



NAGC BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Saturday, March 1, 2008
1:00 pm – 6:15 pm
Sunday, March 2, 2008
7:30 am – 3:00 pm

Draft Minutes

SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 2008

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Del Siegle called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm with greetings, acknowledgements and encouragement for continuation of open dialogue.

Board Present:

Del Siegle (President), Ann Robinson (Vice President), Frederick C. “Ric” Ladt (Treasurer), Paula Olszewski-Kubilius (Governance Secretary), Joyce VanTassel-Baska (Past President), Sandra N. Kaplan, Jann H. Leppien, Karen B. Rogers, Cindy Sheets, George Betts, Bonnie Cramond, Arlene DeVries, Thomas Hébert, Jean S. Peterson, Julia Link Roberts, Mary Slade (Day 1 Only), Carol Tieso, Diana Reeves, and Christine Nobbe

Not Present: Donna Y. Ford, Michael Clay Thompson

Staff Present:

Nancy Green
Carol S. Malinowski
Jane Clarenbach – Legislative Advocacy Discussion Only
Andy Bassett – Financial Discussion Only

Guests:

D. Betsy McCoach, (University of Connecticut) NAGC Awards Committee Member
Sally Reis, (University of Connecticut) NAGC Legislative Committee Chair
René Islas, B&D Consulting, Washington, DC

President Siegle asked Board members to provide an update on individual activities since the last meeting in November 2007. He continued the discussion by providing an overview of the Board agenda for the March 2008 meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

President Siegle called for approval of the Board minutes from November 7, 2007, with the following amendments:

Motion: Approve the Board of Directors' meeting minutes from November 2007 as amended.

- *Executive Director's Report* (page 5). Dr. Ken James, formerly a superintendent of a small school district and commissioner of education in Arkansas
- *Executive Director's Report* (page 5). (3) check with states to see if hosting is feasible as they must relinquish their major state association sponsored conference ...
- *Legislative Advocacy* (page 6). Dr. Henry Johnson, former state superintendent of education and NC state director of gifted education, ...
- *Legislative Advocacy* (page 6). Insert "." in third paragraph, last sentence.
- *Legislative Advocacy Proposal (Revisited)* (page 12). Opposed to selecting a firm at this time and requests financial impact statement.
- *Legislative Advocacy Proposal (Revisited)* (page 12). Inclusion of discussion comment: "Board member Ladts commented that it was a dangerous precedent to award a sole source contract without seeking competitive bids."
- Inclusion of the name(s) of Board members who had opposing votes throughout the minutes on any and all motions. Board members were asked to submit their name(s) for the record before the conclusion of the March 2008 Board meeting.

Motion unanimously approved.

President Siegle indicated that immediately following the NAGC annual convention in Minneapolis in November 2007, several actions were taken by the Board. The NAGC "Division" chairs proposed regulations language reflecting a name change to "Networks" and also Governance Secretary Paula Olszewski-Kubilius was the overseer of proposed edits to the *Position Statement on the Use of the WISC-IV for Gifted Identification.* Both actions were approved by the Board by majority vote between meetings.

President Siegle presented the Board actions since the November 2007 meeting.

Motion: Approve and accept the report on Board actions taken since November 2007, including the Board votes on the WISC-IV Dissemination and the votes on the Network Regulation.

Motion unanimously approved as reported.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Siegle called for approval of the Board of Directors' meeting agenda for March 1-2, 2008.

Motion: Approve the Board of Directors' agenda for March 1-2, 2008

Moved: Cramond

Seconded: VanTassel-Baska

Motion unanimously approved with the addition of a discussion on Maryland affiliates

Discussion: President Siegle commented that the agenda would include a private discussion (Board members only) on the goals and objectives, salary and possible bonus for NAGC Executive Director Nancy Green. President Siegle responded to questions by the Board as to the activities immediately following the Board meeting pertaining to the legislative agenda. Siegle confirmed that appointments on Capitol Hill were to be made in advance; however, there would likely be opportunities to join some sessions that were currently scheduled. Five Board members were officially scheduled to participate in legislative training and Hill appointments following the Board meeting.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Divisions/Networks

President Siegle began the president's report with a generous thank you to Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Jean Peterson, and Carol Tieso for their patience and diplomacy in working with the Networks (formerly Divisions) at the annual convention in Minneapolis in November 2007. He noted that the Robert's Rules Parliamentary process was used during the five-hour session with the Networks, eventually resulting in a unanimous approval of the three final policies.

NAGC/SENG Pediatrician's Brochure

President Siegle updated the Board about the joint NAGC/SENG brochure entitled *Is My Child Gifted?* He reiterated that a test mailing is currently being conducted with approximately 500 brochures sent to pediatricians' offices. Initial feedback will be collected in April 2008 regarding success of the distribution effort.

Board members asked about the selection criteria and which states/pediatricians' offices received the brochure (Reeves). Green indicated that once feedback is gathered from the initial pilot test of 500, a marketing plan and possible plans for mass circulation/distribution will be considered. She noted that sponsorship and foundation backing are certainly considerations to be included in the marketing plan, and sponsor logos on the materials will be considered in the plan. Green further indicated that the pdf version of the brochure is currently available on the NAGC website and may be copied and circulated for those who want a copy. To print the brochure:

Access the NAGC Website at www.nagc.org
Select “2007 is a Wrap!”
Select “The Best of NAGC 2007”
Select “*FREE! Is My Child Gifted*”

Board members suggested that institutions/schools of medicine with specific courses aligned with the message may be valuable outlets for distribution (Kaplan), such as the Department of Nursing at Purdue University (Peterson). Board members emphasized the need for a possible DVD, and perhaps a shorter (fax) reply sheet for pediatricians (DeVries).

Board Training/Evaluation

President Siegle shared the outcome of a governance retreat he recently attended with Nancy Green. In assessing the responsibilities and characteristics of exceptional boards, Siegle indicated that the goals and expectations of the Board chair and the association executive director were virtually the same (e.g., honesty, openness, timeliness of material distribution, among other answers); thus identifying the need for a Board self-assessment at the March 2008 meeting. Using the eight characteristics of effective Boards, each Board member was asked to complete a questionnaire before the end of the meeting. Siegle noted that September Board training would be designed given the feedback and findings from these questionnaires.

Other Matters

President Siegle provided an update on the B&D Consulting Initiative - on the agenda later - during the meeting. He also discussed an alternative marketing plan for the 2009 NAGC Calendar to absorb the profit/loss outcome from the 2008 Calendar effort (Note: Approximately 800 calendars were purchased in 2008; a total of 5,000 were printed). He identified a plan for sponsors and a photo competition underway.

Feedback from Board members on the calendar effort included:

- Continue with personalized signatures to committees and associations at specific meetings (Robinson)
- Target state affiliates as recipients of the calendar (Reeves)
- Donate overrun copies to social studies programs (Kaplan)
- Donate overrun copies to the upcoming Wallace Symposium (VanTassel-Baska)
- Donate to the National Social Studies meeting in April 2008 (Peterson)

President Siegle also noted that an upcoming meeting of the University Network will take place at the American Education Research Association (AERA) convention—scheduled through the Gifted SIG for March 24, 2008. Internships, syllabi-sharing, and NCATE will be discussed at this meeting and another meeting tentatively scheduled in January 2009.

Presidential Address and Possible White Paper

President Siegle called attention to his 2007 NAGC Presidential Address entitled, “*The Time is Now to Stand Up for Gifted Education.*” He identified problems in terminology in the field of gifted and called for a white paper to discuss differences in gifted and perhaps specific terms for describing skills and talents. He proposed inviting a work group to come together to explore this. He suggested that a white paper be developed in the September/ October/ November time period.

The President’s Report concluded at 2:30pm.

V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REVIEW/ANNUAL PRIORITIES DISCUSSION

President Siegle called for a confidential discussion on the annual review of NAGC Executive Director Green. (All NAGC staff members were asked to leave the boardroom and return immediately following the discussion.)

Motion: Move to accept the 2007-2008 Performance Review of the NAGC Executive Director as submitted, and to approve an annual bonus in the amount of 6% of total annual salary.

Moved: xxx

Seconded: xxx

Motion unanimously approved.

The Board meeting resumed at 3:45 pm after the executive director review and a short break. (All NAGC staff members were asked to return to the boardroom.)

Executive Director Green thanked the Board for their consideration and support over the past four years. She mentioned her dedication as a professional and emphasized that NAGC belongs to the members of the organization. She delineated her role as (1) facilitator – using the best conversation, best connections and best communications possible; (2) guide – to provide full information to support a common goal or decision; and (3) champion – trying to bring NAGC to the table at important venues for the cause.

Executive Director Green mentioned the importance of the NAGC Board as the only group looking out over the horizon for the entire organization. She was pleased to announce the recent hire of two new staff members in the NAGC office: Rachel Coleman, who will work directly as an assistant to the executive director and special projects coordinator (starting March 3, 2008) and Nicole Lukan, who will serve as membership and marketing coordinator (starting March 17, 2008).

NAGC Strategic Plan

Using the 2004-2008 NAGC Strategic Plan and the seven specific goals identified in the plan, President Siegle charged the Board with developing measurable objectives based on the seven

goals to be assessed within a one-year timeframe. Specifically, a measurable objective or objectives would be established for each goal and fulfillment of the objective(s) should be completed within one year. Siegle indicated that the Board officers will refine these goals as measurable objectives to evaluate the NAGC executive director.

Board members were randomly selected to participate in a working session in four separate groups – Groups 1-3 received two goals (each) for discussion; Group 4 received one goal for discussion. Following the working session, each group reported on their measurable objectives for NAGC. Siegle concluded the exercise with a commitment to the Board the officers will work with the Executive Director to refine and present a plan.

Group 1 (Paula, Chris, Cindy, Jean and Julia)

Goal 1: Public Awareness. The public understands, recognizes, values and supports high potential youth.

Goal 4: Information Resources. NAGC will be the national clearinghouse for knowledge about high-potential youth and the field of gifted education.

- Augment the information resources such as video-clips (on demand), podcasts, Webinars, Website resources that are owned or endorsed by NAGC to educators (teachers and counselors and administrators) on the NAGC Website and streamline procedures for approval

Discussion: to augment online resources, drive people to the Website, use different media and current technology, up-to-date sites; make sure that the process does not get stalled by approvals; have a series of sessions with a focused theme (e.g., creativity, development); individuals could write a script, talking points; have e-mail addressees of people in the field; not to exceed 20-30 minutes; check with Annenberg to co-sponsor

Group 2: (Joyce, Carol, George, Karen)

Goal 3: Enhanced Competency. NAGC's stakeholders have the knowledge and skills they need to be effective and successful in their support of high-potential youth.

- Responsible for teacher training on the new NCATE standards guides (e.g., conference day, regional academies, web-based) to 200 NCATE universities and 1000 school district and state personnel

Goal 5: Leadership Development. NAGC will encourage and develop a broad based pool of prepared leaders committed to strengthening both NAGC and the field.

- Increase by 30 percent the number of administrators at local and state levels trained in program development and implementation for gifted in at least three venues (e.g., national conference, state conference, regional academies, university centers)

Group 3: (Ann, Jann, Arlene, xx)

Goal 2: Legislative Advocacy/Policy Development. NAGC is a leader in the development of and advocacy for public policies that affect high-potential youth.

- Align B&D with Board priorities (more clearly) and legislative requirements; pass the legislative language regarding training of pre-service teachers in the Higher Education Act; insert appropriate AYP in the reauthorization

Goal 6: Strategic Alliances and Partnerships. NAGC fosters strategic alliances and partnerships with other organizations in order to nurture high-potential youth and develop talent.

- Pass legislation that inserts pre-service teacher exposure into Title II funding and deliver a written plan for NAGC's role in the implementation

Discussion: Use B&D Consulting to jump start ideas; draft white paper by NAGC and chief counsel to further partnership activities; include AARP; focus to further the policy agenda; advocacy should be long-term, but consideration should be made on what is probable for completion in one year;

Group 4: (Ric, Bonnie, Mary, Sandra)

Goal 7: Organizational Effectiveness. NAGC is an effectively governed, diversely funded, efficiently managed organization that focuses its resources to address the needs of its growing membership.

- Increase revenue by 10 percent
- Increase parent membership (value-based; parents already members of associations)
- Include legislative advocacy as part of pitch
- Pro-sponsorship
- Increase fulltime parent members (regular members) by 1,000 (total)
- Increase parent affiliate (members) to 1,500 (total)
- Add plan to investigate corporate membership
- Increase net profit by 20 percent to \$10,000

Discussion: What are the sources of funds? Diversity equals protection; parents as increased revenue source (teacher/university-based revenue; NAGC resources). How do we get parents to join? K-6 (post id) and parent associate members as target; parents being a large and important group with lower membership; \$10 membership cost – perhaps to other states – for parent affiliates

President Siegle adjourned the meeting at 6:15 pm on Saturday, March 1, 2008.

SUNDAY, MARCH 2, 2008

The meeting resumed at 7:40 am.

VI. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Siegle provided an overview of the consent agenda.

Motion: Approve the consent agenda as presented with the exception of items pulled for further deliberation

Motion unanimously approved as amended.

The consent agenda is filed.

6.1 Governance Report – Policy Review

Governance Secretary Paula Olszewski-Kubilius provided an account of the Governance Committee activities for Board consideration.

6.1 (b) Publication Policies

1. A policy on the role, authority and accountability of the editor of *Gifted Child Quarterly* and the relationship of the CGQ editor with the national office, Board and editorial advisors was discussed. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Approve the policy outline regarding the role, authority and accountability of the editor of *Gifted Child Quarterly* with an amendment to delete “acting in an independent journalistic fashion...” in the third paragraph.

Motion unanimously approved as amended.

2. A policy on the role, authority and accountability of the NAGC association editor and the relationship of the association editor with the national office, Board and current periodicals was discussed. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Approve the policy outline regarding the role, authority and accountability of the NAGC association editor with an amendment to insert “and approved by the Board” at the end of the second paragraph following “President”.

Moved: J. Roberts

Seconded: K. Rogers

Motion unanimously approved as amended.

3. Immediately following the motion, the Board made a second amendment to the association editor policy. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Approve the policy outline regarding the role, authority and accountability of the NAGC association editor with an amendment to insert “ ...NAGC office or leadership positions...” and to insert “(e.g., book company)” after “a conflict of interest” both under Eligibility

Moved: J. VanTassel-Baska

Seconded: A. Robinson

Motion unanimously approved as amended.

4. A policy on the publication relationships of NAGC and the publications committee recommendations was discussed. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Approve the policy regarding definitions of types of publication relationships.

Motion unanimously approved as stated.

Discussion: Olszewski-Kubilius introduced the idea of having an established review process on publications on the Website and based the discussion on feedback from the publications committee. Board members agreed that clearly defined language is necessary, but cautioned against endorsement of specific publications outside the service publication process (Kaplan). Board member noted that transparency is necessary in the process (Reeves), along with clear expectations at the beginning of the process (VanTassel-Baska). President Siegle noted the need to set minimum royalty expectations for NAGC.

6.1 (c) Network Policies

1. A policy on the process and guidelines for Network Elections, the qualifications for candidacy, and the rights and responsibilities of service for officers within a Network was discussed. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Approve the policy regarding Network Elections with an amendment to revise the paragraph on Tenure of Office as follows: “Tenure of Office for successful candidates for any Network office is two years, with the exception of the chair, who will serve two years as chair-elect and two years as chair. A term of office begins on September 1st. Furthermore, Network chairs can serve in this capacity in up to three networks during a 12 year period.” Also, to delete “two letters of recommendation” under “Applications” and to change the word “reimbursement” to “reimbursed” under “Rights and Responsibilities”.

Moved: Sheets
Seconded: VanTassel-Baska

Motion unanimously approved as amended

2. Revised policies on the establishment of a Network Communications Committee (NCC) and also a description of the responsibilities of the national office and the Networks in soliciting and selecting annual convention proposals among other tasks were disseminated to Board members as part of the consent agenda.

6.1 (d) NCATE Policy

A policy on the appointment of an NAGC liaison to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education was discussed. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Approve the NCATE Policy as stated.

Motion unanimously approved as stated.

Discussion: Board member Ladts questioned the length of the appointment of the NCATE liaison - one five-year term. He noted that a shorter term would allow for reappointment should the NCATE liaison not be able to fulfill the entire commitment and/or if the appointed individual was not the best candidate for the position. Two Board members emphasized that a five-year appointment ensures a commitment to the task and draws a more serious candidate (Olszewski-Kubilius and Robinson). Other positions that currently exist (e.g., GCQ) also require a five-year term (VanTassel-Baska).

6.1 (e) Board Policy

President Siegle notified the Board that current NAGC Regulations prohibit the vice president of the NAGC Board of Directors from moving into the president position on the NAGC Board of Directors without being elected for the role specifically. Siegle called for a revision of the Regulations which would include language to allow for the vice president to automatically succeed to the office of the president after one two-year term (President-Elect).

Motion: Approve a change in NAGC Regulations that allows vice president succession to president

Moved: Roberts
Seconded: Reeves

Yes (9): Betts, Leppien, Tieso, DeVries, Sheets, Peterson, Reeves, Roberts, Olszewski-Kubilius

No (7): VanTassel-Baska, Kaplan, Rogers, Ladts, Nobbe, Cramond, Hébert

Motion defeated (requires two-thirds majority vote).

Discussion: To allow for a comfortable discussion on the topic, Board member and current Vice President Robinson graciously excused herself from the boardroom.

Many Board members felt that further discussion is needed before making a decision on a regulation change so recently approved by the membership and untested. Some Board members offered that adequate mentoring, institutional history, and/or continuity before stepping into the president position or any leadership position is critical (Olszewski-Kubilius and Leppien).

Several questions arose as to preparations for leadership in the president position such as (1) Is being a program chair essential to being president? (Peterson); (2) Is chairing a conference an important precursor to the president role or are the governance/financial secretary roles more important precursors to succession? (VanTassel-Baska) Executive Director Green indicated that a six year commitment may be unrealistic and that someone who had involvement in the organization may make a good candidate for leadership. Green continued by reminding the Board that an election committee should ensure that only viable candidates are considered. Board member Ladts encouraged the organization to consider the founding ideas of democracy and to be more inclusive – that a candidate *without* all the requisite qualifications should still be considered. It also was mentioned that more individuals are needed in leadership – rather than one person for six years (president-elect as next president; former president as past president).

6.2 Position Paper Review

Olszewski-Kubilius reported on the status of NAGC position papers in progress. After a lengthy discussion on the draft position paper on Inclusion, the following motion was cast:

Motion: Remove from the Website the position paper on Inclusion.

Moved: Leppien

Seconded: VanTassel-Baska

Opposed: Roberts, Cramond, Peterson

Abstained: Ladts, Sheets

Motion approved by majority.

Discussion: The draft position paper on inclusion may contradict what is stated in the ability grouping position paper (12/96?) which underscore the need for flexible grouping (Nobbe, VanTassel-Baska). The ability grouping and differentiation papers should include the issue of inclusion, but a separate paper on inclusion may be an inhibitor to a better understanding on the matter (VanTassel-Baska). Some Board members agreed that this draft position paper should not serve as a model (Leppien), though individuals will likely search for a better understanding of

the topic of inclusion (Rogers), an explanation (Cramond), and NAGC’s position. Board member Rogers agreed to create a new draft of the ability grouping position paper to include “inclusion.”

Olszewski-Kubilius introduced the draft position paper on “The Role of Assessment in the Identification of Gifted Students”. Board member Kaplan commented that the paper does not discuss areas of diversity and more latitude on specificity of instruments used is needed. Regarding the five non-negotiable practices in the use of assessments as identification tools, Cramond emphasized that the position paper should emphasize the need for individuals administering the assessment tools to understand the process, for a disinterested party to be involved in the assessment process, and for inclusion of a statement on testing ethics. Reeves noted that institutions should match testing to the program that they plan to offer. Rogers noted that the individual assessment category is being ignored and should be discussed more in the position paper. VanTassel-Baska concluded by stating that various NAGC position papers should be linked together and that concepts should be more cohesive across them. Olszewski-Kubilius agreed to communicate these changes back to the author.

6.3 NAGC Organization Committees/Task Force Reports

6.3.1 Awards Committee

D. Betsy McCoach, a member of the NAGC Awards Committee, was invited to attend the Board meeting to provide information on behalf of the Awards Committee regarding doctoral and non-doctoral student awards. Specifically, the committee is proposing changes to the selection criteria for 2009 nominees in both categories.

McCoach provided insight as to the discussion and rationale of the Awards Committee and indicated that the selection criteria for doctoral award recipients are too “research” intensive. The committee is recommending that the selection be more inclusive of all candidates at all type of institutions, not just those with a research emphasis. Though the committee would continue to require evidence of scholarly activity, now each candidate must also demonstrate a service contribution to the field. She added that the group had discussed the importance of presenting in front of a professional audience at least once at the national, regional or local level. The Awards Committee is confident that the new criteria would surface well-rounded doctoral candidates.

The following motion was cast regarding the doctoral student award criteria:

Motion: Approve the modifications recommended by the Awards Committee to the criteria for the doctoral student award with an amendment to change the selection criteria for the doctoral award as “Scholarly productivity: The candidate must submit a copy of at least one first-authored publication on gifted and talented education in a peer review journal”.

Moved: Olszewski-Kubilius
Seconded: VanTassel-Baska
Opposed: Leppien

Motion approved as amended.

Discussion: It was noted that considerations must be made for assistant professors and individuals with Ed.Ds. Additional comments included nominating a person who is truly “outstanding” (Slade) and a research publication on a topic of central importance to gifted education might be redefined (Robinson). President Siegle also recommended that the award be given within one year of the candidate’s graduation.

The following motion was cast regarding the non-doctoral student award for exceptional contributions to gifted and talented:

Motion: Approve the modifications recommended by the Awards Committee to the criteria for the non-doctoral student award with an amendment to change “Non-Doctoral” to “Masters and Specialist” and to increase the selection criteria and decrease the examples of types of service.

Moved: Betts

Seconded: Cramond

Motion approved unanimously as amended.

Immediately following the motion, there was discussion to create multiple awards at the Masters and Specialist level. The following motion was cast:

Motion: Create three awards at the Masters and Specialist level to include (1) an award in teaching, (2) an award in service leadership, and (3) an award in research with the Awards Committee to select up two awards in each category.

Moved: Cramond

Seconded: Leppien

Opposed: DeVries, Betts

Yes - 5

No - 9

Motion defeated.

Discussion: Opposition to the motion was made based on too many existing awards (DeVries), overall basic language used (Betts), and more emphasis needed on leadership and less on scholarship (VanTassel-Baska). There was a suggestion to make the criteria more specific to the master’s degree to reach more students (Olszewski-Kubilius) and less specific to the doctoral degree (Tieso). McCoach clarified that the Awards Committee’s intention was not to make this a “mini doctoral” award and that the committee is receptive to any change instituted by the Board. Again, President Siegle recommended that the award be given within one year of the candidate’s graduation.

I RECALL THAT WE SENT THIS NON DOCTORAL AWARD BACK TO THE COMMITTEE—WE ASKED THEM TO REWORK THE CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD. WE DID NOT APPROVE IT I DO NOT THINK—WHAT WAS PRESENTED NEEDED SIGNIFICANT REWORKING AND RE THINKING

Committee Reports

President Siegle called attention to the NAGC resource request form submitted by the Diversity/Equity Committee requesting financial support for a mid-year meeting and other costs. Several Board members agreed that the overall goals and objectives of the committee and the rationale for a mid-year meeting were not clear (Olszewski-Kubilius) and that the work had already been synthesized in the past (Leppien).

It was suggested that committees might need more information on how to operate when they are newly formed (Hébert). A recommendation was made that each committee report lists all members as well as the change. Regarding the Javits-Frasier Teacher Scholarships, some members of the Board were concerned that the committee was spending a substantial part of their activities on this topic (Betts) and perhaps the charge of the committee should be much broader (VanTassel-Baska). Board member Cramond emphasized that the role of the D/E Committee regarding Javits-Frasier should be advisory only. There was a suggestion to include Board member Donna Ford in all discussions and decisions pertaining to this group, when possible (Ladt).

A decision was made to decline the resource request form submitted by the Diversity/Equity Committee and to further assist all committees with clarification of their respective roles and responsibilities. President Siegle and Green agreed to coordinate and inform the Board after the meeting. The role of the NAGC national office in working with committees needs clarification (VanTassel-Baska, Cramond), certainly when key staff have been replaced. Board member Leppien cautioned that there are personal issues to be respected based on prior work and involvement by committees.

The Professional Standards Committee (formerly NCATE Teacher Education Standards Committee) provided a report to the Board regarding tasks accomplished since meeting for the first time in November 2007. In reviewing the future activities of the committee, the following motion was cast by the Board:

Motion: Assign the NCATE Teacher Education Standards Committee with the task of updating, revising and aligning the current P-12 standards with the newly approved NCATE standards and to change the name of the committee to the Professional Standards Committee.

Moved: VanTassel-Baska
Second: Betts

Motion approved as amended.

Immediately following the approved motion, a second amendment was cast as follows:

Motion: Update, revise and align the current P-12 standards with the newly approved NCATE standards in collaboration with the original authors of the original NAGC P-12 standards publication.

Moved: Olszewski-Kubilius

Seconded: VanTassel-Baska

Opposed: Leppien, Sheets, Kaplan, Rogers

Motion approved with second amendment.

Discussion: Many Board members agreed that the P-12 standards are dated (over 10 years old) and are in need of revision; the standards also represent what is best practice in the field, so it is essential that they be revised (VanTassel-Baska). Some Board members caution that the role of NAGC may be a conflict of interest (Sheets) and that a service publication notation must indicate that the authors' agreement or acceptance of the revision to the original work (Leppien).

A supplement to the Parent Advisory Committee Report was disseminated to the Board which included a draft proposal to recognize Community Support Alliance Organizations (CSAs) (Handout) and to consider CSAs as part of the NAGC affiliate network. Executive Director Green indicated that CSAs are small grassroots groups of dedicated parents and community members who need educational and advocacy materials in support of gifted education. Since this may involve a change or amendment to the NAGC Regulations, President Siegle agreed to discuss the matter with the state affiliates immediately following the March Board meeting.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the Math/Science Task Force Report, specifically a draft concept or white paper created by the M/S Task Force. The focus of the white paper is on the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) promise to recognize and develop talent and expanding opportunities for promising students. Board member VanTassel-Baska emphasized the importance of determining if STEM is essential. If so, then this white paper should be at the forefront.

VII. FINANCIAL REPORT/PROPOSED BUDGET

Treasurer Ric Ladt commended the hard work of the Finance Committee on behalf of the Board. He discussed NAGC's financial statement for the year ending August 31, 2007 with summarized financial information for 2006 (handout – Gelman, Rosenberg & Freedman; handout – letter dated December 27, 2007). He commented on the health of the organization, but encouraged the organization to be vigilant regarding future expenditures. He clarified that many of the expenditures by the national office (e.g., building expenditures) were simply out of the control of the leaders, but that other expenditures would start to accumulate as the year unfolded.

Ladt provided an overview of the NAGC FY 2007-2008 operating budget for September 2007 to January 2008 and noted that the total income was up by 2 percent (?). He acknowledged that this was probably due to the success of the November 2007 convention and also mentioned that

estimates were given on SAGE and several publications. He concluded by stating that the net income (or revenue over expenses) is 33 percent higher than one year ago which is very good. When highlighting the mid-year status of NAGC investments as of January 2008, Ladt noted that there are \$3 million in reserves or a “healthy level” of reserve funds.

The treasurer then presented the NAGC FY 2008-2009 operating budget. Given the expectations for current expenses, Ladt indicated that a \$230,000 deficit was anticipated; thus, the staff prepared a revised budget to the Finance Committee resulting in an \$87,000 projected deficit. Continued reworking of the proposed budget resulted in a balanced budget for the 2008-2009 timeframe.

Regarding the upcoming annual convention in Tampa in 2008, Ladt called attention to the fact that the destination/location is more expensive than other destinations. To absorb the additional expenses, NAGC will be increasing the convention registration by \$15. The convention attendance in 2006 and 2007 exceeded 3,200, which places the burden on NAGC to match or exceed the number in Tampa in 2008 (handout).

Board members proposed ways of avoiding a backlog of publications, including a possible fifth issue of *Gifted Child Quarterly*. To offset expenses for a “special issue” of GCQ and to help generate revenue, Board member Leppien proposed that Networks sponsor the fifth issue or perhaps another revenue source. Olszewski-Kubilius mentioned having advertisements as a revenue source. There was also mention of *Compass Points* moved to an online format, as a cost saving measure.

The Board called attention to the oversight of excluding payment of \$500 for miscellaneous expenses for the past president of the Board of Directors in the 2008-2009 operating budget, along with a bid for an increase (from \$500) for all Board members based on cost of living expenses. A cost/expense analysis for serving on the Board is needed and should be added to the Board agenda at the next meeting in September 2008. The Graduate Student Committee budget was not included in the proposed budget, though this expense may be included under “special committee” expense. Finally, the performance-based bonus for staff has not been included in the proposed budget.

The Board agreed that (1) \$10,000 should be allocated for an additional GCQ with the expectation that alternative sources for payment will be reviewed; and (2) \$500 will be provided for miscellaneous expenses for the past president. The Board would like to see an amended proposed operating budget for 2008-2009 to include these two items at which time a vote will be cast electronically.

The Finance Committee Report was filed.

VIII. CONVENTION PROGRAM UPDATE

Vice President Ann Robinson enthusiastically reported on the activities of the Program Committee. She announced the opening keynote speaker for the annual convention in Tampa as

Daniel Pink, who emphasizes a different type of “whole-mind” thinker needed for the future of American schools – designers, inventors, teachers and storytellers.

Robinson outlined her ideas for mini-keynotes and signature series sessions, noting the importance of ELL and diversity as a theme. Robinson mentioned that it was exciting to work with the Program Committee, though difficult to review 860 proposals for only 256 session time slots.

The Convention Program Committee report was filed.

The Board took a short break and resumed for a working lunch session at 12:40 pm.

X. LEGISLATIVE AND COMMUNICATIONS PLAN UPDATE

The Board discussed the 2008 Federal Advocacy and Communications Plan (working draft revised February 2008) submitted by B&D Consulting and their recommending strategies to strengthen impact on federal public policy and programs (*A Federal Relations Assessment*, October 2007, B&D Consulting). Sally Reis, Chair of the NAGC Legislative Committee, was invited to attend the session and provide any feedback necessary for the Board to consider.

The B&D focus is on federal legislation and the public’s readiness to discuss the gifted education. At the onset, key areas of concentration included STEM and No Child Left Behind, along with accountability and achievement of all students. A specific goal is to educate and influence the public’s perception on gifted education and advocate on the Hill to change the perception of the country. It is important to note that Congress will revisit the No Child Left Behind program on an annual basis, beginning with a review in September 2008. This timeframe provides for the opportunity to influence and be part of new legislation on the Hill.

Some of the deliverables of B&D include refined talking points, policy documents for dissemination on the Hill, and the B&D work plan itself. A general “hit list” has been established by B&D which focuses on the best advocates on the Hill (e.g., Senator Grassley and others – handout). The next step is to create a “rapid response team” to respond to immediate public and media inquiries; developing a cohesive message (Op-Ed papers, for example) is critical. Islas indicated that the legislative training and visits to the Hill in the next two days is significant towards a common goal.

René Islas provided an update on current activities and potential outcomes and emphasized the importance of responding to the media with a common message to maximize the impact of decision makers on the Hill. He distributed three “message sets” as starting points on specific themes (handouts):

- (1) Theme: Global Competitiveness
- (2) Theme: Meeting the Special Learning Need of Gifted Students
- (3) Theme: Diversity

The Board agreed that these three message sets are the most important themes which resonate with the targeted audience; however, refinement is needed on the themes and bulleted items that support each theme. Islas reiterated that the message sets are not talking points leading to a powerful discussion, but rather a simplified, unified theme. Reis commented that the Legislative Committee had created a similar 9-page document entitled “Meeting the Special Learning Needs of Gifted Students,” which basically mirrors the B&D message sets.

Three additional documents were circulated to the Board which call for Hill support. Islas stated that by focusing on *No Child Left Behind*, B&D will be able to assess who on the Hill is a good target for our message. These three documents will be given to individuals on the Hill.

- (1) *No Child Left Behind*’s assessment and accountability system requirements to ensure that schools are held accountable for improving the achievement of all students, including students who perform at the “advanced” level (Handout: Hold Schools Accountable for Educating All Students Including the Gifted and Talented)
- (2) Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Act in the current *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* to create formula grants to states for gifted and talented education (Handout: Increase Equity in Gifted Education: Enhance the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Program)
- (3) Requiring States to describe how they will use federal funds to improve the skills of teachers in instructing gifted and talented students in the *No Child Left Behind* reauthorization (Handout: Improving Teacher Effectiveness for Gifted Students)

The following motion was cast:

Motion: Endorse the (1) Hold Schools Accountable for Educating All Students Including the Gifted and Talented; (2) Increase Equity in Gifted Education: Enhance the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Program; and (3) Improving Teacher Effectiveness for Gifted Students; and to distribute these documents on the Hill.

Moved: Olszewski-Kubilius

Seconded: Kaplan

Motion passed.

Discussion: Executive Director Green reminded the Board that feedback on B&D themes, messages and talking points is essential. VanTassel-Baska requested feedback on the strategic alliances and to include superintendents as part of the strategic alliances. She would like to know the rationale for how B&D is petitioning groups to be included on the list of strategic alliances. Also, she noted the importance of alignment with the NAGC agenda. Peterson requested that the NAACP and/or other minority groups be represented in the list of strategic alliances. A suggestion was made to forward a copy of the Math/Science Task Force position paper(s) to

B&D. Another suggestion was made to establish a clear path of communication with B&D – perhaps the Legislative Committee can be the conduit.

XI. New Business

State Affiliate Approval Process

NAGC received a letter dated February 9, 2008, from Helaine Zinaman with the Maryland Educators of Gifted Students (MEGS) requesting affiliate status with NAGC (handout); supplemental information on MEGS was included with their letter. Executive Director Green asked the Board what additional information is needed from MEGS as part of the review process. Several Board members inquired as to why MEGS was unaware of any other gifted organization in the state, as reported in their application. The Board agreed that additional information is needed to determine the relationship between the existing affiliate and MEGS. It may be prudent to introduce the two groups to be sure that a conflict would not ensue by allowing both to be affiliates for the state of Maryland. The Board agreed that an electronic vote to approve the application for NAGC affiliate status for MEGS would be taken after the March 2008 Board meeting and after a final assessment of the two groups was completed.

XII. CONCLUSION

Board members were asked to complete their NAGC Board Evaluations and also the NAGC Board of Directors Meeting Evaluation (two handouts) for collection at the end of the meeting. In addition, the NAGC Development Committee's 2008 Solicitation form was disseminated to Board members.

_____ adjourned the meeting at _____