Anniversary Celebration;
- Design and Execute membership campaign in conjunction with 75th anniversary – This has not gotten off the ground yet. This will be charge of the recruitment committee;
- Re-vamp website;
- Build new search engine for NCME database;
- Develop opportunities for outreach and partnerships with other related organizations;
- Develop strategies for informing assessment policy and practice;

- Increase mentoring for graduate students and early career scholars – we have not gone anywhere with this initiative yet. We have good mentorship of graduate students but not for early career scholars. This is a goal of the membership committee;
- Increase international participation in NCME – this has not gone anywhere. This needs to be assigned to a committee. The outreach committee already has a lot of their plate. Perhaps create an ad hoc committee to take this on; and
- Develop uses of technology to support outreach and training – this is being carried out through the webinar work that Terry Ackerman and Amy Hendrickson are leading.

Linda asked for a motion to form an ad hoc committee to address international participation in NCME. The charge of the committee would be to find ways to increase international participation and whether a special committee is necessary to do that or should be the charge of one of the existing committees. Greg suggested that the chairs or members of the Membership, Outreach, and Recruitment, and GSIC committees be the ones to decide which committee should lead this initiative, or how the committees can work together. The cross-committee should be charged with brainstorming ideas for increasing international membership and participation and come back to the Board.

ACTION ITEM: Jim, Greg, Sherry, and Chad will put together a group to think about ways to increase participation by international members. Linda requested something to review in January.

Wayne noted that it is important not only to generate ideas to help international members, but ideas that will also benefit NCME such as increasing our membership, and increasing their volunteer work for NCME.

Linda shared that NCME has not revisited their strategic plan since 2007. This is an extensive process that will cost about \$10,000 for the whole planning process. The process needs to start before a new President is elected. The new executive committee (Linda, Greg, and new Vice President) should sit down and determine whether the strategic planning be included in the 2012-13 budget. Linda asked the Board whether they felt that this is an important initiative.

Deborah said that she thinks it is important but is leery about giving too much power to the Board that is in place when the strategic planning takes place. Linda clarified that data would be collected from people outside of the Board. The strategic planning process should be institutionalized (and put in the handbook) so that it occurs every 3 years or so. Greg voiced concern that a strategic plan may be too binding on future Boards so that they may not be able to pursue their own goals. Anne noted that a strategic plan guides decision making and focus whether or not finances are involved; and the goals of a strategic plan are usually broad so that many things could be encompassed, so it doesn't have to be constraining. The value is that it establishes a perspective so that it provides some focus for making decisions.

Greg asked what kind of questions would be addressed in the strategic plan and noted that he would endorse a clearer concept of what the strategic plan would yield. Linda thought that it would be important for the Board to review the 2007 plan to determine how useful it was. Plumer noted that the

organization is in very good shape so now is the time to have these conversations when we can have them in a thoughtful way.

Linda stated that she would like to see a planning process that is institutionalized, but she is not vetted to having an outside consultant/formal facilitator. We need someone responsible for planning and to bring that plan to the Board. Wayne noted that another model is to have a subset of people to discuss long-range planning as a dedicated task. The implementation of initiatives is sometimes lacking, so this would be one of the goals of a strategic plan.

Linda asked the Board whether they are satisfied with the planning process as it exists now, and if not, whether a group should be charged to review the planning process and come back to the Board with a suggestion. Linda suggested tabling the discussion and finding time somewhere else in the agenda to determine how to move forward with this.

Vice President's Update

Greg provided the Vice President's update. He has been involved in the Gala planning, and has been working with Anne on budget and finance. He is in discussion with U.S. Dept. of Education (USDE) regarding providing assistance by providing model policies and procedures that they can adopt or recommend to states. The committee on assessment policy and practice will also be involved. He would like NCME to become more involved with the USDE so that they contact NCME when they have assessment questions and issues. An upcoming initiative on test integrity may open the door for this partnership.

Greg provided an update on planning for the 2013 annual meeting. Leslie Keng and Ye Tong and Elaine Rodeck and Kimberly O'Malley are planning for the 2013 meeting. They are formulating several ideas including featured debates, opportunities for graduate students to be more involved; and themes.

Joseph Martineau asked Greg to elaborate on how we would collaborate with the USDE. The committee on informing assessment policy and practice could identify people who could respond quickly to issues and questions from the USDE. Joseph had concerns that the people doing the best work in a certain area may not be able to respond at a moment's notice. Greg clarified that this initiative would involve connecting the USDE with NCME members with expertise. These members should also have knowledge of policies, constraints, and what is realistic. Joseph suggested that we also reach out to the states because they are the ones who have to implement the policy. Greg believes that this is very ambitious. Greg clarified that he prefers not to publicly call the goal to influence policy; it would be seen as a resource. Kris noted that the website will include a way to identify members by state who could be a resource.

Executive Director's Update

Plumer provided an update on TRG and reported on recent staff changes. Drew Nelesen will leave TRG on Oct. 28. Plumer assured the Board that the planning of the 2012 annual meeting is moving forward. The owner of TRG is looking at revamping the software tools used for finance. Another organization

(Goetz & Associates) will provide staff for the NCME conference. Drew's supervisor (Jane) may take on NCME.

Plumer reported that there will not be any financial obligations for NCME associated with the potential change of location of the 2013 meeting. Leslie Lukin contacted Plumer regarding the fire in Lincoln, NE. NCME will provide journals to Leslie to replace those lost in the fire.

Plumer reminded the Board that all NCME contracts will be moved into BaseCamp. All of the organization's policies are there as well as reimbursement forms. There are many capabilities in BaseCamp that can help NCME do its work. An orientation package for new committee chairs will be developed.

Last year, there was an issue where a vendor claimed that a product was endorsed by NCME. Plumer believes that NCME's endorsement policy should be made available for these situations. Anne noted that the policy is included in the handbook, and perhaps it should be reviewed by our attorney.

Andre Rupp, Program Co-Chair, joined the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

Linda asked to re-arrange the agenda and asked Kris to provide her report on the website committee.

Website Update

Kris Waltman presented the report of the Website committee. Kris described the results of a survey conducted by the outreach committee several years ago (2008 or 2009) on information that would be useful for other educational organizations. The outreach committee developed two annotated bibliographies on the topics that were identified. The outreach committee has no plans to update these. Andre suggested that a white paper would be more useful.

At present, there is no new content for the website. The committees were charged with developing this content. The website committee took the ITEMS modules and categorized them for different audiences. There will be a glossary (for general public) that will be posted. This is the only new content.

Linda noted that only two committees have activities related to the website in their goals (Membership and Diversity). The committees are expected to provide new content and update content continually. Unless we get the website goals into the committee's reports, this will not happen.

<p>ACTION ITEM: Board liaisons make sure that committees include goals for generating and updating website content. An update should be included in their next report to the Board. Board liaisons are to ascertain plans and identify obstacles.</p>
--

Linda wondered why the website content is not being generated by committees. Do they not have time, and/or do they need more volunteers? Linda has many volunteers that would be able to work on these tasks. Kris provided ideas for the content to be generated by each committee in her report.

Perhaps the committees need to be given a deadline and reminded of that deadline. The Website Advisory Board is supposed to be comprised of chairs (or a designee) from each committee. Kris is not

sure whether this Board has been active. The hope is that committee members/chairs will eventually have direct access to the website and make changes to the website, which will then be reviewed by John Willse.

Kris would like to see information about the Standards put on the website. The Standards committee should be responsible for determining what information is posted on the website.

ACTION ITEM: Joseph to connect with Standards committee and ask them to develop plan for posting information about revision of the Standards on the website.

Sherry asked if the committees write something for the website, is there an approval process? Kris indicated that the content editor will make the decision. If there is measurement content that needs to be reviewed, the website advisory board will do so.

Linda asked Kris to continue her report later in the afternoon to accommodate committee chairs who were calling in to the meeting.

Appointment of ITEMS Editor

Krista Breithaupt joined the meeting by phone at 2:45 p.m. The Publications committee put out a call for ITEMS editor. Linda ranked ordered the nominees based on background in technical expertise and noted that all three were strong candidates. Deborah indicated that it is important to have someone who is going to go out and actively solicit ideas for the modules. This is more important than psychometric background.

Linda made a motion that the Board accept her ranking of the two candidates for ITEMS editor. One candidate was not considered because it was not clear that he is an NCME member. Sherry seconded the motion. All Board members that were present voted in favor of offering the position to the candidate ranked first.

ACTION ITEM: Linda will contact the selected candidate to offer him the position. If he declines, she will contact the second ranked candidate.

Joint Standards Update

Steve Ferrara joined the meeting by phone at 3:00 p.m. and provided an update on the committee to revise the *Standards*. The work of the committee has been very positive. Most of the substantive issues have been worked out and now there are some political issues to work on. There have been thousands of comments from the public review. The next version will undergo review in the coming months by NCME, AERA, and APA.

Linda added that it is astounding how many comments were received. All comments were considered and many changes were made based on those comments.

The Standards and Test Use committee put together a process for NCME to review the Standards and the committee will conduct the review and make a recommendation to the Board next fall.

Greg asked Steve for clarification of the political issues. Are these related to endorsement by the 3 organizations? Steve confirmed this. There are a large number of APA committees that will review and approve the standards before the organizations will endorse them. Greg asked whether there are any issues that may be an issue for NCME. Steve thought the chapter on fairness which now combines all groups (English language learners, individuals with disabilities, and ethnic minority groups) into one chapter may be of concern to individuals/groups concerned with specific stakeholder groups (but this is not necessarily a direct concern for NCME. There was some discussion about the levels of endorsement and clarification that the highest level of endorsement can be Level 2 because Level 3 requires that the material be developed by NCME.

Continuation of Website update

Linda asked Kris to continue her report on the Website committee. Kris emphasized that the website should be used as a vehicle by committees to further their work. She would like to feature photographs of award winners on the website, but cannot use the photographs taken at the breakfast because these also include the award presenters. She also requested professional photos of Board of Directors Plumer noted that individuals submit photographs when they are up for election, so these can be sent directly to the website. A short blurb about each Board member can be taken from candidate bios when they are up for election.

The website committee is replacing the Listserv with a discussion forum, and will ask the GSIC to identify a member to moderate the forum. Michael Finger (one of the website committee members) will be asked to moderate a particular theme. It will take a lot of time to get it started, so this may not happen by December.

Andre asked whether it would be appropriate to keep the Listserv for announcements and have the discussion forum for discussion. Plumer indicated that the university that originally maintained it transferred it to TRG, and there is no technical or financial support right now for the Listserv. Deborah felt that it is important to have a mechanism to send out announcements (e.g., jobs) to members that does not require them to go to the website.

The discussion forum would be only available for members, while the Listserv may have non-members. So, transferring this to members-only may boost membership.

There was discussion of putting conference papers on the website like AERA does. Kris felt that NCME is a long way from making that decision. It would be possible to allow members to post documents in the members-only section of the website, but there are a lot of issues to work out, such as screening of documents. Kris thought the Membership committee may take this on. Kris felt that the public part of the website can have a different level of review of materials/content than the members-only section.

Jim noted that there may be other issues regarding posting of papers on the website (whether this would be considered a publication) and that the Publications committee should also be involved in the planning.

Kris told the Board that this is not in the current plans for the website, but can be added at a later date. She prefers to have this as a member-only benefit.

ACTION ITEM: Andre and Joanna to write up a proposal for posting conference papers and present to the Board.

The Board discussed the idea of posting NCME members' CV's on the website. There was support but Greg noted that he wants more discussion about how these will be searchable. Linda noted that CV's get out of date quickly. Kris thought that posting CV's could be part of the annual membership renewal process.

ACTION ITEM: The Website committee will pursue plans for posting of CV's and return recommendations to the Board.

Kris noted that it is not likely that the website will be ready for launch by December. Kris provided an update on the T-shirt design contest to promote the website. Last week, Kris received an email message indicating that the fitness walk/run chairs want to have a t-shirt design contest as well. Kris would like to suggest that there be one contest for both purposes. There are plans to post information on the 75th anniversary but no clear plans what that will look like. The software database that is currently maintained by Gary Skaggs will be moved over to the NCME website.

Need for Systemic and Comprehensive Approach to Data Collection and Utilization

Kris presented a report with a proposal for a system for collecting and using information about members. There is currently no systematic way of obtaining and using member information. Kris asked the Board to think about what information we want from the members and how it will be used, and to develop policies and procedures related to information use. Kris described several areas where it would be beneficial to collect information from members and potential uses of that information by NCME committees, Board, and membership. Any data collection would have to be voluntary and would have to have a benefit for members. Kris will volunteer to create a proposal but requests working with a Board member. Jim volunteered to help with this initiative.

ACTION ITEM: By the April 2012 Board meeting, Kris and Jim will develop a proposal outlining policies and procedures with any budget implications. The proposal would outline the policies and procedures for evaluating requests for collecting information from members, how it would be collected, stored, accessed.

Linda adjourned meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Thursday, October 27, 2011

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

The Board made a statement regarding the passing of Dr. Leonard Feldt:

The Board of Directors of the National Council on Measurement in Education is greatly saddened by the passing of Professor Leonard Feldt. Professor Feldt will be remembered for his outstanding contributions to both the theory and practice of educational measurement. As director of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development, Professor Feldt created standardized achievement testing programs that have been used as models of best testing practice both nationally and internationally. Among Professor Feldt's many contributions was his leadership on the AERA, APA, NCME Joint Committee to Revise the 1999 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. NCME recognized his many contributions to the educational measurement field in 1994 when he was awarded the NCME Career Award. Perhaps Professor Feldt's most significant achievement was his education and mentoring of the next generation of leaders in the field of educational measurement.

A formal obituary will be written for the NCME newsletter.

Wayne announced the candidates for the next election slate. For the BOD: Randy Penfield and Susan Brookhart, and Dale Whittington and Haufang Zhou. The slate for Vice President is still being finalized.

Update on Sponsorships

Wayne provided an update on NCME sponsorships. To date we have received \$22,000, and we are awaiting an additional \$16,000, giving a total estimated revenue of \$40,000.

Linda noted that some of the contacts may not be the right person. Wayne asked to Board to try to pursue receiving payment from any organizations with which they have contacts. Greg agreed to send emails to follow-up with DRC, Questar, and Castle. Jim will contact NCBE.

Anne will record this sponsorship income on the 2012 income statement. Sponsorship requests for the 2013 meeting should be sent out in August. Wayne thought that eventually the task of obtaining sponsorships may go to the Budget and Finance Committee. Linda believes the President should be involved. If we get a foundation set up, a development committee could take this role.

Kristen Huff joined the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Webinar Update

Amy Hendrickson and Terry Ackerman joined the meeting by phone at 9:30 a.m.

Amy discussed the webcasts that are planned for the 2012 meeting. The plans are to webcast four 4-hour sessions. In order not to conflict with a plenary session and NCME breakfast, they are splitting up the days of the webcast. Two will be on Friday, and two will be on Monday. \$12,500 is budgeted, but may go up to \$12,800 because the tech from Sonic Foundry will remain onsite on the days that webcasts are not scheduled. Linda indicated that the techs may be used for other tasks, such as filming videos for the 75th anniversary. The webinar committee got cost estimates for offering training sessions on

demand via the web. Sonic Foundry suggested doing a 3-month trial where they would host sessions that have already been recorded. The editing would cost about \$1200, and the cost is \$717 for hosting the sessions for 3 months. Cost estimates were also provided for implementing long-term.

Sherry asked how the committee would evaluate the success of the trial. Amy replied that an evaluation survey would be developed, and the committee will keep track/monitor how many people are accessing the sessions. Marketing and advertisement of the sessions will be needed. Sherry asked about the proposed pricing structure. Terry felt this would be a better discussion for the Board. Kristen added that the sessions would be ideal for individuals/early career scholars who are not able to attend the conference. Amy said that the committee were thinking that the sessions would be free for international members, but there would be some fee for all others. Linda noted that we have to make sure that we don't lose money. Deborah suggested that testing companies could be asked to sponsor the webcasts. Sherry suggested that the committee should keep track not only how many times it was shown, but how many people attended. Andre suggested checking to make sure there aren't training videos on the web for free (YouTube) in similar areas.

The webinar committee is requesting an additional \$5,000. This would put the budget in the negative. Anne suggested keeping the budget number the same and determining if we can raise funds to cover additional costs. The committee should also pursue trying to schedule the webinars on adjacent days, or getting a commitment from Sonic Foundry for a local tech.

ACTION ITEM: Plumer, Amy, and Terry to negotiate with Sonic Foundry to get the cost estimate down. Amy will determine feasibility of filming webinars on adjacent days to avoid costs of keeping the tech onsite for four days. Get a reduced budget number to Anne by November 11.

ACTION ITEM: Deborah will talk to ACT and Linda will talk to ETS about the possibility of sponsoring webcasts. Amy will send topics and names of presenters.

It may be necessary to reduce the number of webinars. Amy expects the estimate for the trial to go down – the amount for editing will likely be reduced.

Kris asked whether access to the webinar would be through Sonic Foundry or the NCME website. Amy thought that there would be a link through the NCME website but Sonic Foundry would host the videos. The Website management committee should be involved when the webinars are ready to be posted.

Awards Area Update

Deborah Harris provided the report on behalf of the awards committees. The main issue for all 6 awards is getting enough applicants. Deborah asked the Board whether they have encouraged others to apply or nominate others. Deborah offered to screen applicants to make sure they meet qualifications. The Millman award committee is struggling to get nominations – there is a similar award for early career scholars in AERA Division D. It takes a lot of work to nominate individuals for awards, so it is necessary to push people. Andre suggested that it can be the committee chair's job to make sure their committee members get nominations. Next year, the deadline for accepting nominations will be standardized.

Kris added that the website will eventually have the capability for nominating members for awards. If CV's are eventually posted to the website, they could also be used for identifying individuals for awards. Deborah suggested having an award overview section of the website, rather than separate pages for each award. There will be a session again this year at the annual meeting highlighting the previous year's award winners.

Deborah brought to the Board's attention that a Brenda Loyd Award committee member wanted to nominate a student for the award, and it was not clear whether this member should remove himself from the committee. An individual can still participate in the committee but must recuse him/herself from the voting that year. The process is not documented and should be included in the handbook.

ACTION ITEM: Deborah will write up policy for inclusion in the handbook.

There was additional discussion about award nominations for both NCME and AERA. It is clear in the call for awards that an individual cannot apply to a similar award in AERA. The chairs of the committees in both organizations should try to communicate about nominees to make sure there is no overlap. Kris thought it is worth checking the call for AERA awards to make sure there is similar wording.

The Board recognized the hard work of the award committees.

Professional Area Update

Sherry and Jim presented the reports from the Recruitment, Outreach, and Diversity committees. All three committees are struggling with their identity and what the Board is looking for them to do.

The Board can give the committees charges, but the committees need to be involved in determining how to carry out those charges. The liaisons need to be involved with the committees. The website can take a role and should be part of the discussion. Liaisons should remind committee chairs that the diversity committee is available as a resource.

ACTION ITEM: Board liaisons will develop charges for their committees and bring them to the January Board meeting. The charge focuses the committee more than the descriptions in the handbook.

ACTION ITEM: Notify Diversity committee that they should proceed to produce a report on the diversity of NCME membership and governance.

ACTION ITEM: Plumer noted that revision of all NCME brochures is needed (recruitment and membership), and review of content. Plumer will send copies to liaisons.

Update from Committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice

Kristen Huff provided an update from the Committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice. Joseph Martineau will be the new Board liaison along with Michael Rodriguez. There is one member vacancy, which will remain open until the next round of committee appointments.

The committee secured commitments from participants for the 2012 session on test score use in educator evaluation. The committee will put together a conference call and develop a set of questions for participants prior to the session.

Kristen indicated that the synthesis paper based on last year's symposium has not made much progress due to bandwidth issues (lack of time) on the part of the committee chairs. The committee is concerned that the content becomes outdated quickly. The Board suggested changing the goal from creating a synthesis paper to creating introductory notes, or policy points. There is a PowerPoint that was used at CCSSO. This can be modified to stand alone. The committee can send out emails with links to policy makers and targeted organizations, and can also provide names of NCME members who can be resources on given topics.

ACTION ITEM: Kristen will take suggestions back to her committee and come up with a proposal or decision for final product; have conversations with website committee for potential formats.

A new project on test integrity for K-12 accountability testing was assigned by Greg Cizek. A small ad hoc committee will be formed to draft a model policy for the USDE. Suggested committee members were discussed. The committee on informing assessment policy and practice and the committee on standards and test use will review the policy. Greg would like this initiative to move as soon as possible. The product cannot exceed two pages, and will be focused on how to define test integrity, what are the key activities to be in place, routine analyses for anomalies, and why this is critical. Iowa testing program has guidelines that will be useful. Our policy cannot look too similar to other policies.

ACTION ITEM: Kristen and Sherry will share what they have and put a draft together for the committee to review. Greg will reach out to potential committee members. Kristen will schedule a conference call.

The Board expressed appreciation to the committee for all of the work they have been doing.

NCME Archives

Linda provided an update on the development of NCME archives. Gretchen Anderson joined the meeting by phone at 12:30 p.m. An ad hoc committee was formed to pursue development of NCME archives. The committee includes Gretchen Anderson, Barbara Plake, Linda Cook, and Plumer Lovelace. The purpose of the archive is to permanently hold information that is of historical interest, and to preserve and maintain a history of the organization.

The committee considered three different ways of establishing archives:

- 1) Physical archive at the Center for History of Psychology, housed at the University of Akron. They store physical documents and objects. The cost is \$1/member/year which would be around \$2,000/year.
- 2) PsycEXTRA, a completely digital archive and all materials are available online. Cost would be approx. \$6,000/year (subscription fee).

3) NCME Website, which could store historical documents and information. There is no process for preserving the content for future accessibility and interpretability. This option has a number of weaknesses. NCME would need to find someplace to store physical materials, and these materials would need to be indexed.

Linda asked the Board whether they supported pursuing the establishment of NCME archives. There will be costs associated with this initiative, and there will need to be a volunteer position to identify materials that will be archived and to deliver these materials to the archival entity. The committee that is currently looking at this is considering appointing an ad hoc committee to pursue one or more alternatives. The ad hoc committee could explore additional options not already considered.

Anne asked what material would be identified for archiving. Gretchen indicated that the archive could include NCME charters, presidential addresses, interviews with past and current members, artifacts generated through the conference that are not published in journals, conference programs, Board minutes, photographs from the conference, and lists/profiles of award winners. Digital archives are expensive to maintain – there needs to be a systemized retrieval system and a system for making updates.

Deborah noted that is necessary to determine how the archive would be used, and how often it would be used. Kris noted that the website will already have previous Board minutes and other documents posted on an ongoing basis.

The Board discussed the purposes and advantages of establishing an archive; whether it is worth investing our resources when it is not clear how and how often it would be used. If we want to digitize and store materials ourselves it will be necessary to appoint someone to collect and oversee the process. Gretchen noted that many organizations use archives to create a storyline to demonstrate the impact of their organization, and membership should be involved in this effort.

ACTION ITEM: Linda will appoint an ad hoc committee on establishing an NCME archive. At the April board meeting this ad hoc committee will have answers to the following questions: What are all of the materials that would be stored in the archives? How often would the archive be used? Given the answers to the first two questions, what are the options and costs? The chair of the ad hoc committee will provide a report to the Board.

Program Committee Update

Andre Rupp presented the report from the program co-chairs. The co-chairs solicited proposals in three areas: methodology, policy, and practice. A new innovative format session was created. A set of new key words were created, which greatly enhanced the program. There were 539 total submissions, an increase of 18% over last year. Andre suggested changing the way we get volunteer reviewers (perhaps require everyone who submits a paper agree to be a reviewer?) 209 proposals were accepted.

Automated scoring was the dominant theme for the sessions. Andre discussed the topics of the invited and accepted submitted sessions and paper sessions, and presented an overview of ratings by proposal

type and orientation. There was discussion about the quality of reviews and ways to train individuals to perform reviews.

All of the sessions have been created and the co-chairs are ready to send out acceptance/ rejection notifications. They would like to send out a note that communicates why some highly-rated proposals were rejected. They will be selecting discussants shortly. Andre asked the Board what information regarding creation of the program would they be comfortable sharing with members. It was suggested that the acceptance rate (which was less than 50%) be shared.

The program will not be shipped via regular mail. Andre and Joanna can begin the formatting of the program. Is this something they should do, rather than wait for TRG? They will need to wait for resolution with AERA for schedule conflicts. Linda suggested that they do this since they have the resources, but there is a procedure in place for TRG to produce the program for future years.

Chad noted that the acceptance of graduate student poster sessions will not be available until December.

Linda thanked Andre and Joanna for all of their hard work on the program.

Training and Professional Development Committee Update

Heather Buzick joined the meeting by phone at 2:00 p.m. The Training and Professional Development committee reviewed 21 training session proposals. There were a large number of 8-hour session proposals. The committee accepted 15 sessions, and will have one invited session for graduate students, for a total of 16 accepted sessions. Six sessions were rejected. The committee decided to offer two 4-hour sessions during the conference. There were 4 sessions (4-hour) that are eligible for webcasting. Due to the necessity of reducing the budget for the webcasts (see discussion from committee on webcasts), options are to offer an 8-hour training session during the conference or only webcast 2 sessions. Several Board members thought that members would not like an 8-hour session during the conference, since it would take them away from other conference sessions.

Jim suggested perhaps raising the fee of the workshops to help cover some of the costs for the webinars (by about \$5). Enrollment in the training session averages about 30 per session, for approx. 450 individuals. Andre asked whether there was a specific reason the sessions couldn't be scheduled on Saturday or Sunday afternoon; Heather agreed to look into this.

ACTION ITEM: Heather will discuss possibility of raising the fees when she talks with Amy and Terry, and will look into the possibility of offering the sessions on Saturday or Sunday afternoon.

Graduate Student Issues Committee Update

Chad Gotch presented the report from the GSIC. The deadline for proposals for the graduate student poster session was October 1st. This year they have only 62 reviewers, which is a smaller number than the previous two years. Last year there was a delay in getting access to the reviewer system which resulted in a 10-day time frame for conducting the reviews and making decisions. Chad had a

conference call with John Hoffman from TRG to discuss ways of improving the process. The problem is still not completely resolved. Chad will need to know the layout of the room for the poster session, which determines the number of posters that are accepted.

The invited symposium for 2012 will feature Pheobe Winter, Brian Gong, Diane Henderson-Montero, and Derek Briggs.

The GSIC is continuing to work with the website committee. They reviewed material generated by the membership committee. Chad discussed the list the GSIC is compiling of organizations that employ measurement professionals. At the July Board meeting there was some discussion and concern about how official this list would be. The idea is to have a list to be a resource. The concern was that not all organizations are on the list. There was discussion about the possibility of enabling members to request adding their organization to the list. Kris suggested listing the organizations that employ NCME members. The database would be able to generate this list. The Board was supportive of the GSIC's initiative in creating this list.

Last year Chad got in touch with the Division D and Division H graduate student committees and will put together a list of all graduate student events and sessions.

Sherry suggested keeping track of how many graduate students used their free breakfast ticket. Chad's sense is that most are used.

Greg indicated that the 2013 program chairs are very interested in working with the GSIC.

Linda expressed gratitude and appreciation for the work of the GSIC.

Budget and Finance Committee Update

Anne Fitzpatrick presented the report from the Budget and Finance (B&F) committee. The committee has two action items. First is review/approval of the 2012 budget. There were revisions based on comments on the preliminary budget presented at the July Board meeting. Anne showed plots of revenue sources and expenses over the last 6 years, to compare with the 2012 budget. The increase in dues and conference registration fees will result in an increase of revenue. Whatever we have in revenue reflects what NCME is able to do. With regard to expenses, there was an increase due to an increase in the TRG contract and an increase in administration costs. We cut meeting costs to make sure that the bottom line was still positive. The budget does not include Wayne's new estimate for sponsorship revenue, so the picture could look a lot better. The initiatives budget is not included here. The net is \$3,183. Anne noted that an amendment to the budget may have to be made to adjust for the period when there was not a contract with TRG.

Anne called for a motion to approve the 2012 budget. Greg made the motion, and Linda seconded the motion. Five Board members voted in favor. There were no abstentions.

Anne discussed the initiative to create a charitable giving arm for NCME. The B&F committee suggests that a development committee be established to continue pursuit of the NCME foundation. We can

begin fundraising whenever we want, but it is a policy decision for the Board. A development committee can begin thinking about the best way to proceed. NCME puts aside a certain percentage of revenue for initiatives; this money can be considered to be the seed money for the development fund. Individuals contributing to the fund can designate the fund to specific initiatives (e.g., research, graduate students, outreach).

Greg wanted to confirm that the plan is not to change the flexibility of resources for initiatives, but to stimulate interest that NCME is investing in worthwhile initiatives.

Linda wanted to confirm that the committee would be established to create a plan for developing the foundation, but would not necessarily be the ones to engage in fundraising. Another committee may need to be established for this purpose. Linda feels that it important to bring more money into the organization and would like to get people to focus on this. The committee could figure out a way to discern the interest in the membership or think of ways to communicate to the membership and get members to donate. The Board will have to give the committee the structure and parameters to work within. The B&F report describes aspects and tasks for developing a charitable giving arm.

There were several questions from the Board about whether NCME could limit or define the initiatives/ areas where donations can be applied.

If we want to do something around the 75th anniversary, the ad hoc committee will need to be appointed soon. This is a planning committee that may eventually become a standing development committee. Jim suggested that perhaps one of the members rotating off of the B&F committee be involved.

The Board supported the appointment of an ad hoc committee. Anne asked the Board to think about individuals who would be interested in serving on this committee and who have the appropriate knowledge and skill set. Deborah suggested also including a newer member to represent the next generation of members.

Deborah Harris left the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Discussion of the TRG Contract

Anne presented a table showing the dollar amounts of the TRG contract. There was a gap between the termination of the last contract with TRG (June 2010) and the signing of the new contract in July 2011. The amount we pay TRG increased by 42.5% between 2007-2010 and 2011. NCME needs to account for the gap where there was no contract. Three possibilities were suggested:

- 1) Revise the new contract to begin in 2010 – this would require NCME to pay them retroactively to reflect the large increase in the new contract.
- 2) Extend the 2007-2010 contract and give the annual raise (2.5%) specified in the 2007-2010 contract.

3) Auditors acknowledge that there wasn't a contract, and leave it at that. (This is not good business practice).

Anne suggested the second option and asked the Board if this is an acceptable approach. The Board members present agreed with this approach (there was not a quorum of Board members present to take a vote). The money will come out of the 2011 budget.

ACTION ITEM: Anne will notify the Board of her conversation with TRG about this issue.

Linda adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

Friday, October 28, 2011

Linda called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Update on Standards and Test Use Committee

Joseph Martineau gave an update on behalf of the Standards and Test Use Committee. The committee has been very involved in getting out a plan to review the Joint Standards.

Joseph asked whether NCME endorses materials such as the Code of Fair Testing Practice, the ABC's of Testing, etc.. that are not created by NCME. There was some discussion about revising the ABC's of Testing. During Wayne's presidency, he suggested that the committee review these documents again. The committee will develop a process for reviewing these documents.

Kris asked whether there are any documents that are out of date that should be removed from the NCME website. Randy Penfield will contact Kris to determine this. Linda recently reviewed these materials and felt that there was nothing that was bad or wrong, but updates and revisions are needed.

The committee is also working to identify other documents/materials that should be reviewed. The estimated completion of this task is December 2011. Anne found a document that she will send to Joseph and the committee.

Kris would like to promote or share the status of the revision of the standards on the website. Linda suggested having a link on the NCME website to the Standards website. At last year's annual meeting a session regarding revision of the standards was videotaped; this should be added to the website. Plumer indicated that the video was edited into 30 minute segments.

ACTION ITEM: The Standards and Test Use committee should review the video to determine if it is reasonable to post on the website and how to package it. The committee should write text to accompany the video on the website. This is needed by November, 2011.

Linda expressed appreciation for the committee's work and their progress.

Joseph indicated that the committee on Informing Assessment Policy and Practice are taking their charge very seriously and asked whether it would be useful to consider producing standards for the use

of test scores in educational evaluation (which is the focus of the committee's session at the annual meeting this year). The outcome of this session may be a set of guidelines.

Sherry discussed an opportunity to contribute to the Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS). This is the world's largest publication developed under the auspices of the UNESCO as an archival source of reference. Sherry was contacted to request a 10,000 word document on the topic of measurement in education. Board members suggested discussing this opportunity with the Publications Committee or the outreach committee. Sherry will follow-up to obtain more information.

Linda updated the Board on the need for volunteers at the Annual Meeting. Volunteers will be needed at the information desk (the busiest time is during the training sessions and the first day of the meeting). There is also the option of hiring a temp. Our contract with AERA indicates that they can provide assistance, but NCME would have to pay.

ACTION ITEM: Linda, Anne, and Plumer will determine how to staff the information booth during the training session.

The Membership Committee will be asked to take responsibility for getting volunteers to staff the information desk. A volunteer is needed at the information desk at 5:30a.m. to collect release forms for the Fun Run.

Plumer discussed the need to market the conference. He would like to see NCME increase marketing efforts to help with membership growth. He suggested seeking free marketing such as exchanging membership lists with other organizations. We can put a countdown to the conference clock on the website. Can we advertise our conference on other organizations' websites, such as CCSSO? Plumer suggested getting contact information from other organizations and maintaining a list. Greg suggested also posting on Smarter Balance and other similar websites.

Linda suggested having a link to the program highlights on other organization's websites – but we have to act quickly. We need to identify the organizations we want to target and then determine how best to disseminate information about our conference, since there is variability in how frequently members of other organizations go to their websites. For this year, we don't have time to be that extensive. The websites are a good place to start.

Linda asked the Board to suggest websites that have teachers, counselors, and others who would be interested in attending our conference. Anne suggested publicizing at the Vancouver School Board and other educational entities in Vancouver.

ACTION ITEM: Board members to send lists of organizations to target. Linda will contact Bruno and Kadriye to ask them about contacts in the Vancouver area. Linda will contact AERA about promoting NCME on their website.

It was noted that AERA does little to advertise/promote NCME. Perhaps AERA can put the dates of the NCME conference on their website and a link to the NCME website.

Publications Committee Update

Mark Gierl joined the meeting by phone at 10:15 a.m. to give the update from the Publications Committee. The new committee chair is Krista Breithaupt. In the spring, there will be a call for an EM:IP editor. All committee activities are proceeding smoothly.

Kris asked whether content generated by other committees will need to be reviewed by the publications committee. Would the committee have to be expanded, or can we solicit from the editorial pool of the journals? There was some discussion about whether the outreach committee should take on reviewing content generated by other committees.

Mark indicated that his role as chair has been largely administrative. Linda feels that the publications committee can be more actively involved in other initiatives, including setting policies to ensure that the quality of publications is maintained.

Linda expressed appreciation for the work of the publications committee.

Membership Committee Update

Min Lee joined the meeting by phone at 10:45 a.m. to present the report from the Membership Committee. The membership committee conducted a survey of lapsed NCME members. Recommendations to entice individuals to renew their membership included: reducing fees, such as instituting a graduated fee structure; having lower fees for graduate students; or having a discounted joint membership with AERA. Some lapsed members reported a desire for NCME to increase its focus on practical or applied issues as opposed to theoretical, and other quantitative and statistical topics.

Linda asked the Membership committee to think about things to offer lapsed members, such as a discounted fee or promotions, and put together a proposal. It will be good to target graduate students because these are the future members of NCME. There was discussion on whether the task of bringing back lapsed members should be undertaken by the Membership committee or turned over to the Recruitment committee. Perhaps both committees can work together.

<p>ACTION ITEM: Membership and Recruitment committees to work together in consultation with TRG to develop a proposal for ways to increase membership, including bringing back lapsed members, by April meeting.</p>

Min provided recommendations for conducting a lapsed member survey on a routine basis. The committee prepared a report describing the steps for conducting the survey.

Sherry asked whether doing the survey every 3-5 years is necessary, and whether we would get different information. It may be more useful to identify lapsed members every 3-5 years and provide incentives for them to return. The committee can query the membership database to determine trends in lapsed members and retention. Joseph felt that the response rate was low so it might be useful to repeat the survey, or to determine if the reasons for lapsed membership changes over time.

Greg suggested always asking individuals why they don't renew their membership by inserting questions during the renewal process. And we can ask if they still want to receive emails about NCME news and events. Jim added that we can continue to send them renewal notices until they answer the questions. The Board discussed ways of tracking members when their email addresses are no longer valid.

The Membership committee recommended ideas for redesigning the banner displayed at the NCME booth. Linda suggested coordinating with the 75th anniversary, and asked the committee to think about additional materials to have at the booth at the 2013 meeting. The banner design should be consistent with the website. Cost estimates are needed by sometime this summer.

Linda expressed appreciation for the work of the Membership committee.

Linda adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.