



BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Wednesday, November 4, 2009
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Renaissance Grand Hotel, Lucas Room
St. Louis, Missouri

Final Minutes

Wednesday, November 4, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ann Robinson called the meeting to order at 7:59 AM.

Board Present: Ann Robinson (President), Paula Olszewski-Kubilius (President-Elect), Del Siegle (Past President), Kristen Stephens (Governance Secretary), Jann Leppien (Treasurer), Katie Augustyn, Jaime Castellano, Lauri Kirsch, Sally Krisel, Stuart Omdal, Jean Peterson, Cindy Sheets, Carol Tieso

Staff Present: Nancy Green, Rachel Coleman, Andrew Bassett (for financial discussion only), Jane Clarenbach (for legislative discussion only)

Guest: M. René Islas (for legislative discussion only)

2. Approval of Minutes

2.1 September 2009 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

2.2 Recap of “Javits in Jeopardy” webinar

Motion made by Del Siegle: to approve the September 2009 Board of Directors meeting minutes and the “Javits in Jeopardy” attachment

Second: Katie Augustyn

The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Consent Agenda

The following reports were pulled for discussion: Conceptual Foundations and Research & Evaluation Network reports.

The following items were added to new business: Lauri Kirsch—discussion of networks and membership dues, NCATE/Rick Olenchak’s report, and GCQ report

Motion made by Jann Leppien: to approve consent agenda

Second: Lauri Kirsch

4. President’s Report/September Follow-Up

Chair Robinson addressed several issues that have progressed since the September meeting in Atlanta, including:

4.1 Acceleration Guidelines

Recalling that the Board approved the IRPA-CSDPG-NAGC partnership, Nancy Green presented the “final product,” the printed Acceleration Guidelines to the Board. She mentioned that each Board member and each Convention attendee will receive a copy in their Convention tote bag, and the report will be highlighted in the Saturday general session.

4.2 Committee, Task Force, and Workgroup Follow-Up

Chair Ann Robinson provided an update on committee and task force progress, noting her efforts to create alignment and clarity around committee objectives with personal phone calls and conversations. She has spent time on the phone with Education committee co-chairs (Kim Chandler and Frances Spielhagen). They explored criteria for developing webinar topics and discussed agendas for their committee meetings.

Robinson also made connections with the Standards Committee via chair Susan Johnsen. New work is percolating for that group on Advanced Standards and they’re ready to move forward. Clarity does seem to exist among the group about respective roles and expectations. The members of the Advanced Standards workgroup include: Cheryll Adams, Connie Phelps, Susan Johnsen, Joyce VanTassel-Baska, and Ann Robinson. NOT Scott Peters, Penny Kolloff, or Laurie Croft. The University Network will meet while in St. Louis on the topics of Advanced Standards, the P-12 program standards, and other issues of interest to the University community.

4.2.1 IQ Testing Task Force Memo (see attachment 4.2.1)

The IQ Task Force is working toward becoming a SIG, and received a memo outlining this request. Robinson has been in contact with Bobbie Gilman.

4.2.2 Math/Science Task Force Memo (see attachment 4.2.2)

In a memo to the Math/Science Task Force, all questions submitted in their last report were answered point by point. The Task Force’s response to the memo was mostly positive; however, they still want to become a Network and have guaranteed convention slots. Even so, they will take the step to become a Special Interest Group first. The new NCTM book is in process with the Publications Committee. At the suggestion of Paula O-K, staff will look into whether the 1999 Sheffield book, “*Developing Mathematically Promising Students*,” could be updated. Staff will follow up on who has rights to the content of the publication.

4.3 Strategic Framework Review

Chair Ann Robinson highlighted the strategic framework, which was approved in concept by the Board at September’s retreat/meeting. This document will be used as a backdrop to prioritize NAGC’s objectives, and then the staff will develop a program of work. Green agreed to use the framework to build a draft budget and workplan for the Board’s review prior to the March Board meeting.

Del Siegle asked about two items in the strategic framework document: develop diverse talents or diversity of talents and gifted potential vs. potentiality. The Board did not make changes to the document at this time.

Nancy Green observed that the framework is challenging, in that projects at a variety of levels have been outlined—eg items in the strategic plan that are happening now, projects scheduled 6 months from now, and goals that will be finished 5 years from now. Jann Leppien suggested construction of a matrix to track projects and status. Green agreed to use this concept as a guiding principle—a matrix with annual targets, as a possible reporting mechanism for the Board.

5. President-Elect Report/Convention Update

5.1 Program Committee/Atlanta Planning

As first time Convention Program Chair, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked to use her time to seek ideas about the 2010 Atlanta Convention. Since pre-convention registrations have been low, she raised questions about what might be changed to attract additional attendees. She also suggested reducing the number of Board Institutes at Convention and encouraging Board members to collaborate. By expanding the concept of Board Institutes to Expert Perspectives, high profile, well-known names can be used as a draw. Olszewski-Kubilius explored the Renaissance idea from September's meeting: come together to conceptualize what a Renaissance for the field would look like. Several of our goals can be accomplished and pre-conference structure can be revitalized.

Sally Krisel added that it should not only be a Renaissance for the field of gifted education, but also for America/Society. The Board brainstormed ideas for speakers: Tyler Perry, Ben Carson, Ted Turner, Michelle Obama, MLK family, Dean Kamen (60 minutes interview), Debbie Allen, George Lucas (Edutopia)

Nancy Green mentioned that NAGC is collaborating with the Texas Association for Gifted and Talented (TAGT) to attract attendees to both conventions with a virtual component since overlap between the schedule dates exists.

6. Executive Director Report

6.1 Project Updates

Nancy Green shared that State of the States research and its companion overview piece, State of the Nation," have been completed and will be available during the convention. In a truly comprehensive way, NAGC has been pro-active about working with state affiliates and key leaders on common messages. A national release date for the study has been set for Thursday, November 12, 2009. This media event will be a call to action that will help to mobilize state affiliates that are starved for media awareness templates and tools.

Green noted the success of Webinars on Wednesdays, (WOW) sharing the webinar registration and participation numbers for each webinar, a breakdown of participation by state, and future webinar topics.

Jann Leppien asked if NAGC has thought about price for a professor to buy a webinar for an online course. Del Siegle doesn't agree with the current price (might be too high). He also suggested that NAGC examine popular Convention sessions and ask those presenters to be webinar presenters.

Green also distributed several letters that Jane Clarenbach and B&D have collaborated on to proactively communicate with Education Secretary Arne Duncan and other agencies about various policy initiatives affecting gifted learners.

6.2 NAGC Convention—By the Numbers

Green noted that attendees numbers look like they will hit just shy of the budget, but will be higher than last year in Tampa. The Board will receive an updated quarterly report when bills are paid and attendance numbers confirmed.

7. Financial Report

Andrew Bassett joined the Board meeting for this discussion

7.1 2008-09 Profit and Loss

Andrew Bassett and Jann Leppien updated the Board on NAGC's 2008-2009 profit and loss statements. Income was down 25% last year due to lower convention attendance in Tampa. A highlight of the year was publication sales. Due in large part to the *Mile Marker Series*, publication sales were up 28%. Expenses were down 7% as a result of cuts implemented throughout the year. The operating budget deficit was \$395,000 (which is lower than the \$500,000 deficit that was predicted). Some Board members who participated in the Finance conference call expressed discomfort at the budget deficit of almost \$400,000.

7.2 Investments Update

As of October 19, 2009, NAGC had approximately \$2.65 million in reserves. The majority of NAGC's reserves are managed by SunTrust Capital Management within the guidelines of NAGC's investment policy. The reserve funds are divided into three types of investments: short-term (supplemental cash), intermediate (bonds and certificate of deposits), and long-term reserves (fixed income securities). Compared to many other nonprofits, this is a relatively high level of reserve funds.

7.3 2009-2010 Budget Summary

NAGC is projecting a 17% increase in revenue compared to the actual FY08-09 amount, but a 17% decrease when compared to the FY08-09 budgeted revenue level. Higher attendance is expected for the St. Louis Convention and other professional development revenue (WOW) would add to the increase. Budgeted expenses are \$81,000 less than FY08 - 09 budgeted level, even after incorporating the \$100,000 cost of the B&D advocacy/alliance building contract into the operating budget (the B&D contract was previously funded from the reserves).

NAGC is in the last year of its office space lease. Andrew Bassett and Nancy Green will work on negotiating a much lower rent in the existing space and exploring other office options in a different location.

A serious discussion ensued about the budget deficit. Many comments reflected the unsustainable nature of continued deficits each year with no end in sight. Green provided some additional options for cuts, noting that most of the discretionary cuts made by the Board in the last fiscal year were maintained in the current budget. Furloughing and the possibility of staff cuts was suggested. Green noted that programs would need to follow.

Green also suggested that the budget is moving in the right direction, noting that that last year in Tampa, the convention had 1000 less attendees than budgeted; in St. Louis, there is only a 250 attendee shortfall. NAGC is also in a healthier place with reserves, since investments have begun to bounce back. Staff positions at NAGC were frozen and there was no cost of living increase or raises of any kind.

Discussion moved to the potential savings on office space when the lease expires in August, 2010. Andrew Bassett added that the savings on rent could be at least \$85,000.

The Board discussed options regarding NAGC's space in downtown Washington, DC. In terms of networking and advocacy, Carol Tieso asked what value does NAGC get from being downtown? Katie Augustyn asked if it was possible to get a smaller space in the current

building. The Board continued to weigh the pros and cons of moving versus staying in current space.

Motion by Del Siegle: to authorize Nancy Green and staff to investigate going outside of downtown DC and looking for long term savings as opposed to immediate savings.

Second: Cindy Sheets

More discussion occurred. Sally Krisel voiced that non-quantifiable factors (ability to attract and retain quality staff) must be taken into consideration. Other Board members shared that NAGC needs to be cautionary since the future financial picture is unknown. Del Siegle noted that what can be saved in rent can be spent on other things (like B&D). This discussion led to an amendment to the motion.

Amendment to motion: authorize Nancy Green and staff to explore options of moving outside of downtown DC as well as serious negotiation with current landlord.

Second: Cindy Sheets

Approved unanimously.

7.4 2010-2011 Budget Development Process

Andrew Bassett highlighted the planning steps outlined in the FY2010-2011 budget timeline. NAGC staff will review the strategic plan framework & propose a first draft of the budget that includes new programs, potential savings. This first phase of the timeline will be completed by the end of January 2010.

7.5 Setting Priorities—Funding New Projects

Budget line items for review:

Nancy handed out a list of budget cuts that were made last year after the November Board meeting, and noted that most are still in place. The Finance Committee asked the National Office to brainstorm any ideas to aid in balancing the budget/decreasing the deficit. Nancy shared some of the ideas on the table: paying off the membership database early than the amortization schedule, membership in NCATE, not having a face-to-face March Board meeting, advocacy (B&D), and subsidizing awards.

Cindy Sheets suggested converting printed publications (*Teaching and Parenting for High Potential* to electronic magazines). Jean Peterson said her first instinct is to protect staff. She asked what we could go without for a year, maybe awards.

Nancy Green said that GCQ is not really an option because it makes money and because of library subscriptions. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius observed that cuts/changes to *THP* and *PHP* are still options. Ann Robinson said that the Board doesn't have all the information needed to make cuts at the meeting. Criteria for cuts should be established. Some criteria to consider: When you make a cut, do you cut revenue? If you make a cut, can you restore the activity, product, service when finances bounce back? Does it cut a direct member service? Short-term implications? Long-term implications?

Jann Leppien emphasized that the Board's responsibility is to ensure that we don't have a sustained, significant deficit that continues to cut into reserves. Katie Augustyn challenged the Board to think of other ways to increase revenue. Jaime Castellano shared that he has faith in the executive director to refer to Board policy to take appropriate action. Del Siegle commented that expenses exceed income therefore something drastic must happen. Others noted that Networks should be more a part of the conversation as they benefit from NAGC services. Jean

Peterson reiterated transparency- if the Network membership knew about financial status of NAGC (members take organization for granted), they might step up with more support. Chairman Ann Robinson acknowledged the concerns expressed and provided direction to Green: Once convention figures are final, provide them to the Board and let's make some decisions with actual budget numbers. Additional conference calls will be held over the next 2 months.

BREAK

10:30 AM – 10:45 AM

8. Past President's Report

Del Siegle reminded the Board that one role of the Past President is to annually review the Executive Director's performance and assess how well the organization is doing. Del Siegle then called the Board's attention to several updated documents: the job description of the Executive Director, Board policy regarding the Executive Director, a proposed timeline of the Executive Director evaluation, a proposed performance review that current and immediate past board members will be asked to complete early next year, and a proposed performance review that staff will be asked to complete early next year.

Siegle highlighted some of the changes to this year's Executive Director performance review. He noted that Green will address her progress in each category of the strategic plan right on the modified evaluation form. He also mentioned the revised staff evaluation—noting that the form is different this year to reflect feedback on the culture of NAGC and the climate of the national office. The Review Committee will consist of NAGC officers who will review the compiled evaluations before the March Board meeting. Their report will be brought to the March Board meeting (confidential and private) for review and discussion by the full Board.

Siegle also mentioned another role of the Past President--to serve as the Elections Committee Chair. For the 2010 Board Elections, the following positions will be open for nomination: Treasurer, Governance Secretary, At-Large Members (2), Parent Representative, and State Representative.

9. Governance Update

9.2 Position Paper Update

Governance Secretary Kristen Stephens updated the Board on the status of three position papers. The 'Differentiation' paper (Carol Ann Tomlinson) is in process and more time is needed. The 'Competencies Needed by Teachers of the Gifted and Talented' paper (Ann Robinson, Diana Reeves, Susan Johnsen) is in process with initial discussions regarding the use of the term "competencies" and thus the "re-titling" of the paper. It is possible that this paper could come to the Board for discussion at the March meeting. The 'Pre-Service Teachers and Gifted Education' paper (Julia Roberts, Mary Slade, and Kristen Stephens) is in process. This paper emphasizes instructional strategies (pedagogy) and acknowledges that a federal mandate doesn't exist.

Break for lunch. Robinson suggested returning to Governance Report after the Legislative Update.

LUNCH

12 noon – 1:00 PM

10. Legislative Priorities for 2010

M. René Islas (B&D Consulting) and Jane Clarenbach joined the Board meeting for discussion of NAGC's advocacy agenda.

10.1 Legislative Accomplishments Memo 2009

René Islas first reviewed highlights from his October Progress Update Memo. He noted the renewed commitment from Sen. Dodd to include *Equity in Excellence* in the reauthorized version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA,) increased support of *Equity in Excellence* from Sen. Grassley, Rep. Payne, and Rep Guthrie, *Equity in Excellence* support from La Raza, Campaign for High School Equity, APA, and CEC, comprehensive advocacy strategy, strategic message points were designed to support NAGC's policy priorities, and continue attracting media coverage in key areas.

Nancy Green commended the Rapid Response Team (RRT) for their monthly efforts to support NAGC messages and outreach at the national level. Comprised of a variety of voices and perspectives from around the country representing different groups, (teacher, parent, and coordinator) and meet for a monthly call, the RRT helps to amplify NAGC's messages more effectively.

René Islas also shared progress on NAGC's work plan objectives. He expressed the level of urgency that NAGC faces with the funding of Javits. It was a devastating blow to have a new administration object to spending on that program. While Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) was able to retain Javits at its current level through a manager's amendment, a request like this cannot ensure funding repeatedly. NAGC must capitalize on policymakers' interests in order to protect support for gifted and talented education.

Comprehensive National Talent Development Strategy

Islas then shared a handout (attachment included with these minutes) proposing a Comprehensive National Talent Development Strategy with goals to: equalize access to G/T services across states, support research, development and dissemination of replicable talent development strategies, and provide support of high-potential students from at-risk backgrounds. Islas led a discussion of the proposed new features of the program, inviting comment and feedback on the document. Concerns were expressed about supplanting existing funding, rather than supplementing it. Kristen Stephens suggested modeling this concept after Race to the Top funds. Board also asked whether the price tag per pupil is too high. (\$300 million). Carol Tieso expressed that the problem is exacerbated between the "haves" and "have nots" (\$100 per student). In other word, schools already supporting gifted learners would receive support, thus exacerbating the disparity in funding rather than correcting it. Islas noted that the basic formula based on per pupil allocation (dollar amount) is still be worked out to ensure that it is reasonable.

A discussion on the reconstitution of the National Research Center then came up, as Nancy Green asked how the proposed strategy differs from the vision of the current NRC. While regional comprehensive centers would plan a role in dissemination, this would not replace the role of centers like Purdue and the College of William & Mary. Islas suggested that a competition for field based studies would still occur.

Islas thanked the Board for their general support and agreed to incorporate input into the next draft of the document, which would then come back to the Board for review and approval.

Board then returned to the Governance Report, led by Governance Secretary Kristen Stephens, who presented three items for action and discussion.

9.1 Legislative Committee Charge

By way of background since the September meeting, Stephens noted that the Board was asked to approve the revised charge of the Legislative Committee, which has been modified to reflect a broader role in advocacy efforts. This charge also leaves the leadership in setting NAGC's legislative agenda to the Board.

Del Siegle spoke in support of the new charge, agreeing that it is the Board's responsibility to set legislative agenda in conjunction with staff; not the Legislative Committee who sets the agenda. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius suggested a name change (legislative & advocacy committee) to reflect the broader charge. This name closely aligns with NAGC Board of Directors agenda.

Stephens presented the draft of the new charge:

New Charge: In conjunction with Board and staff, the Legislative and Advocacy Committee implements a wide range of advocacy initiatives that are closely aligned with the legislative agenda set by the Board. In conjunction with staff, the committee develops resources, samples, and training materials for direct and grassroots advocacy efforts and promotes education and action among the NAGC membership.

Motion: To approve the revised charge and name change from Legislative Committee to Legislative and Advocacy Committee.

Second: Lauri Kirsch
Approved unanimously.

Secretary Stephens then moved on to an update of NAGC Positions in progress.

9.2.1 CEC-TAG Growth Model Position

After a brief update by Stephens, the Board discussed NAGC's role in this paper, especially since it was developed without NAGC involvement. For example, if it is a joint paper, then everywhere it says CEC-TAG then NAGC needs to be listed. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius noted that NAGC should take a stand on this important topic. Should we write one ourselves or is this something we can support? Jann Leppien asked if it is in alignment with our thinking, stressing that she would rather have somebody in our field write it, but can support it because it's general enough.

Carol Tieso stated that if growth models are the future, then we need to be in front of that. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius noted again that while it is not an NAGC position, in the spirit of collaboration, we look at it differently as "NAGC supports what you're trying to do". Unless we're willing to write our own, we should foster the relationship and support it. Sally Krisel would support it in concept and applauds the efforts made by CEC-TAG.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked if Board support is contingent on changes in the document. She hopes that they would consider our comments, but she is willing to go ahead with it as is. The Board agreed and chose to move ahead with the following action:

Motion by Jann Leppien: that Kristen Stephens return to CEC-TAG with a question about some of the language, (in the 3rd bullet), and also seek clarification on what kind of endorsement CEC-TAG is seeking. eg Could we lend our support to the document in a role other than joint author?

Second: Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Abstention: Carol Tieso

9.2.2 Response to Intervention for Gifted Children position paper

Carol Tieso expressed that there are many problems with the paper (systematic needs: not specific enough on page 3, focus of interventions are so focused on behavioral; not clear on gifted). The underlying assumption is that the regular program is appropriate (not the case most of the time). Jann Leppien agreed with Tieso.

Lauri Kirsch spoke out in favor of supporting the document, viewing it as a beginning; time is of the essence that NAGC take a stand, so she recommends supporting it. Sally Krisel said that it is a position paper, not a manual or a how to. The opportunity is there for delineation. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius is fine with this for same reasons as growth model.

Motion by Del Siegle: that Kristen Stephens be given an opportunity to go back to TAG and and seek clarification on what kind of endorsement CEC-TAG is seeking.

Second: Kristen Stephens

Abstention: Carol Tieso

9.3 Gifted Terminology

Jann Leppien suggested some edits (motivation essential to achievement). Del Siegle encouraged edits—in this case, the paper is an NAGC product.

Motion by Del Siegle: to adopt the Gifted Terminology paper, contingent upon the group addressing the concerns expressed by the Board (re wording in 2nd paragraph-transition to adulthood)

Second: Carol Tieso

In favor: ALL

AFTERNOON BREAK

3:00 PM - 3:15 PM

11. Consent Agenda

11.4.3 Conceptual Foundations

Del Siegle noted that for a group to select someone then give someone an award, that we must craft response to them. Siegle also acknowledged the complaints in their report (network social, cumbersome programming).

11.4.12 Research & Evaluation

Del Siegle noted the problems the Research & Evaluation network had with the conference proposal system. Nancy Green emphasized that Derrick Johnson will shepherd the 2010 process and it will be different than last year.

Jean Peterson acknowledged the role of networks in the convention program; someone needs to be avant-garde. Kristen Stephens asked if there is listserv capability available on our website. Del Siegle suggested that all networks have Facebook pages. Lauri Kirsch asked how we can bring networks together. Carol Tieso is going to survey membership about networks. Tieso also noted that she blogs after each Board meeting about NCC representation, provides new

documents (e.g. SIG application), and highlights programs (e.g. NCC referral program). Paula Olszewski-Kubilius is willing to give this whole structure a chance to work.

11.1.1 GCQ Report

Nominations for GCQ paper of the year should include nominations from anyone. Procedures can be modified, but needs Board approval. This needs to be communicated to Carolyn Callahan and team after Sidney Moon becomes Association Editor.

12. New Business/Setting Priorities

NCATE report

Ann Robinson called the Board's attention to the NCATE report, submitted by Richard Olenchak, NAGC's designated liaison. Robinson noted that NCATE is negotiating a more formal relationship with TEAC around a shared vision and potential unified accreditation system. This will have implications for NAGC and other SPAs. Redesign ideas are already in the works. She agreed to keep the Board Posted.

12.1 Dues model that includes network membership

Network representative Carol Tieso requested support from the Board to move ahead with a formal proposal to adopt a "Network Inclusive" Membership Model. Currently, 1253 of NAGC's 6,000 members are also members of at least one network. If network membership is included in a single membership price, will this model increase participation?

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius urged the Board to pursue; network membership is too complicated the way it is. A simplified system is necessary. She is deeply concerned that some networks put out products and some don't; what are the guaranteed services? After some discussion the Board supported the concept.

Motion by Paula Olszewski-Kubilius: to authorize Nancy Green to assess general membership regarding network membership and services to collect data and bring a budget and proposal back to March meeting.

Second: Sally Krisel

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.



NAGC BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
 Saturday, September 19, 2009
 (7 PM – 10 PM)
 Sunday, September 20, 2009
 (10 AM – 12:30 PM)

American Room
 Westin Peachtree Plaza
 Atlanta, Georgia

Final Minutes

Saturday, September 19, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ann Robinson called the meeting to order at 7:40 PM

Board Present: Ann Robinson (President), Paula Olszewski-Kubilius (President-Elect), Del Siegle (Past President), Kristen Stephens (Governance Secretary), Jann Leppien (Treasurer), Katie Augustyn, Lauri Kirsch, Sally Krisel, Stuart Omdal, Jean Peterson, Cindy Sheets, Carol Tieso

Not present: Jaime Castellano

Staff Present: Nancy Green, Rachel Coleman

1. Approval of Minutes

1.1 March 2009 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Motion: To approve the March 2009 Board of Directors meeting minutes made by Lauri Kirsch

Second: Del Siegle

Discussion: Del Siegle asked whether the board-approved position paper on assessment will appear in *Gifted Child Quarterly*, along with other NAGC position papers as they are approved. This idea was presented to the Board in March and Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, speaking as a former GCQ editor, noted that it would be possible for the position paper to appear in GCQ on a space available basis, potentially with a byline. This is an exception to the June 15, 2009 Board vote that makes provisions to acknowledge the contributions of authors in general without listing specific names.

Action: Staff agreed to follow up to determine cost and space implications.

The minutes were approved unanimously.

1.2 Board/Organization Actions since March 2009

a. Structure for Position Papers Vote

Since the last Board meeting, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius circulated draft language for a Board policy on the structure for NAGC position papers. After discussion and informal feedback, a final version of the policy was approved on June 15, 2009.

Eleven (11) Board members were in favor of making provisions to acknowledge the contributions of authors in general without listing specific names. Five (5) Board members voted to make provisions to acknowledge the contributions of specific authors by name. One (1) Board member did not support either option. One (1) Board member did not vote.

b. Regulations change

During the 2009 Board of Directors Elections, a regulations change was proposed on the ballot. The proposal was to rename and reposition a Board officer position (from NAGC Vice President to NAGC President-Elect) ensuring that the President-Elect automatically becomes President after serving a two-year term.

The revised language now states: The President-Elect shall automatically succeed to the office of the President upon expiration of the President's term of office. The President-Elect shall assume and perform the duties of the President in the event of the absence or incapacity of the President. Should the office of the President become vacant, the President-Elect shall become the President immediately and shall serve both the unexpired portion of the previous President's term and the elected term.

The voting period ended July 13, 2009 with 87% of members voting in favor of the regulations modification.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked for clarification about the position paper structure and was informed that the policy is now in effect and ready to use.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: To approve the Board agenda made by Jann Leppien

Second: Lauri Kirsch

The agenda was approved by unanimous vote.

3. President's Report

President Ann Robinson began by thanking the Board for proposing the regulations change (Vice President to President-Elect). This change connects the Vice President's role to the Presidency and ensures continuity. She is delighted to have a fully functioning team member as her President-Elect, and observed that the opportunity to collaborate now increases because of the clear relationship between these two key positions.

Robinson announced that she is on sabbatical for the year. For Summer and Fall 2009, she will be live in Wyoming and only be in Little Rock, Arkansas at her Center for an NCATE visit. From mid-December to mid-February, she will be in Australia. She will return to the US for March 2010 in order to participate in NAGC-related activities including the Affiliates Conference, the NAGC Board Meeting and the collaborative initiative with the US Department of Education, the National Research Center on the

Gifted and Talented, and the American Psychological Association. She will be in the UK at the University of Cambridge for a few weeks in Spring 2010. Executive Director Nancy Green has been talking with Ann Robinson about a communications plan using Skype while she is out of the States. As per the Regulations, the President-Elect can step in so there is no delay in response or actions in the absence of the President.

Robinson announced her Presidential initiatives:

1. Expand the publication library of NAGC (ensure that books go into the pipeline) by 10%.
2. Focus attention on NAGC's work with administrators. While gains have been made with the Superintendents' Forum, a national strategy needs to be implemented. A rich opportunity also exists with principals because they have the potential to be political allies and stakeholders. With attention focused on administrators who are key gatekeepers for services and educational decisions, NAGC can potentially expand its influence and reach.
3. Collaboration between the U.S. Department of Education, the National Research Center, NAGC, and APA on the work of Carol Dweck.

Robinson sees a link between Carol Dweck's work and NAGC, and mentioned that she is working with Pat Johnson, Carolyn Callahan, and Rena Subotnik, on a project related to translating Dweck's work into a publication with wide relevance to the field and to NAGC.

Robinson will announce two other Presidential initiatives later in her term. These initiatives will be crafted around standards and advocacy.

3.1 Organization Committee Appointments

President Robinson shared with the Board that 45 people volunteered for committee service in addition to the more than 100 who are already serving. She explained that she worked to accommodate preferences by renewing members who requested it, and working closely with the Leadership Development Committee to honor the first choice of applicants, if possible. It was a very inclusive process.

Since most chair positions are co-terminus with a president's term, Robinson carefully considered renewing some chair positions and appointing new leaders to others.

The Board was asked if they had any changes to the committee rosters. Del Siegle noted that the Legislative Co-Chair was not named as such (Rebecca Odoardi). Kristen Stephens shared that Debra Troxclair is now at Lamar University.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked how the number of volunteer applications compared to last year. Nancy Green shared that more than 75 people applied in 2008 and there were 45 applicants in 2009. Del Siegle mentioned hearing some confusion over the re-application process, pointing out that more could be done next year to communicate the process.

Motion: to accept slate as presented by Ann Robinson so moved by Del Siegle

Second: Katie Augustyn

The rosters of committee appointments were approved unanimously.

The Board was asked to send in their preferences for Board Committee assignments before the meeting. Not everyone had responded so a sign up sheet was passed around for Board members to rank their committee preferences—for Governance, Finance and Elections.

3.2 Association Editor

President Robinson suggested that the board minutes reflect appreciation to Bonnie Cramond, Jann Leppien, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, and Jaime Castellano for participating on the Association Editor Selection Committee.

Action: to accept Sidney Moon's application to the position of association editor (no motion since the proposed action came out of committee.)

Sidney Moon was selected unanimously to begin her term as Association Editor on January 1, 2010.

4. Guidelines on Acceleration Policy

Nick Colangelo was invited to Atlanta to update the Board on the status of the "*Guidelines for Developing an Academic Acceleration Policy*." President Robinson thanked Nick for coming and congratulated him on the comprehensive work that has been completed so quickly. Colangelo provided background and stated that having written guidelines gives schools rationale and research that can and should be considered as part of a comprehensive gifted program.

Nick Colangelo thanked the Board and remarked that his time as Association Editor has been one of the best experiences he has had in his career.

He then provided an overview of the Guidelines process, mentioning that he has received good editorial comments from Jane Clarenbach on the document, and that NAGC had done a survey to parents, state affiliates and other stakeholders. Rosanne Malek, current chair of the Council of State Directors, also sent the guidelines out to state directors nationwide. Colangelo expressed a positive view of the final product, as it includes a variety of viewpoints, and input from many stakeholders. Colangelo then opened it up to questions.

Del Siegle inquired about the distribution plan for the document. Colangelo urged wide access and mentioned that NAGC has agreed with this concept. The Guidelines will not be sold, but rather distributed for free as a service. Nancy Green shared NAGC's plan to have the Guidelines printed (without appendices) for dissemination to convention attendees in St. Louis. Green mentioned that the plan is for NAGC and IRPA to share the printing costs, which Green estimated will be no more than \$2000.

Siegle had editorial comments. He suggested that since not all schools use composite scores to take out composite on page 1. Siegle also didn't agree with the definition of profoundly gifted (99.9 percentile) on page 5. Jann Leppien suggested that the appendix include Rtl to open up audience (search capability). Ann Robinson suggested adding associate dean as Pam Clinkenbeard's title.

Further positive comments were expressed—regarding the inclusion of state directors in the process, the accessible format of the document (especially the checklist), and the desire to disseminate it widely. Colangelo again expressed appreciation for the

comments and reinforced the potential for impact if it gets into the hands of school leaders. At the end of the discussion, Colangelo left the meeting.

Motion by Jann Leppien: to approve the Guidelines for Developing an Academic Acceleration Policy as presented by the National Work group, and to support the concept of wide dissemination on a complimentary basis.

Second: Carol Tieso

Discussion: Jann Leppien requested more specific budget implications, definition of complimentary basis, and stated that the printing should be a line item for the Board to approve. Green noted that besides printing costs for copies to distribute at Convention, no other costs are envisioned. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius suggested that Nick Colangelo and the Belin Center should cover additional costs because they have grant money to support the printing. Green agreed to check into this. A suggestion was made that Joel McIntosh of Prufrock Press might wish to sponsor dissemination of the document.

Motion to amend by Jann Leppien: to approve the Guidelines for Developing an Academic Acceleration Policy as presented by the National Work group, and to support the concept of wide dissemination.

The motion as amended was unanimously passed.

5. Past President's Report

Del Siegle called the Board's attention to key issues and actions from the past year in the context of his presidential initiatives. In particular, he focused on Item #3 of his report (promoting advocacy within and outside NAGC). To bring the whole Board up to speed, he shared news about the tremendous legislative challenge that Javits reauthorization faced this year. The Administration first zeroed out funding and the House followed suit. At the final key House subcommittee stage, the University of Connecticut contacted Representative Rosa DeLauro (Rep. from CT), who convinced the chair to include an earmark through a manager's amendment. The level of "arm twisting" required to secure funding this year does not bode well for the future success of Javits, and Siegle urged the Board to consider broader legislative approaches in the coming year.

Some strategic questions raised for the Board to consider: What are the components of the strongest package of services for gifted learners? What are the initiatives around legislation that we would like to see? The answers to the questions involve service-minded, pragmatic projects with a strong evaluation component built in.

Siegle mentioned that René Islas (B&D) has offered to do a board webinar to present a continuum of options, and to explain more fully the "Javits in Jeopardy" handout that was distributed to the Board. Board members agreed that this would be a good next step in exploring and better understanding the issue. Green agreed to schedule this webinar with Islas' in the next few weeks.

6. National Office Update

Nancy Green shared some highlights from her report, and also raised key issues that require input from the Board between the September and November Board meetings. First, she shared a snapshot of NAGC's publications statistics. The highlight for the year has been the Mile Marker Series; since November, 2008, NAGC has sold 1,800 copies for total sales of \$43,388). Other high sellers include sets of NAGC's Frequently Asked Questions and *Best Practices in Gifted Education*. Green shared some of the challenges related to growing *Parenting for High Potential*, and increasing parent memberships. This member segment has proved to be the toughest to grow, in spite of a redesigned publication and our special \$10 state affiliate partner membership rate. Although these challenges are present, ad sales revenue have increased.

Green updated the Board on her trip to Austin, Texas after reminding the Board that both the TAGT and NAGC conventions are scheduled the same week in 2010. The purpose of the Austin visit was to define a partnership with Texas that will support exhibitors and speakers who typically participate in both venues. Green was positive about the ideas that resulted from the face-to-face dialogue.

Green also shared that NAGC's office lease is up August 30, 2010, and that she and the staff are considering two options:

1. Stay in the current space at a renegotiated rate. After renegotiating with the current landlord, the office went from \$49/ sq ft (\$171,000/year) to \$37/ sq ft (\$129,200/year). This would be an annual savings of \$42,000.
2. NAGC could move to a cheaper building and take a smaller footprint. Larger potential savings over the long term, but no savings realized immediately.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked about the cost of moving--stationery, relocation/moving costs. Stuart Omdal added that numerous national organizations aren't located with DC. Ann Robinson asked Nancy Green to provide more details, which Green agreed to do as part of the November Board agenda.

7. Treasurer's Report

Treasurer Jann Leppien shared with the Board that NAGC's audit is scheduled during the weeks of October 12 and October 19.

7.1 Overview of 2008-2009 Year-End Projections

Leppien also shared that NAGC's income is down 25%. The projected operating deficit is \$398K, but after factoring in the B&D line item the deficit is projected at \$510K. It is also expected that there will be a 7% decrease in expenses as a result of mid-year reductions recommended by staff and the Board of Directors.

7.2 2009-2010 Approved Budget

Leppien asked Nancy Green about the Live Learning Center (LLC) in the 2009-2010 Budget because there is no number associated with it. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked about LLC/webinar revenue. The FY09-10 includes a \$10,000 LLC revenue line item (in professional development) with a \$10K projected revenue over and above anticipated LLC expenses for the year.

7.3 Investments

Leppien explained the three types of NAGC's investments: short-term, intermediate, and long-term reserve funds.

There is about \$2.3 million among these three investments.

There is \$260K in NAGC's short term money market funds, \$1,246,000 in intermediate bonds and CDs, and \$779,000 in long-term bonds and equities. The total reserve funds as of August 31, 2009 are \$2.3 million. Reserves are down \$184,846 from last year.

7.4 Budget Planning

Leppien shared the 2010-2011 budget timeline. At the next Board meeting, there will be discussion of course corrections and the Board can begin to look at the 2010-2011 budget. At the March meeting the audit report will be shared.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM.

Sunday, September 20, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ann Robinson called the meeting to order 10:03 AM.

8. Approval of Consent Agenda

Committee reports pulled: 8.1 Awards Committee, 8.2 Development Committee, 8.7a Higher Education Opportunities Act Workgroup, and 8.12 Math/Science Task Force

Motion: To accept the consent agenda, moved by Lauri Kirsch

Second: Carol Tieso

8.2 Development Committee

This report was pulled to clarify questions raised by former committee chair, Shelagh Gallagher about the role of the Development Committee. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius requested clarification about charge and purpose. Ann Robinson responded that a new committee chair, Wendy Behrens, is taking a leadership role in shaping a plan that will be brought to the Board in March.

Nancy Green also provided additional context, explaining some of the issues: whether annual giving falls within the purview of the Development Committee, how to expand the Javits Frasier fundraising effort, and other short term versus longer term goals. The Board suggested exploring grant writing and fundraising for internal events. Further, print materials are needed, as well as a big-picture vision. Green agreed to share this guidance with the chair as the group begins its work to develop a fundraising plan.

Jann Leppien left the Board meeting to catch her flight.

8.1 Awards Committee

In Felicia Dixon's report, a change to the A. Harry Passow Award is proposed. The Committee recommends that the Board approve a change in criteria for the award—

suggesting that enrollment in a graduate program not be required. They submitted a modified review form to reflect the changes, which the Board reviewed.

Motion: To approve recommended changes to the A. Harry Passow Award, moved by Del Siegle

Second: Cindy Sheets

Discussion: Robinson shared background on the Award, noting that its original intent was teacher recognition. She noted that back in the 1990's Elaine Dumas, NAGC Board Secretary at the time, suggested that teachers be recognized by NAGC in some way, so a teacher award was put forward. Harry Passow was on the Board at the time. After he passed away, the award was named in his honor.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked if there had been any family input to the nature of the award. She sees no problem with changing the award as long as it is in line with the family's intent.

Other Board members expressed hesitation over the modified review form. Del Siegle suggested that the NAGC membership requirement be at least three years. Lauri Kirsch agreed, emphasizing that length of membership shows commitment to a professional organization and to the field. Kristen Stephens and Cindy Sheets also agreed and added that the review form should evaluate evidence of student impact instead of outstanding student performance.

Nancy Green shared that NAGC is not receiving many applications. The Board asked Green to check on the family's involvement. It was suggested to ask Rose Rudnitski or Sandy Kay, a longtime student and friend of Passow's.

Amendment to motion: Motion to modify criteria for the A. Harry Passow Award to recognize an outstanding teacher who has been a member of NAGC for at least 3 years. In addition, modify criteria to evaluate evidence of student impact. (Last bullet, criteria #2—see review/response sheet.)

Motion: Del Siegle

Second: Stuart Omdal

All in favor to amend motion: Unanimously

Approve motion as amended: Unanimously approved

8.7a Higher Education Opportunities Act (HEOA) Workgroup

This report was pulled because it contained an action item requesting approval of the "Common Core."

Ann Robinson provided background on the workgroup, which emerged from the Legislative Committee. They are now seeking to respond quickly to the new HEOA language that requires Schools of Education to provide educational content on the needs of gifted learners. To this end, they're working to identify teacher education courses, sample syllabi, suggestions for units and activities, and related material. Since this language has been included in the Act, they anticipate that deans and program directors will seek content and materials on working with our population of children. The goal of the Workgroup is to make it easy for them to get the information they need from NAGC.

Lauri Kirsch expressed concern about a potential unintended consequence; that with this pre-service training, gifted teachers and policy makers will perceive that teachers do not need a requirement for in-depth endorsement. Robinson replied that this is targeted toward pre-service training, so the issue should not readily come up. Carol Tieso also noted that the outcomes for preservice teachers were minimal, so they are not likely to be viewed as sufficient. Lauri's concerns were duly noted and care will be taken in the ways the materials will be presented to university preparation programs.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius emphasized that NAGC has an opportunity to create materials that could be sent to pre-service educators, and that the organization could have an impact through product development. Kristen Stephens shared that she is working on revising position papers and proposed that the message about the need for endorsement could be reinforced there. The Board agreed that it will be important to have the tools ready, and also to work to increase awareness.

Motion To approve the Common Core Knowledge and Skill Standards in Gifted Education for All Teachers as presented by the HEOA Workgroup, and to approve the development of support materials for regular education teacher preparation programs as soon as possible, but no later than early 2011.

Motion: Carol Tieso

Second: Katie Augustyn

In favor: 10 (unanimous)

8.7 Legislative Committee

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius pulled this report from the consent agenda because it is clear that the Committee is seeking guidance from the Board in order to move ahead with a clear vision for the charge of the Committee.

Olszewski-Kubilius noted that, with the addition of B&D to facilitate legislative strategy, it makes sense for the charge for this committee to be adjusted to include a broader advocacy agenda.

Green agreed that the Legislative Committee's recent work on the advocacy toolkit is a good example of a broader scope of work. Katie Augustyn then asked about how B&D gets direction. Ann Robinson replied that Nancy Green, Jane Clarenbach, and the Committee Chair set direction with the Board. The committee assists in carrying out direction.

Robinson noted that it's also true that the Committee will respond by mobilizing the grassroots during legislative emergencies, and that the Legislative Action Network is used as a dissemination tool to get out the messages delivered by the Committee Chair or by the National Office. Green agreed that current chair Sally Reis has been proactive in this leadership role.

Based on the discussion, Kristen Stephens offered to review and amend the current charge, noting that guidance and messaging documents about advocacy could be provided to other committees and to outside stakeholder groups like the State Directors.

Action: Kristen Stephens will work on policy for the Board to review in November.

8.12 Math/Science Task Force

This committee report was pulled by Chair Ann Robinson because of the feedback requested in many areas. Each topic is dealt with here as it appeared in the report.

Becoming a Network:

Ann Robinson asked if the Board decision was not communicated to task force. (Board voted unanimously in March, 2009 to recommend that this Task Force become a Special Interest Group.) She also asked if the structure is in place to formally encourage the SIG process. Carol Tieso shared that the SIG application process is in place and the Math/Science Task Force can apply.

New NCTM Publication to Co-Sponsor: This request needs to go to Publications Committee, so Green agreed to check on where the process currently stands.

1999 NCTM/NAGC book: The book is out of print, and so the request for NAGC to publish without royalties may not be feasible. Staff agreed to check on whether NCTM has any interest at all in printing on demand. If that is the case, then the manuscript will be sent to the Publications Committee for review.

STEM Education Coalition: The Math/Science Task Force asked if NAGC has joined, and the answer from staff is yes.

White Paper Co-sponsorship: The Math/Science Task Force would like to know if NAGC will seek co-sponsorship with a number of groups. Green noted that this is a resource issue, and also dependent on a larger strategy for partnership. The Board supported some partnerships; Ann Robinson requested that CCSSO be pulled off of the list because we are already pursuing a larger agenda with school administrators and the white paper co-sponsorship could be folded into that effort.

Position statement: The Executive Summary for the white paper could possibly also serve as a position statement. The Math/Science Task Force would like to know the process and structure of NAGC's position statements. Kristen Stephens will send the format to Linda Sheffield.

New Publications: The Math/Science Task Force suggested a special issue on promising math and science students in *Teaching for High Potential* and/or *Parenting for High Potential*. Del Siegle stated that special (topical) issues of *THP* and *PHP* are field independent. We can give direction on who they can approach; they can contact the editors.

Green will work with Ann Robinson to send a letter in response to all items.

9. Network Communications Committee (NCC) Report

Carol Tieso provided an update on the Network Communications Committee, the leadership group that facilitates partnerships and information-sharing across networks, created during Del Siegle's presidency.

Tieso noted that there have been some changes to the original group, since at least two of the representatives now serve on the Board. Currently no less than 7 members may serve; each member represents 2 networks.

The recommendation from network leadership was to do a better job of serving membership as a whole. Steps to improve this include: finalizing the SIG application, creating the NCC request form (networks with new ideas would submit them first to the NCC), explaining the proposal review process (special session at convention).

Nancy Green raised the issue of raising dues with the suggestion of wrapping network membership into the cost of membership. The Board seemed to be in favor of including network membership in regular membership, but asked for more data.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius suggested an alternative of 3 networks for \$25 in addition to the price of membership. The issue of whether and how much revenue networks would receive in this new model needs to be considered.

Carol Tieso suggested a Network Leadership Retreat; a time to do strategic planning (keen on facilitation not oversight). The retreat would focus of roles of committees vs. networks because there seems to be overlap. This could be a time for chairs to sit down together to eliminate overlap and collaborate. The Board agreed that this is a good idea to consider when travel funds become available.

11. New Business

Motion: by Del Siegle to adopt the conceptual strategic framework created with Marsha Rhea.

Second: Lauri Kirsch

10. Governance Update

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius updated the Board on the status of the CEC/TAG endorsed papers.

The two pressing NAGC policy issues are: the executive director succession and search process and a publications policy. The publications policy will be discussed with Sidney Moon when she becomes Association Editor in January. The March Board meeting will contain an agenda item on succession policy.

10.1 Terminology Task Force

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius provided background on the Terminology Task Force. This group was asked to create common terminology for the field to use—especially with outside stakeholders.

Jean Peterson and others on the Board requested additional time to review the paper. Robinson agreed, and added it as an action item for the November Board meeting. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius suggested keeping the group active for now and stated that she would have the authors make revisions upon request.

12. Future Meeting Dates

The next Board meeting will be held Wednesday, November 4, 2009 in St. Louis. If money is available for a March meeting, it will be held on March 6-7, 2010, in conjunction with Super Weekend in Crystal City, Virginia.

Meeting adjourned 11:58 AM

Present: George Betts, Sally Krisel, Catherine Little, Sylvia Rimm, Dina Brulles, Kim Chandler, Keri Guilbault, Brian Housand, Michael Matthews, Jonathan Plucker, Michelle Swain, and M. René Islas (*ex-officio*)

Not Present: Joy Davis, James Moore (*ex-officio*)

Staff Present: Cathleen Healy

Board Actions

Consent Agenda

March 2017 Meeting Minutes

Approval of Agenda

Sally Krisel moves to approve the consent agenda. Michelle Swain seconds the motion.

Sylvia Rimm amends the motion to approve consent agenda with additions to the meeting agenda—the addition of items 3.4 and 3.5. Catherine Little seconds the motion.

MOTION PASSES

President's Report

George Betts and Brian Housand provided an update on the Whole Gifted Child Task Force.

President-Elect Report

The Awards Nominations were presented.

Sally Krisel makes a motion to present Joyce VanTassel-Baska with the Ann F. Isaacs Founder's Memorial Award. Michelle Swain seconds the motion.

MOTION PASSES

Networks Update

Kim Chandler presented an overview of the Network Representative Report.

Catherine Little motions to dissolve the Middle Grades Network based on policy for dissolution. Brian Housand seconds the motion.

Discussion follows.

MOTION PASSES (*with Jonathan Plucker voting against and Sylvia Rimm abstaining*)

Governance Report

Catherine Little shared the Governance Items Outline, and two amendments to regulations to ensure that NAGC's commitment to non-discrimination is reflected in the organization's regulations and policy, and to ensure that regulations regarding dues are up to date to include all membership categories.

Catherine Little moves to amend 4.2 non-discrimination language. Sally Krisel seconds the motion.

Non-discrimination language

4.2 Proposed new language:

Any individual or organization desiring to foster the purposes of this Association shall be eligible for membership regardless of race, religion, cultural background, ethnicity, nationality, disability, gender, age, marital and family status, socio-economic status, or sexual orientation or gender identity.

MOTION PASSES

Catherine Little moves to a 4.4 membership dues language. Sylvia Rimm seconds the motion.

Membership dues

4.4 Proposed new language:

Dues are payable to the Association. Fees for student, parent, institutional, and lifetime membership categories will be set as a percentage or multiple of the regular membership fee.

MOTION PASSES

The proposed non-discrimination policy was discussed. The NAGC Board Policy 2.7 articulates NAGC's commitment to non-discrimination in membership, programs, and practices.

Catherine Little moves to adopt the Non-Discrimination Policy and statement. Sylvia Rimm seconds the motion.

The National Association for Gifted Children does not discriminate for reasons of race, religion, cultural background, ethnicity, disability, gender, age, marital and family status, socio-economic status, or sexual orientation or gender identity in membership or in any of its programs or practices. This policy covers all entities of NAGC, including its Governing Bodies, Networks, Committees, Task Forces, and the National Office.

MOTION PASSES

An update to the 9.3 Network Elections policy was discussed.

Catherine Little moves to update the Network Elections Policy. Michelle Swain seconds the motion.

Proposed possible adjustment/revision:

NAGC will cover convention expenses upon presentation of original receipts for travel and hotel for chair or one officer of the Network who has satisfied annual reporting requirements. Reimbursement amounts per chair/officer will not exceed \$500 and are contingent on annual budget determinations. If a chair chooses to stay outside the official NAGC hotel block as designated in conference materials, he/she will not be reimbursed for sleeping room expenses.

MOTION PASSES

Update to the language for Board Member Policy was discussed. Current NAGC Regulations and Policy articulate expectations and responsibilities for the Board of Directors. Implications of not fulfilling these responsibilities are more sparsely addressed or absent. Although Regulations include language for how officers may be removed for cause, such language does not appear in Regulations or Policy for the other members of the Board of Directors. Adding this language to the policies, which specify responsibilities for each of the other Board roles, would provide consistency.

Catherine Little moves to add language to Policies 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5 which is adapted directly from the NAGC Regulations regarding removing an officer for cause. The motion is seconded.

VIII. REMOVAL

Board Members may be removed for cause only. By petition of a majority of the members of the Board of Directors, the Board may consider removing any Board Member. Upon receipt of such a petition, the President (or President-Elect, if it is the President who is charged) shall convene the Board to conduct a hearing on the matter. The Board Member who is charged may also make a defense statement to the assembled Board and/or be represented by counsel at his/her own expense. At least two-thirds of the Board members must be present at the hearing. The Board will render its decision in writing at the close of the special meeting, unless the Board determines by a vote of those present that further investigation is necessary. The Board need only state a general reason for removal in its written decision, which should remain confidential. Only those Board Members who are present for the hearing will be eligible to vote. The vote for removal must be approved by two-thirds of the members of the Board who are present at the special meeting.

MOTION PASSES



BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Saturday, March 6, 2010 (1 PM – 5:45 PM)
Sunday, March 7, 2010 (8 AM – 2:30 PM)
Hyatt Regency Crystal City, Fairfax Room
Arlington, Virginia

DRAFT Minutes

Saturday, March 6, 2010 – Day 1

CALL TO ORDER

President Ann Robinson called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

Board Present: Ann Robinson (President), Paula Olszewski-Kubilius (President-Elect), Del Siegle (Past President), Kristen Stephens (Governance Secretary), Jann Leppien (Treasurer), Katie Augustyn, Jaime Castellano, Lauri Kirsch, Sally Krisel (late flight), Stuart Omdal, Jean Peterson, Cindy Sheets, Carol Tieso

Staff Present: Nancy Green, Rachel Coleman

Guests: Susan Johnsen, Baylor University (Program Standards presentation only), Jane Clarenbach (also for Program Standards presentation only)

2. Approval of Minutes

2.1 November 2009 Board of Directors Meeting

The following changes were made to the November 2009 Board of Directors meeting minutes:

- The members of the Advanced Standards workgroup include: Cheryll Adams, Connie Phelps, Susan Johnsen, Joyce VanTassel-Baska and Ann Robinson; NOT Scott Peters, Penny Kolloff, or Laurie Croft who are working on the new Higher Education outcomes for pre-service teachers.
- On page 8, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius' first name was misspelled (Paulla).
- On page 10, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius' last name was misspelled (Kubiluiss).

Motion made by Katie Augustyn: to approve the amended minutes

Second: Del Siegle

Vote: unanimous

2.2.1 Board Speakers Program

At its November 2009 meeting, the NAGC Development Committee proposed a fundraising concept that would expand the Board speakers program to include any Board member from the past 10 years. Affiliates and outside organizations with a focus on gifted would pay \$1,000 to book one of these speakers, which would be returned to NAGC in the form of a donation. The concept of the revised NAGC Expert Speakers Program was voted on and passed via electronic ballot sent between meetings.

Nancy Green distributed a flyer with details about the modified speakers program. The new concept of \$1,000/speaking engagement was incorporated into the 2010-2011 budget with an \$8,000 commitment to revenue. By expanding the program, more speakers can present at more conferences, including state affiliate conferences. Green made the point that affiliates still have an opportunity to book a speaker at half price if they go through the Board program. Jaime Castellano asked where the money generated from the speakers program would go. Nancy Green responded that the money could either go in the general fund or speakers could earmark where they'd like the money to go (e.g., Frasier, other restricted funds, fund of their choice).

3. Approval of Agenda

President Robinson noted the full agenda and asked the Board of Directors to be respectful of times posted on the agenda. She also reviewed items requiring votes or resolutions.

Motion by Jann Leppien: to approve the agenda

Second: Stuart Omdal

Vote: unanimous

4. NAGC President's Report

President Robinson noted progress on presidential initiatives and referred the Board specifically to Page 3 of her report for input.

Since November's report, progress has been made on the collaborative project with the U.S. Department of Education, the NRC/GT, and the American Psychological Association. With regular phone calls among the planning group (Ann Robinson, Carolyn Callahan, Rena Subotnik and Pat Johnson), the project has been moving along. She noted the list of participants in her report—key scholars outside the field, researchers within the field, and case authors.

In response to a question about whether and how Dweck's work can be applied in the context of gifted education, Robinson noted that the case authors will be tasked with practical application—this third group of people are skilled in translating difficult research and policy ideas that can be used in districts, teacher prep programs, and in real world situations that compel us to be interested (underachievement, young children, use of executive function). Invited: Del Siegle, Carol Tomlinson, Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Pam Clinkenbeard, Margie Kitano.

Robinson asked for ideas on the best ways to reach the people in leadership positions about Dweck's work and its implications (i.e., reach leaders at the state level; promote to state affiliates).

Several questions came up as part of the Board discussion, as outlined below:

Del Siegle asked why NAGC should promote Dweck's work over others.

Robinson clarified that when the offer was presented to her, it included Dweck's work. We were asked by the DOE to be a collaborator on this project. The Javits project was going to focus on Dweck's work with or without NAGC's involvement.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius commented that Dweck is a solid researcher. Olszewski-Kubilius' understanding of the project is a book, not just about Dweck, but other social scientists' work and how it relates to gifted research. Robinson reiterated that it is an opportunity for the field of gifted to have input.

Jean Peterson noted that sometimes the best ideas come from outside the field, and she is encouraged to hear that we're moving in a different direction; collaborative projects enhance the NAGC mission.

Carol Tieso clarified that nothing will be rolled out until the 3rd group finishes its work. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius said for this to be useful to our membership, we need to offer recommendations about interventions in learning situations based on their work (roll out into presentations, curricula, webinars). Stuart Omdal reiterated Carol Tieso's comment that when project components are conceptualized, that will determine the final product and involvement of NAGC

Cindy Sheets asked for further clarification regarding the timeline and when members would be informed. Robinson responded that she would prefer to inform people that the project is under way; she is uncomfortable with going through the whole process and showing up with an end product without anyone having prior knowledge of NAGC's role in its development.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius noted that in order for this work to be translatable, case authors need to focus on recommendations for interventions that will change the perceptions of teachers and others. Robinson asked the Board to email her recommendations to communicate to the other collaborators after giving the issue further thought.

Susan Johnsen and Jane Clarenbach arrived 2:18 pm. President's report to be continued.

5. Revisions to Pre-K-12 Program Standards

Susan Johnsen thanked the Board for the opportunity to present the revisions to the Pre-K-12 Program Standards. She began her presentation by acknowledging the standards revision workgroup members, NAGC-CEC teacher preparation standards members, contributing authors, and NAGC staff for their work on such a significant project.

She reviewed with the Board that the purpose for these standards is to reach consensus on outcomes for GT students among professionals in the field. The intent of the standards is to enhance GT student outcomes through the schools' use of effective practices. The purpose of revising the standards was to align the Pre-K Program Standards with the NAGC-CEC Teacher Preparation Standards and to reflect current research.

Johnsen walked the Board through the difference between the current and revised standards and provided an overview of each revised standard. Jaime Castellano thanked Susan and the workgroup for explicit alignment and attention to diversity. Del Siegle spoke positively about the student outcomes. He also commented that the revised standards are ideal for program evaluation. Sally Krisel suggested having the revised standards on CD with supporting materials that illustrate how they can apply to practice. Kristen Stephens noted that North Carolina recently overhauled program standards for gifted and tried to align it with old standards. Now they need to realign with new standards.

Nancy Green asked Johnsen if she has a timeline in mind for creating support materials. She also inquired how NAGC as an organization should guide people who are using the old standards. Johnsen responded that between March 2010 and September, a rough draft about implementation will be created to facilitate the use of the revised standards, which could then be made available by Fall, and certainly by the NAGC Convention. Johnsen suggested having a printed version of the revised standards available (similar to State of the Nation).

Motion by Carol Tieso: to commend Susan Johnsen and the Professional Standards Committee for aligning and completing the revised P-12 Standards.

Second: Cindy Sheets

Vote: approved unanimously (Del Siegle not present)

Motion by Jaime Castellano: to approve the revised Pre-K-12 Program Standards.

Second: Lauri Kirsch

Vote: approved unanimously (Del Siegle not present)

Break (25 min.)

4. NAGC President's Report (continued)

After Susan Johnsen left the meeting, the Board returned to the President's report.

Robinson expressed her interest in appointing an Administrator Involvement Task Force, in order to determine what superintendents and principals need and want and where they see points of contact with gifted.

Robinson asked for suggestions for superintendents from the Board. Del Siegle suggested the winners of the NAGC-Ball State Administrator Award. Kristen Stephens recommended Carl Harris (former NAGC administrator of the year winner who previously served as superintendent of Durham Public Schools; now in Washington, DC as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Strategic Initiatives at the U.S. Department of Education); Stephens will get Harris' contact information to give to Robinson. Sally Krisel suggested Ball State winner at Tampa Convention (William Schofield, Superintendent of Hall County School District in Georgia).

Jann Leppien recommended Wayne Lord; Jaime Castellano observed that state affiliates also have an administrator of the year award—that would be a potential pool of

good candidates. Castellano also suggested looking for members—and also seeking collaboration—with the National Association for Elementary School Principals. Robinson thanked the Board for its good suggestions.

Moving on, Robinson noted that the Network Communications Committee had two unfilled slots, and that she recommends Ellen Fiedler and Dorothy Sisk to fill the positions.

Motion by Del Siegle: to appoint Ellen Fiedler and Dorothy Sisk to the Network Communications Committee.

Second: Katie Augustyn

Vote: approved unanimously

6. Network Representative Report

Carol Tieso referred to the results of the general membership Network Survey. The purpose of the survey was to determine future benefits of Network membership. The results of the survey are summarized in item 6.2.1 of the Board materials. She also noted that the NCC is starting to come together and function as a group, with meetings being positive and forward looking.

6.1 Special Interest Group Approval

Tieso presented the three Special Interest Group applications, complete with proposed activities and appropriate signatures. She noted that ultimately, some of these groups might become Networks, and that currently no SIG is guaranteed convention slots.

Motion from the Network Communication Committee: to approve three SIG applications-- twice exceptional, STEM, and assessment.

Second: Jann Leppien

No discussion

Vote: unanimous

6.2 Networks Inclusive Membership Model

Tieso reviewed the highlights of the new membership proposal, stating that the NCC strongly supports the new model as do the NAGC networks. Overall membership benefits would include: membership in 3 Networks, access to Network resources (newsletters, bibliographies, etc), one free webinar provided by Network, opportunity to attend any Network social, and an opportunity to serve in a Network leadership position.

Tieso noted that this model will require Network benefits to be provided, so staff and Network leaders will need to be more vigilant about delivering value for the additional dollars.

Leppien asked whether we should consider one newsletter for all networks, encouraging each of the 14 to contribute on a regular basis. Tieso responded that Nicole Daniel does produce this, but contributions from Networks have been uneven.

Green suggested that a general network operating budget be built to include in next year's operating budget; that way, we can see what NAGC spends annually and what Networks spend. This would provide a clear path to creating a general Network fund.

Jaime Castellano: called question

Vote: more than two-thirds

Vote: to include 3 networks as part of an individual one-year membership (with price to be determined): 12 Board members voted yes

Del abstained

Robinson provided clarification on next steps after the vote. With the proposal now approved by the Board, she directed the NCC to work with the Finance Committee to define a structure for managing Network revenue and expenses.

Katie Augustyn clarified that a separate vote will be taken on Sunday regarding the dues increase. Robinson agreed.

7. Approval of Consent Agenda

The following reports were pulled for discussion: Diversity/Equity by Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Membership by Katie Augustyn, (deferred to the next day's budget discussion), and the Education Committee report by Del Siegle.

Motion made by Cindy Sheets: to approve consent agenda

Second: Jann Leppien

Vote: unanimous

Robinson requested a sense of the issues related to the pulled reports.

Olszewski-Kubilius inquired about the status of the position paper the Diversity/Equity Committee seems committed to writing. Green responded that, to her knowledge, no work had yet been done. Stephens agreed to get in touch with the group about criteria for position papers.

Motion made by Jaime Castellano: to have the Diversity Equity Committee write a position paper on "Meeting Educational Needs of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners"

Second: Del Siegle

Vote: unanimous

Regarding the Education Committee report, Del Siegle inquired about the Research-to-Practice briefs. He noted the Education Committee needs to know to work with Sidney Moon. Green agreed to see that the message is conveyed.

8. Past President's Report

8.1 Elections

Siegle began by reviewing the Elections process, and clarified the terms of the current Board and also other positions. He reminded the Board that NAGC's regulations do not

permit officers to serve two terms. He also noted that later in the agenda he proposes that Board member terms be extended from two to three years.

8.2 Executive Director Review/Recommendation on Compensation

Del Siegle presented the Executive Director evaluation by staff and board, and the evaluations were overwhelming positive.

The Executive Director contract for Nancy Green expires April 1, 2010. As per the contract, since the 60 day notice was not given, the current contract will continue to be in effect for a period of one year, or until April 1, 2011.

Because her staff will not be receiving raises due to the current economic situation and budget deficit, Nancy voluntarily waived her cost of living increase again for this coming year (2010-2011). Siegle proposed that the Board provide Green with her cost of living increases once the financial situation of the organization improved. He also shared that Green would like the option of giving the staff bonuses if the 2010 conference revenues were met and exceeded.

9. Board Evaluations

Robinson called the Board's attention to the two documents (board evaluation and meeting evaluation forms) she would like completed and returned by the end of Sunday's meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

5:45 PM

Sunday, March 7, 2010 – Day 2

President Ann Robinson called the meeting to order at 8:07 am.

Board Present: Ann Robinson (President), Paula Olszewski-Kubilius (President-Elect), Del Siegle (Past President), Kristen Stephens (Governance Secretary), Jann Leppien (Treasurer), Katie Augustyn, Jaime Castellano, Lauri Kirsch, Sally Krisel, Stuart Omdal, Jean Peterson, Cindy Sheets, Carol Tieso

Staff Present: Nancy Green, Rachel Coleman

Guests: Sidney Moon, Purdue University (governance report through publications report); Elizabeth Leith, Haymaker & Associates (presented audit report during financial report); M. René Islas, B&D Consulting (for legislative and communications plan update only)

10. Governance Report

10.1 Position Paper Updates

Stephens provided some updates that have occurred since her report was submitted. Three position papers are still under revision: Differentiation (Carol Tomlinson), Competencies Needed by Teachers of the Gifted and Talented (Ann Robinson, Diane Reeves, and Susan Johnsen), Pre-Service Teachers and Gifted Education (Julia

Roberts, Mary Slade, and Kristen Stephens). Additional time still needed. Deadlines have again been postponed.

10.1.2 Gifted Terminology

Stephens confirmed that this version reflects input from the Board from the November meeting. At Green's request, the Board suggested some ideas for distribution. Olszewski-Kubilius suggested including in *GCQ* and *PHP*, and possibly distributing through an independent brochure. Augustyn suggested dissemination through state affiliates. Moon suggested a catchier title for the piece—perhaps a question that is then answered within the paper. Olszewski-Kubilius suggested going back to the committee for a title for the paper.

10.1.1 Update on WISC-IV

Stephens reported that, at Bobbie Gilman's request, a paragraph was inserted into this position, which Stephens included in her report for the Board's information. The paragraph reflects mostly technical changes, rather than significant content.

Motion by Del Siegle: to approve the amended version of the "Use of the WISC-IV for Gifted Identification"

Second: Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Friendly changes that update web links (name of publisher changed)

Vote: unanimous

10.2 Executive Director Succession Policy

Robinson requested that Stephens provide background and context for this policy and why it's important. Stephens noted that this is one of the few remaining areas of critical policy development that has not been completed since the revisions to NAGC's governance structure. Approval of a plan for how NAGC would select a new executive director and also transition during the process ensures the stability of the organization. As Green circulated a draft policy, Stephens mentioned some of the resources she's been drawing on to develop the draft. She noted the list of questions still to be addressed, and assured the Board that this will come to the Board in November as a formal agenda item.

Siegle suggested that how to address a sudden emergency absence be dealt with as a separate policy from replacing the executive director in an expected transition. The Board agreed.

11. Strategic Framework Update

11.1 Strategic Framework 2010-2015

Robinson referred the Board to the new Strategic Framework, approved by the Board in November 2009 and submitted with the agenda. She explained that since then, the national office staff, with Nancy's guidance, has built a work plan that includes objectives that begin to prioritize and execute the major goals. She called the Board's attention to some of the highlighted questions and concerns remaining, and requested that the Board add detail and ideas to the list.

Green also noted the importance of Board input to the priorities and annual metrics. While the framework captures a 5-year horizon, the staff has defined the specific actions for the upcoming year and metrics that will be attached. As the “eyes and ears” of the field, the Board can help guide staff toward the most important areas of strategic opportunity.

With that Backdrop the Board discussed NAGC’s priority partners:

- Jann Leppien suggested: National Education Association (NEA), Council for Exceptional Children's-The Association for the Gifted (CEC-TAG), and Ted.com grants
- Jean Peterson suggested the American Counseling Association.
- Sidney Moon thought of 21st century partnerships: National Academy of Engineering, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and suggested looking for other groups that have transformative goals.
- Nancy Green asked if there are 2-3 partners that would be our best renaissance partners.
- Jaime Castellano stated that since public schools in America are becoming less white, and there are more students of color, we could partner with the National Council of La Raza and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- Cindy Sheets suggested partnering with those involved in the RtI movement
- Lauri Kirsch stated that the resources become the responsibility of the parents and all the stakeholders coming together (looking at schools where gifted kids are guaranteed resources is no longer a trend)
- Paula Olszewski-Kubilius suggested the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL)
- Sally Krisel suggested looking for trends or organizations; trends generate short-lived opportunities
- Nancy Green said that there is not capacity for partnering with too many groups
- Kristen Stephens thought of Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID); there are probably gifted kids participating, but not identified
- Ann Robinson suggested: looking at language in higher education bill; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

11.2 Framework Strategies

Green then presented the objectives and strategies addressed by the staff, noting that they have been mapped against the 2010-2011 budget. She stressed the importance of Board/Staff alignment on the documents, since they will guide the work of the staff for the year.

Sidney Moon commented that the office should work closely with the Publications Committee on these objectives and Green agreed.

Siegle expressed concerns about the cost for creating a members-only section of the website. He was under the impression that the purchase of the membership database and website had included that; he questioned whether we should go forward with software for a members only website. Green shared the challenge of capturing

information about who visits the website, and commented that in the long run, that might be one of the best ways for NAGC to grow. Consensus was not reached.

Green then distributed and reviewed a list of ideas for new revenue, as developed by the NAGC staff. (filed with approved minutes)

Green mentioned the challenge of recruiting and engaging parents in NAGC. Membership numbers reflect a steady decline of parents, making *Parenting for High Potential* an even more costly way to meet member needs. She also expressed concern about how parents access information. Typically, they can find what they need on the internet without waiting for a quarterly publication, especially younger parents.

Olszewski-Kubilius noted her Northwestern experience with the difficulty of getting parents to pay for resources. New Mile Markers, materials on twice exceptional, social emotional, parents' resource guides or start up kits, etc. as resources parents might want from NAGC were mentioned during the discussion. Siegle also suggested packaging the parent webinars to include an interactive discussion.

12. Publications

12.1 Publications Committee Report

Robinson welcomed Sidney Moon to the meeting and called the Board's attention to the Publications report and 3-year Strategic Plan.

Moon began by sharing that she will retain the structure put in place by the former Association Editor, Nick Colangelo, including the following editor positions: Associate Editor for Service Pubs, Associate Editor for Collaborative Pubs, and Associate Editor for "NAGC Recommends" Pubs. In addition, Moon requested that the Board approve a new editor position, Associate Editor for eMedia.

Motion by Del Siegle: to accept the definition of eMedia Publications and add it to Policy 11.2.

Second: Sally Krisel

Discussion: The Board expressed concern about the time consuming approach that would be created if everything posted on the web had to be approved by the Publications Committee. Moon clarified that the eMedia editor would spot check the site and act as a resource for staff.

Siegle also noted the area of webinars, where NAGC delivers and archives content with very little oversight, and that a disclaimer may be needed on the Live Learning Center page. Castellano agreed that this is a better approach than trying to vet everything or to censor it.

Vote: unanimous

Moon expressed that she would prefer same term of office for associate editors as for the Association Editor, and that the person named to the eMedia editorship might come

from outside the publications committee. Stephens and Moon agreed to look at policies and provide changes as needed.

Olszewski-Kubilius agreed that the policy provides flexibility for Association Editor and associate editor's terms coincide.

As a point of interest, Moon shared her suggestions for the roles.

Susan Assouline: Service Publications

Anne Rinn: Collaborative Publications

Lou Lloyd-Zanini: eMedia Publications

12.2 Publications Strategic Plan

Moon then presented the 3-year Strategic Plan, developed with input from the committee members and the national office staff, pointing out its emphasis on revenue generation.

Motion by Jann Leppien: to approve Publications Committee 3-year strategic plan for years 2010-2012 as amended; put on hold the strategies with budgetary implications pending Board deliberation and resource allocation.

Second: Carol Tieso

Discussion: The Board recommended the following changes to the plan:

First, they expressed reluctance about purchasing software (such as "Open Journal") to manage the review process. In a budget deficit situation, this will need to be put on hold for now. Siegle suggested that Moon talk with others who have suggestions for free software to manage journal tracking.

Second, the Board suggested eliminating the final strategy under Goal 2: Foster collaboration between the National Office, Editors and Advisory Boards. With the revenue implications and potential changes to future publications, this approach should be put on hold.

Third, the second strategy (page 4) needs a change to, "continue to publish a high quality publication (instead of magazine) for parents," pending any format changes to *Parenting for High Potential* going forward.

Moon expressed her opposition to an online format for *Parenting for High Potential*. Additional discussion ensued on the pros and cons of various delivery vehicles and expanded *PHP* audiences (e.g., pediatricians).

Vote: unanimous

14. Financial Report/Proposed Budget

14.1 Treasurer's Report

Sidney Moon left after her report.

Elizabeth Leith (Haymaker & Associates) arrived for Audit Report.

Leith generally reviewed some of the recent changes made by the IRS to ensure absolute transparency with nonprofits. She also walked the Board through the documents they need to formally accept—these include the standard compliance letter, the management letter, as well as the Audit of Financial Statements as of August 21, 2009.

Leith first reviewed the Statement of Financial Position, noting NAGC's total assets of \$2,545,963. Other highlights included a note about fixed assets--old equipment written off in 2009, and lower convention revenue and expenses.

Leppien asked if we have insurance for convention. Nancy Green said that we typically have convention cancellation insurance for every meeting. Its cost is dependent on the state in which the convention is held.

14.1.2 Form 990 Review (taxes)

Leith highlighted the clean management letter and reviewed next steps. Once the Audit is accepted and Andy Bassett completes the new 990, the Finance Committee needs to approve it and then Haymaker will finalize. It is due to the IRS by April 15th.

Motion by Katie Augustyn: to accept auditor's report.

Second: Cindy Sheets

Vote: unanimous

13. National Office Update

Green reviewed significant project developments of importance to the Board.

First, she updated the Board on the office move and distributed a spreadsheet of viable choices. In the context of making a final decision, she asked the Board for the following guidance: Can they be comfortable with any choice, provided it is comparable and achieves the savings goals set out by the Board? Can they support a 7 to 10 year lease, so if the economy improves, we won't be looking for space at a much higher rate in just 5 years? Is the Board in favor of front loading any additional savings to mitigate this year's debt (e.g., free rent)? Finally, is the Board comfortable with either Bethesda or downtown DC?

Jean Peterson inquired about a potential turnover in the next decade (due to location, would staff continue to work there if the office is not downtown?). Nancy Green stated that central is always better as is a 7 year or 10 year lease (for when market rebounds, we don't want to end a lease at a high time in the market).

Katie Augustyn and Paula Olszewski-Kubilius agreed that there is an intangible benefit to staying downtown. Green asked the Board for explicit guidance about the office move. They expressed positive support for the options she outlined and gave her suggestions.

14.1.3 2009-2010 Budget Update

Jann Leppien provided an overview of the current financial picture, reminding the Board that NAGC has about one year's operating funds in reserve. Convention revenue did increase from Tampa to St. Louis, but the overall deficit is projected to be closer to

\$460,000 at the end of August, not the \$327k that was budgeted, due to the attrition situation at the Hyatt.

After presenting the current scenario, she asked the Board for input on any expense cuts or revenue generation ideas that could play out between now and the end of this fiscal year (August 31).

Inquiries by the Board included: whether any publications are coming out before the end of August, whether the last issue of PHP could be produced electronically, whether the Expert Perspectives Program featuring former and current NAGC Board members could be launched sooner than September 1.

Green mentioned the Wisconsin Academy, and its potential to generate at least \$5,000 in revenue.

The Board also revisited whether to “borrow” or earmark Network monies for the short term. Siegle cautioned the Board not to view these funds as money we can retrieve. He predicts that the reaction would be, “Board sitting on \$2 million in reserves; networks could ask why Board isn’t looking at own reserves?”

In the context of the dues increase, Green suggested that NAGC honor the past by leaving current funds intact, but creating a single Network pool for new revenue. The Board agreed to recommend that we try this for one year and see how it goes. Other revenue ideas included: Finding a well-known leader to write exclusively for NAGC. Take the lead on a Gifted 101 book for undergraduates. Jean Peterson offered to work with Susannah Wood on a school counseling book.

Green agreed to incorporate these ideas into the current fiscal plan where possible, and expressed a strong commitment to holding the line on expenses for the rest of the current fiscal year.

14.1.4 Investments Update

Leppien went on to review NAGC’s investments and how they’re distributed into the short term, mid term and longer term funds. The long term portfolio has bounced back about 70% from worst losses.

14.2 2010-2011 Proposed Budget

Leppien reviewed some of the assumptions outlined in the 2010-11 budget proposal. She noted a bare-bones financial picture that manages to maintain all current programs, with revenue budgeted to increase a scant 0.1%. Projected revenue was built on a two-year average in most cases, to take the current economic downturn into account in the most realistic way possible. She noted some tough realities: that Atlanta is a more expensive city and convention center and food and beverage pricing reflects that.

The Board then discussed the potential dues increase as well as convention registration fee increase. The Board generally agreed that staff need to convey the significant increase in programs and services—media templates for affiliates, webinars, increased web content. The increase in fees is justified.

The Board also encouraged staff to think of ways that webinar content can be repackaged and resold, and also ways to partner more successfully with affiliates to disseminate content.

Motion by Carol Tieso: to accept proposed dues increases at all levels

Second: Lauri Kirsch

Friendly amendment by Katie Augustyn: One year introductory offer for Affiliate Parent Membership; not permanent membership

Vote: unanimous

LUNCH (working lunch)

17. Legislative & Communications Plan Update

Rene Islas began by reflecting on what brings him here today. He shared that he has faith that NAGC's energy, focus, and work is making a difference. He also noted that this is the most critical time for our advocacy efforts. Congress will make progress in writing new legislation for ESEA. We need to make sure our voices are heard.

Islas then reviewed accomplishments and activities since the St. Louis convention, which have been strongly focused on the federal push for GT education.

He noted our strong engagement with CEC to plan a strategy, and how they came along on many Hill and Agency visits. NAGC tested out the new vision of comprehensive outreach in various offices. All along, we have been building inroads and also making sure our current champions stay strong.

Islas also commented on NAGC's success with indirect advocacy in the form of media outreach and public awareness (our op-eds, letters to the Dept., and to Secretary Duncan). Green distributed printed copies of these media successes to the Board.

Islas then touched on upcoming priorities as outlined in his report, including Javits funding for 2011 and the changes we hope for in ESEA reauthorization. The Board thanked Islas and B&D consulting for a wonderful job.

After Islas left the meeting, the Board returned to a discussion of the proposed 2010-2011 budget.

14. Resume Budget Discussion

Green outlined the financial increases facing NAGC for the Atlanta convention, including bussing expenses, increase in food expenses and higher convention rental fees.

She asked the Board to share its comfort level with cutting lunch one day. The Board also discussed other expense cuts including B&D, Parenting for High Potential, NCATE and staff.

Leppien requested that Green explore other realistic options for increasing revenue and decreasing expenses.

Tieso and Castellano expressed opposition to any cuts to the B&D contract. Others said some cuts might be in order, given the financial climate. Siegle suggested a mid year review once the Convention is completed and we have a clear financial picture for the remaining three quarters of FY11.

The Board moved on to a discussion of the September Board meeting, which is currently not reflected in the budget. Olszewski-Kubilius spoke in favor of adding the face-to-face meeting back into the budget. Virtual meetings for brand new Board members are just not adequate for doing the important work of the Board. The Board agreed to add the meeting back to the budget.

Peterson then pointed out that it is unfeasible to believe that NAGC could leave NCATE, and then return a year or two later. Too many reviews and other programs are working on a continuing basis. Siegle agreed that cutting out NCATE does not make sense at this time.

14.2.2 Budget Spreadsheet

Leppien called the Board's attention to the proposed bottom line, a negative \$157,015, and asked for a final discussion of potential revenue ideas.

This included a more proactive approach to joint publications possibilities, site licenses for webinars, and the potential positive fiscal implications for the NCSSMST partnership, specifically for convention income.

Concluding the discussion, Leppien requested that staff refine the budget based on the suggested cuts and additions (eliminating one convention lunch, dues increase, adding back the September Board meeting) and send out a final budget for a vote by April 30th.

15. President-Elect's Report

Olszewski-Kubilius reviewed the highlights and changes to the 2010 Convention program. She noted that since preconvention numbers have been lower, it was time to rework the Wednesday and Thursday program. Wednesday now features "The Essentials of Gifted Education." The morning begins with a general session loosely based on the new pre-K-12 program standards, and the afternoon features a "deep dive" into one related topic. Paula O-K also touched on her ideas for Thursday's opening keynote and some of her signature sessions. The convention will take a special focus on secondary (as a result of the partnership with NCSSMST, as well as STEM, and underserved populations.)

16. New Business

16.1 Board Term Lengths

Del Siegle made a case for lengthening Board terms, sharing that it seems like once a Board member gets up to speed on the complexities of Board service, the two-year term is over. He then reviewed the actual change to the Regulations language: The proposed change is as follows:

- 6.3 Term. Members of the Board of Directors will serve **three**-year terms, with a limit of two terms. Terms may be served consecutively.
- 6.4 Elected Members. The President and President-Elect will be elected in odd numbered years. The Treasurer and Governance Secretary will be elected in even numbered years. **The board members will be elected in three year cycles. The four elected representatives will be elected in staggered years with the teacher and parent representatives elected the first year, the network representative elected the second year, and the state representative elected the third year. The four at-large board members will be elected in staggered years with one at-large board member elected the first year, two at-large board members elected the second year, and one at-large board member elected the third year.** Terms of office shall commence the first day of September following the election.

Motion by Del Siegle: to propose a regulations change to Board term lengths from a two-year term to a three-year term

Second: Sally Krisel

Discussion: Board members expressed concerns including whether leaders are willing to make a 3 year commitment, and also on the confusing message that is sent when changing regulations before they have had time to be implemented.

Siegle suggests that this would be presented to membership as ballot issue; and then take effect in the next cycle, 2011.

Some noted that the fiscal crisis demonstrates that we need experienced people on the Board who've had a chance to understand the fiscal side of the organization. Leppien stated that participation in the field of gifted is long term and history is critical.

Robinson, calling for a vote, added that having a Board that now sets policy and fiscal stewardship means the extra years add a huge difference.

Vote: unanimous

Items deferred to next Board Meeting or interim discussion/action:

16.2 Adding/Appointing Board Members and 16.3 National Standards Endorsement

ADJOURNMENT

2:41 PM