



BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Saturday, March 12, 2011 (1:00 PM – 6:00 PM)
Sunday, March 13, 2011 (8:00 AM – 2:00 PM)
Hyatt Regency Crystal City
Arlington, VA

FINAL Minutes 7/12/11

Saturday, March 12, 2011 – Day 1

CALL TO ORDER

President Ann Robinson called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

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

Staff Present: Nancy Green, Rachel Coleman

Guests: Sidney Moon (Association Editor); for the parent service proposal discussion: Karen Yoho (NAGC Staff); for legislative update: René Islas (B&D Consulting); for financial report: Elizabeth Leith (Haymaker & Associates) and Andrew Bassett (NAGC Staff)

1. Announcements/Greetings

President Ann Robinson welcomed the Board and asked everyone to share one good thing that happened to them recently.

2. Approval of Minutes

2.1 November 2010 Board of Directors Meeting

Motion made by Lauri Kirsch: to approve the November 2010 minutes

Second: Katie Augustyn

Vote: unanimous approval

3. Approval of Agenda

President Ann Robinson invited the Board to pull any reports from the consent agenda or offer new business. The following reports were pulled: Development Committee, Education Committee, Graduate Student Committee, Legislative and Advocacy Committee, Diversity & Equity Committee, and Parent Advisory Committee.

There were a few changes to the order of the agenda; the Past President's report was moved ahead of the consent agenda and agenda items 12 and 13 were reversed. An item of new business was added: the timeline for the *Gifted Child Quarterly (GCQ)* editor search.

Motion made by Sally Krisel: to approve the revised agenda

Second: Stuart Omdal

Vote: unanimous approval

4. NAGC President's Report

President Ann Robinson distributed copies of *The Christian Science Monitor* article ("Education Reform: The Problem with Helping Everyone Reach 'Average'"). This recently published op-ed reflects ongoing work with Nick Manetto and the B&D/NAGC media team.

The *Malleable Minds* collaboration with the US Department of Education, American Psychological Association, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talent, and NAGC and featuring the research of Carol Dweck has been working to engage researchers in social psychology and cognitive sciences in gifted education. The collaboration hopes to have their publication ready by the 2011 Convention in November.

The Administrators' Task Force has been re-conceptualized to include administrators with an interest, but not a current involvement in gifted education, and will also include individuals with administrative credentials and current involvement in gifted education. The task force will decide which of the administrator groups we can target and involve. Next steps include approval of the charge at this meeting, and then a data collection process to help the field understand better what an administrator audience wants and needs.

The standards initiative focused on Advanced Standards has progressed, with recent input from the field collected by CEC in February. The final version of the Advanced Standards will come back to the Board for a vote. Carol Tieso inquired about the early version of advanced standards NAGC wrote about 10 years ago. Ann Robinson reported they were fed into the current Advanced Standards in the early stage of development.

Robinson then reported on the NAGC follow-up with John Easton, Director of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). During a visit with him earlier this year, he appeared open to working with NAGC on research questions for the IES data bases. She reported on a plan to establish a work group chaired by Tonya Moon from UVA. The purpose of the work group is to identify questions about gifted education and academically talented learners that can be integrated into these large databases. Robinson circulated a list of possible databases compiled by B&D Consulting at her request. Robinson noted that by infiltrating large databases, we could use information for advocacy that we have not been able to access in the past.

Robinson pointed out that the workgroup needs good secondary database researchers who can identify where we can squeeze in an item or two or a variable so the data we want can be pulled out. This is advocacy with no price tag. Del Siegle mentioned that the surveys taken by schools (students, schools, and parents) is an opportunity to ask about gifted in these surveys.

Jaime Castellano asked if NAGC has any relationship with Title I experts at ESE. (??) There is a mandated annual survey administered to students, parents, and faculty; he suggested that NAGC become part of their survey process and get gifted into these surveys.

Sally Krisel asked if CCSSO replied regarding the common core standards. Green replied that efforts to include gifted were recognized as important, but not included in the first standards process. An opportunity to comment should be available in the next round of standards revisions.

5. Administrators' Task Force Initiative

5.1 Administrators' Task Force Charge

Robinson noted that the task force charge was amended slightly from the copy provided in the Board materials.

2. Approval of March Minutes

The Administrators Task Force is charged with providing insight and feedback into the perspective and the needs of this key stakeholder group. Administrators often influence or make the final policy and program decisions related to gifted services and advanced learners. NAGC recognizes the need to help shape the conversation and ultimate set of decisions related to this crucial group of educational leaders. The Task Force will be comprised of invited administrators who have direct experience serving as a principal or superintendent in a school setting. In addition, active NAGC leaders who have worked with administrators in educational settings may also be asked to join the group. Efforts will be made to reflect geographic and economic diversity, and diversity related to school type.

The Administrators' Task Force will specifically be charged with:

- a) Assisting NAGC in engaging school leaders around the country to build awareness about the needs of high-ability learners and how to meet them;
- b) Providing direct feedback on potential programs, publications, services and messages targeted to these key educational leaders;
- c) Improving NAGC's suite of services and the knowledge base targeted to elementary, middle and secondary school principals, as well as district superintendents.

Del Siegle suggested that staff gather the names of those who have attended the Superintendents'/Administrators' Forum at Convention. Siegle also recommended past award winners and nominees for the Administrator award be considered, and that staff put an open call in *Compass Points*. Lauri Kirsch emphasized that responsibilities may be passed down from superintendents and that we need to include language that encompasses those who are not superintendents. Siegle also noted that a specific timeline should be established for the task force so they continue their work and stay focused. Jaime Castellano noted that the lifespan of the task force should be connected to outcomes.

Motion by Del Siegle: to approve amended Administrators' Task Force charge with addition of a suggested timeline and creation date.

Second: Jaime Castellano

Vote: unanimous approval

5.2 Administrators' Checklist

Robinson invited the Board to provide feedback on a draft survey for administrators.

Jean Peterson expressed concern that the survey omits language about underachieving learners and raised the point about whether NAGC cares about these kids, as most of the language that comes out of the organization does not accommodate them. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius noted that Peterson is getting at a fundamental point in the field, but that this checklist is not meant to take a stand, or to be a comprehensive survey. Jaime Castellano noted that part of checklist is contradictory (all about academic achievement; no consideration for a child who is identified as talented). The Board agreed that language about leadership and the visual and performing arts should be considered.

Jean Peterson suggested a language change: programming and identification to accommodate highly able children and teens who, for a wide variety of possible reasons, are not achieving academically at a particular time in their social and emotional development.

Kristen Stephens noted that principals and superintendents might not be able to answer the questions in the checklist. Sally Krisel agreed with Jaime Castellano and Jean Peterson; we are not explicit that we are undervaluing other children, but it can be interpreted as such. Krisel asked for language to be added to ask administrators about a mismatch or lack of social emotional support. Lauri Kirsch said that the language in the first measure (Individual Annual Growth) "this must be calculated on a vertical scale" is muddy language.

Stuart Omdal provided an example for Colorado. In his state, services are based on state definition. The Colorado State Department of Education is working to include creativity and leadership. Since

these services are so state specific, is there any way to tailor/modify the checklist by state? Omdal recognized that state definitions and directives go beyond the scope of the checklist. Ann Robinson suggested that states could make modifications, and that working with state directors might be a good next step. **ACTION:** Robinson agreed that this feedback is important to incorporate into the survey and that the task force chair, Ginny Burney, will be provided with the feedback the Board has discussed.

6. Network Representative Report

Carol Tieso updated the Board on the work of the Network Communications Committee, as outlined in her report. A conference call was held in January 2011 to provide feedback on a draft Network Leadership Notebook, to vote on the proposed new membership model, and approve a SIG application for referral to the full Board.

6.1 SIGs

6.1.1 GLBTQ

The NCC unanimously recommends the approval of the GLBTQ SIG. Tieso noted that no friction exists between the Special Populations Network and this group, and that its leaders, Beverly Trail and Claire Hughes, are whole heartedly in favor of formation of this SIG group.

Motion by Del Siegle: to accept the formation of the GLBTQ (gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, questioning) special interest group

Second: Susan Dulong Langley

Discussion: Sally Krisel asked if there have been other SIGs that fall under the umbrella of other Networks. Carol Tieso noted that the 2E SIG comes out of Special Populations and that the Intelligence Testing SIG emerged from a Task Force. Nancy Green noted that with the approval of new SIGs there will be requests for clarity about what support they actually get from NAGC. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius commented on the SIG policy; given the new membership structure in which all NAGC members receive 3 Network memberships, more thought needs to be given to the membership requirements for SIGs to become Networks.

Ann Robinson called question.

Motion: to accept the formation of the GLBTQ SIG

Vote: unanimous approval

6.2 Networks Policy Updates/New Business

6.2.1 Network Solvency Policy

Carol Tieso informed the Board on what drove the policy decisions, as she reviewed the policy language. For example, the Counseling & Guidance Network wanted to change their name. The NCC liaison raised a big concern about the need for new policy to make the process of name changes a uniform and transparent policy. During the discussion, Del Siegle observed that having 75 members is too low of a threshold for Network membership. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius suggested changing the membership requirement to 100.

Old Policy: "Networks can be formed by any group of at least 75 NAGC members with a common substantive interest that is consistent with the mission and goals of NAGC."

Suggested New Policy: Networks can be formed by any group of at least 100 NAGC members with a common substantive interest that is consistent with the mission and goals of NAGC.

Old Policy: "The application, which shall be designed by the NCC, shall include a Mission statement, a statement about the focus of the Network, a designated leader or contact person for the Network, a list of at least 75 NAGC members who plan to participate in the Network, and a list of proposed activities."

Suggested New Policy: The application, which shall be designed by the NCC, shall include a Mission statement, a statement about the focus of the Network, a designated leader or contact person for the Network, a list of at least 100 NAGC members who plan to participate in the Network, and a list of proposed activities.

2. Approval of March Minutes

Lauri Kirsch asked about the big picture plan; how many networks can NAGC support? Jaime Castellano commented that our mission is maximizing students' potential; we should not have limits to the number of Networks. Sally Krisel suggested having a more strenuous review process; a new Network should be a unique and special niche that cannot be fulfilled by an existing Network. This requirement should also carry over to SIGs.

Motion by Katie Augustyn: to approve Network Solvency policy

Second: Lauri Kirsch

Discussion: Paula Olszewski-Kubilius reminded the Board that it can amend policy if this new language is not restrictive enough in the future. Lauri Kirsch offered an amendment on minimum requirements for viability (convention events and 2 newsletters per year, plus 2 of the following Network responsibilities). Jaime Castellano and Del Siegle support the recommended changes suggested by Lauri Kirsch.

Vote: unanimously approved amendment 1; all in favor to change the minimum number of NAGC members expressing interest in a new Network from 75 to 100, and to change the drop in members to below 100 from 75.

Vote: unanimously approved amendment 2; all in favor to change Network member benefits to:

- As a member benefit, Network Chairs (or their designee) will hold an annual event or special project and publish 2 newsletters per year put out by the national office, plus 2 of the following:
 - o Network blog or listserv;
 - o Regular electronic communication via email;
 - o Active Discussion Forum;
 - o Webinars
 - o Convention events or special projects

Motion by Paula Olszewski-Kubilius: to amend the Network Name Change policy

Second: Del Siegle

Discussion: Del Siegle asked how demonstrated evidence that the proposed name is widely accepted among the membership is achieved. He suggested adding a two-thirds majority vote to the language. Lauri Kirsch expressed concern about name changes related to fiscal implications. How many Networks can we afford to support? Can we continuously print new flyers, information, etc. when a Network changes names? Paula Olszewski-Kubilius emphasized a need to set up a structure where changes are handled annually or even less frequently.

Proposed policy language: Demonstrated evidence and clear rationale that the proposed name is widely accepted and recognized in the field, e.g. citations from the field of specialty, related articles, other published documents, and relates to the mission of the network, or a better name selected to reflect a refinement or modification to the mission.

Vote: Unanimously approved amendment 3; all in favor of amended Network Name Change policy

Motion by Del Siegle: to add a bullet to "Responsibilities of NAGC" in the policy:

"NAGC will provide financial support for Network projects approved within the annual operating budget."

Second: Lauri Kirsch

Vote: Unanimously approved amendment; all in favor of adding additional bullet reflecting financial support

2. Approval of March Minutes

Susan Dulong Langley: asked for clarification on Network budgets. Nancy Green replied that in the new “integrated budget” model, Networks will be involved in the annual budget and planning process to create the operating budget each year.

Motion by Jaime Castellano: to approve full policy with 4 amendments

Second: Cindy Sheets

Vote: unanimous approval

6.2.2 Integrated Budget Proposal (vote with budget)

Ann Robinson asked if the proposal was shared outside the NCC. Carol Tieso stated that she is not confident that every Network chair saw the proposal. The goal is to make process more transparent. Nancy Green highlighted the entrepreneurial Networks and suggested a hybrid: if Networks raise money outside of dues, they could keep the money - a way not to penalize them for taking initiative. Carol Tieso agreed that publications/entrepreneurial endeavors should be separate; but as a dues model only, she believes that the integrated budget model will succeed. Jaime Castellano suggested that when new leadership terms begin, it will be important to include in the Network leadership manual a list of examples outlining how Network leaders can spend their money. Ann Robinson said that if this hybrid model allows networks to incentivize certain projects, we need to make certain the language is tweaked as dues would now be figured into the proposed NAGC budget. Ann Robinson directed Carol Tieso to finalize entrepreneurial language with the NCC, and then come back to the Board.

6.2.3 Special Populations Mission Statement

Motion by Del Siegle: to approve mission statement (he asked NAGC to make parallel)

Second: Stuart Omdal

Lauri Kirsch stated that the language alignment is off:

- Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgendered (GLBT) – add a ‘Q’ to the end

Kirsch suggested the following for the mission statement:

Special populations of gifted children include, but are not limited to, children who are:

- from cultural/linguistic/ethnically diverse backgrounds
- GLBTQ
- twice-exceptional gifted children with disabilities
- highly and profoundly gifted
- experiencing (the impact of) gender issues
- from low socio-economic status (SES) backgrounds
- impacted by geographic issues, such as urban and rural settings

Based on his knowledge of and relationship with the leaders of the Special Populations Network, Jaime Castellano doesn’t think that those working on the mission statement would mind if the Board made a few language changes

Vote: unanimous approval

7. Proposal--Parent Services Strategy

7.1 Parent Services Proposal; 7.3 Parent Outreach Specialist Job Description; 7.4 Committee Feedback

Robinson reviewed documents related to feedback on the proposal: Item 7.4 submitted from the Publications Committee is in the Board book, and handouts from the Parent Advisory Committee and *Parenting for High Potential* Editorial Advisory Board were distributed on site.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius began by reviewing the timeline for parent outreach: in 2000, *PHP* circulation reached its peak (4,064); in 2006, joint parent membership program begins with state affiliates; survey data collected on *PHP* in August 2010; by 2011, *PHP* circulation hits its low point (1,944). Olszewski-Kubilius then reviewed the key components of the Parent Services Strategy--the recommendations include hiring a part-time parent outreach specialist, having more frequent but shorter issues of *Parenting for High Potential* (increasing from 4 to 8; a more cost effective version), and investing in a

“registration page” feature on the NAGC website in order to capture contact information from parent visitors.

A hybrid model of 4 print and 4 e-newsletters was proposed. With more frequency, issues can be tailored to meet different needs and interests (college aged children, theme-oriented issues, parents of middle school children, etc). The diversity of issues that parents are interested in is large; moving to this model will demonstrate that we have something for parents at every stage. This model also envisions less money spent on design and color while adding resources (parent outreach specialist). The outreach specialist would tap into the large parent audience that NAGC does not currently attract.

With a 20% increase in resources, NAGC hopes to achieve 20% growth in key areas—beyond 2009 and 2010 levels. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius highlighted what success would look like:

- Increasing the number of gifted related articles in general parent publications
- Increasing sales of parent products and publications
- Significant increase in visitors to the parent sections of the NAGC website (developed by parent outreach specialist)
- Increase in parent memberships and parent subscriptions
- Stronger connections to state affiliates with active parent groups
- Increase in circulation and advertising of *PHP*

The biggest concern voiced by the Board in past discussions relates to maintaining quality. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius expressed caution about equating quality with design and color. She believes that going to a different format will not necessarily affect quality. Sidney Moon expressed concern that it may be difficult to find people to write for *PHP* in the *THP* format because newsletters usually do not have as much impact as magazines and newsletter publications are not valued in academia. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius spoke with Jeff Danielian to ask his opinion. He has been able to get *GCQ* authors and scholars to write for *THP*, which may be evidence that some scholars are willing to write for newsletters

Robinson noted that another issue related to quality is attracting and keeping a high-level editor. Would *PHP* in this proposed format be less attractive to someone as a potential editor? Robinson also asked for clarification about the number of parent publications that will exist in the new model, and how frequently parents will receive them.

Nancy Green explained that the parent engagement strategy looks like a continuum, with the most committed parent audience receiving 8 issues of *PHP* and other communications (for a \$25 fee). The LEAST committed parent—a new website visitor, might receive a short introductory email. Green noted that NAGC’s website receives 32,000 visitors per month (the most visited page is the parent resource page; we currently have no way of capturing visitors’ information). The goal is to convert some of the 32,000 visitors into more active parent members.

Motion by Paula Olszewski-Kubilius: to approve the proposed parent services model

Second: Carol Tieso

Del Siegle asked to amend the “defining success” section of the proposal. He suggested adding the bullet point: “increase gifted information for parents on the website by the parent outreach specialist”.

Jaime Castellano asked how the parent outreach specialist will be hired. Will that person work from home or is there space allocated at the office? Nancy Green specified that would be desirable to have the person in the office at least part of the time, but more likely that the person who is hired will work remotely. Del Siegle likes the job description (well phrased) for the parent outreach specialist and noted that there is no travel allocated in the budget for the parent outreach specialist. Green replied that a budget for travel already exists within the NAGC operating budget, and this new position would draw

2. Approval of March Minutes

from that as needed. Lauri Kirsch raised the issue of return on investment, noting that if we put money into a \$20,000 position, some expense should also be cut.

Sidney Moon stressed the genuine difference of opinion around issues of *PHP* and the parent services proposal. The Publications Committee feels that there is value in *PHP* as a publication for the field, separate from its value as a member benefit. A 4-color glossy magazine is a more substantial publication than *THP*, which is essentially a newsletter. It may be difficult to find an editor willing to do twice as much work. Moon noted that technology now exists to reproduce magazines in their designed format for electronic distribution. The Publications Committee is not in favor of making *PHP* 8 issues. The Parent Advisory Committee also expressed concerns about making changes to *PHP* that would reduce its impact and quality and concerns about other aspects of the parent services proposal.

Jaime Castellano observed that if current format is not making money and we are losing membership, then we must try something else. Carol Tieso suggested having news feeds and smart phone apps -- a place for parents to go online and search. Tieso and Siegle vocalized their support for the proposal.

Ann Robinson noted that she would like to hear from editors whether this hybrid model is feasible, and to better understand the implications for publications beyond parent strategy. Paula Olszewski-Kubilius noted that our decision should rest on how NAGC is trying to change our parent services strategy; depending on the editor, 8 issues would not be substantially more work (brokering same number of articles; put together in a shorter document) -- just a different strategy in delivering parent services. Cindy Sheets noted that there is some flexibility to increase budget.

Ann Robinson asked about the likelihood of producing content for 8 *PHP*s. Carol Tieso suggested having each network write an article; posing the hypothetical question, "would you rather have parents reading NAGC's feeds, tweets, and Facebook, or Hoagies"? Katie Augustyn envisioned a parent outreach specialist having the connections to opportunities beyond what NAGC currently accomplishes.

Del Siegle called for question

Motion: to accept parent services proposal with friendly amendment

Vote: unanimous approval

Sidney Moon stressed the importance of a communications plan to convey the rationale for the Board's decision. She wants to ensure those who offered feedback (Publications Committee, Parent Advisory Committee, and *Parenting for High Potential* Editorial Advisory Board) are provided with deliberate outreach. Del Siegle suggested that Paula Olszewski-Kubilius communicate the decision of the Board in her role as President-Elect. Olszewski-Kubilius observed that the President's name should also be included, so that the decision of the Board is presented as unanimous. Robinson and Olszewski-Kubilius agreed to follow up. Sidney Moon also suggested that NAGC immediately communicate the explanation and implications to the editor and designer of *PHP* by phone. Ann Robinson agreed to contact Jennifer Jolly within 48 hours.

9. Past President's Report

Del Siegle shared the letter from Scott Hunsaker, Chair of the Leadership Development Committee, that will be mailed (postal and e-mail) to all the people eligible to run for President (former and current Board members). Siegle suggested having the Leadership Development Committee do a follow-up with those individual who are coming up on their 9/10-year eligibility. He also highlighted open Board positions for the 2011 election.

Ann Robinson asked whether the issue of extending the 10-year window of eligibility needs to be addressed. Del Siegle noted that an extension would be a regulations change that the Board would have to vote on and send to membership. He feels it is too soon to make the call. Nancy Green asked the Board to encourage others to run for the Board and nominate people for the annual awards.

Executive Session: Nancy Green and Rachel Coleman left the room during the discussion of the Executive Director evaluation.

The Board of Directors went into executive session to discuss the annual review of the Executive Director. Del Siegle, in his role as Past President, conducted the evaluation. He reported that 16 current and immediate past Board members and publication editors completed the Board version of the evaluation. Nine professional staff completed the National Office version of the evaluation. The Board and National Office completed separate forms. The evaluations were overwhelmingly positive. Siegle reported that he had discussed the evaluation with the Executive Director prior to this weekend. He had also met earlier in the day with the officers, who serve as the evaluation committee for the Executive Director, per her employment agreement. Based on the positive review the Executive Director received, and the discussion held earlier in the day with the officers, he recommended that the Board approve a bonus and increase in the Executive Director's base salary. The Board voted to approve the suggested bonus and increase the Executive Director's salary for next year to the proposed amount. Siegle also noted that the President was working with the Executive Director to renew her contract.

Adjournment: 6:10 PM

Sunday, March 13, 2011 – Day 2

Resume order: 8:00 AM

8.1 NAGC Organization Committees/Workgroup Reports

8.1.2 Development Committee

Nancy Green provided background on the Javits-Frasier Teacher Scholarship program and called the Board's attention to the handout that was distributed at the meeting the previous day. After 5 years, it's time to make a decision about whether the program should continue as a national effort, and how best to seek sustainable funding.

Sally Krisel talked about the Georgia cohort and a recent professional development opportunity that she scheduled with the group. She believes the Georgia model that includes faculty and virtual support from the University of Georgia (and a rich curriculum in developing talents) and district level support could be a model for other states. The Board expressed broad support for a more sustainable model, and directed Green to pursue national funding, but within limited resources given the deficit budget.

8.1.3 Diversity & Equity Committee

This report was also pulled for its reference to the sustainable funding model discussed previously in support of the Javits Frasier Teacher Scholarship Program.

8.1.4 Education Committee

Robinson shared that she asked the report to be pulled in order to seek further information on two items: the RFP that was mentioned in relation to virtual academies, as well as the note about investigating the possibility of a credentialing program based on the revised Pre-K Programming Standards. Green noted the importance of consistency and balance as NAGC continues to offer an increased number of professional development opportunities. The Education Committee wished to pursue an RFP process to maintain balance and a visible selection process. Green also reported that it's likely that the Needs Assessment will go out in March.

The Board further discussed the credentialing/certificate program idea. Tieso expressed support for some sort of "certificate in training" (serve as mentor or co-teacher); she agreed it would be too difficult for NAGC to address the credentialing requirements across states. Krisel agreed the timing is right given Race to the Top and charter school initiatives, both support budgets for regional workshops. Green agreed to communicate this feedback to the Education Committee.

8.1.5 Graduate Student Committee

Robinson noted how effective this committee has been since they were given the freedom to elect their own chairs. Green mentioned that both the webinar they mention in their report as well as the panel presentation idea for convention have both been accepted.

8.1.7 Legislative & Advocacy Committee

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked that this report be pulled in order to address a series of questions asked during the November Legislative meeting. For example, "Is there a way we could influence the NAEP and TIMMS data to include advanced students?" Robinson agreed to follow up with this committee vis-à-vis the Database Workgroup she has created. The Board also noted the importance of Item E about the use of Title I funds to support G/T programs. Peter Laing, the state director in Arizona suggested that the Legislative Committee seek clarity from the Dept. of Education in a way that will reinforce appropriate uses of Title I funds and educate states. Staff agreed to follow up with a letter.

8.1.10 Parent Advisory Committee

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius pulled this report to discuss the "key communicator" roles as well as the schematic that details the relationships among all of the parent leadership groups. Green noted that working more collaboratively within these structures will be easier when a parent outreach specialist is hired. Committees and structure work best when the staff can support them.

Robinson directed Susan Dulong Langley, in her role as parent representative to the Board, to explore with the committees whether clarification among the groups is needed, and whether a more specific liaison role is needed between these committees and the Parent Representative to the Board.

11. Governance Report

11.1 Regulations and Policy Recommendations

Kristen Stephens highlighted some background research and the motions for revisions to policy language. First, to obtain background on the issue of appointed members, a message was sent out through the listserv of the American Society of Association Executives to seek information regarding how other associations/organizations address the issue of appointed members to their Boards. Stephens reviewed the examples that were shared by other associations as a backdrop to her recommendations. She then made several recommended changes, as outlined on pages 4 and 5 of her report.

Motion: To amend Regulation 6.6 giving the President, with input from appropriate organization committees and staff, the discretion to nominate potential appointments to the Board.

Second: Del Siegle

Vote: unanimous approval

Motion: To amend Policy 3.2.6 giving the President, with input from appropriate organization committees and staff, the discretion to nominate potential appointments to the Board.

Second: Lauri Kirsch

Vote: unanimous approval

Motion by Kristen Stephens: To amend the responsibilities of appointed Board members as follows:

Appointed board member duties and responsibilities are assigned at the discretion of the Board of Directors and tailored to the appointed member's area of expertise. Some responsibilities typically assigned to an appointed Board member include:

- Attendance at Board meetings
- Service on a Board committee
- Participation in the development and annual monitoring of NAGC's strategic plan

2. Approval of March Minutes

- Representing NAGC positions to individuals and groups with whom the Board member interacts
- Recruiting new members for the organization

Appointed Board members are required to:

- Know and uphold the regulations, policies, and procedures of the organization
- Represent the best interests of the organization on all issues raised in Board meetings, based on careful analyses of agendas and supporting materials
- Other duties determined by the President and Board of Directors

Second: Lauri Kirsch

Cindy Sheets suggested adding language that the appointed Board member must be an NAGC member during their term, but Ann Robinson pointed out that for a one-year term, they don't need to be a member; NAGC is seeking outside expertise

Vote: unanimous approval

11.2 Position Papers

Robinson asked Kristen Stephens to contact Tamra Stambaugh, Pam Clinkenbeard, and Scott Peters and email Carol Tomlinson to ask status of differentiation position paper.

Diversity Position Paper (revised)

Stephens provided an update on changes made to "Identifying and Serving CLD Gifted Students," since the Board last reviewed it. She noted that the group of authors has been very accommodating and easy to work with. Upon review, the Board expressed the following concerns:

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius agreed that the paper has improved, but shared concern about the last few paragraphs (sounds like we are talking to ourselves); make sure not to orient to the internal audience of gifted education, but to the outside. Sally Krisel noted that in-text citations would be helpful. Del Siegle articulated concerns with specific examples--1. take out Fairfax example. 2. remove this sentence "This axiom is generally accepted as fact by those knowledgeable in the field of gifted education, and many outside the field." Overall, the Board agreed that the message is important, but a few editorial tweaks remain.

Kristen Stephens noted that she likes how the position paper template is working, but the position statement is not strong enough. Sidney Moon offered that there might be a role for Publications Committee to edit syntax and grammar; review in some way before the Board sees it.

Motion by Lauri Kirsch: for pre-review of position papers by Publications Committee to observe format and template changes prior to Board review.

Second: Katie Augustyn

Vote: unanimous approval

13. National Office Update

Green reviewed current progress and priorities and highlights from her report. She noted that diversifying revenue continues to be the most important challenge facing NAGC. While NAGC's Convention revenues might not return to pre-2007 levels anytime soon, other sectors of the economy are picking up, and the Washington, DC area is becoming more competitive for the association market. To compete and to show appreciation for a staff that continues to do more with less, Green requested that the Board consider approving a \$14,000 merit pool to the FY 2011-2012 budget.

Green also highlighted recent successes, including NAGC's partnership with CEC, increasing sales of several brochures created to build awareness, and efforts to promote the Pre-K-12 Programming standards.

2. Approval of March Minutes

Green also outlined three major initiatives for the coming year—**first** a partnership with a new meetings management company, ConferenceDirect. Paid by the hotels through a commission on sleeping rooms, this company will provide logistics support and contract negotiation expertise to NAGC.

Second, Green reviewed a new “10-state strategy”; a service and marketing approach that will be implemented in the new fiscal year. By selecting states with some infrastructure in place (funding for gifted, state agency support, track record of participation), NAGC can build stronger relationships and offer more successful programs.

Finally, Green reviewed the evolution in thinking related to webinars and virtual academies. Programs will be priced to reinforce membership value, and more virtual academies in selected states will be planned for the future. With early success from the first program (net revenue of \$7,000), this model has strong potential as the professional development vehicle of choice.

15. Publications Report

Association Editor Sidney Moon called the Board’s attention to the Publications Report, which also includes reports from the other editors—*Gifted Child Quarterly*, *Parenting for High Potential*, and *Teaching for High Potential*.

Moon began with an update on new publications—not many in the pipeline, but one bright spot is a service publication on gifted and the arts that has been accepted by Corwin Press. Moon observed that a member services survey seeking input on potential publications topics might be valuable. Green suggested including a few questions in the Needs Assessment going out next month through the Education Committee. Moon noted a decline in collaborative publications.

Moon shared concerns expressed by GCQ Editor, Carolyn Callahan, that the GCQ editorial budget may not be sufficient for the next editor. She thinks it should be increased so that the location of the journal will not be dependent on the resources of the university with which the editor is affiliated.

Moon then provided an update and recommendations on the Board’s charge from the September meeting—that the Publications Committee develop a defensible, comprehensive approach to the selection and publishing of curriculum and instructional support materials under the banner/moniker of NAGC.

The Board discussed the following recommendations, and Moon agreed to direct the Publications Committee to pursue:

1. Work with Curriculum Studies Network to design a rubric that focuses on new material (under current award, submitters may pull from already published materials; copyright issues). Consider the possibility of more than one rubric for different types of curriculum—ensuring curriculum is of “high quality and research based,” while not setting the bar so high that no curriculum will qualify—no cost associated with this recommendation.
(Siegle asked whether having “NAGC Curriculum Award Winner” stamped on publications would raise awareness for good content; explore possibility of NAGC royalties.)
2. Research the curriculum publishing models of comparable professional organizations like ASCD, CEC, NSTA, NCTM, NCTE, etc.
3. Create a searchable, online database of lesson plans and units (Indiana and NC have this)—cost associated with this recommendation—possible future consideration.
4. Create materials to be aligned to relevant NAGC and content standards, especially the new Common Core Standards adopted by many states. Explore the possibility of a publication that would help regular classroom teachers differentiate core curricula for talented learners.
5. Develop acquisition strategies that will ensure that NAGC published curriculum represents a wide variety of curriculum models and does not privilege one model over other equally high quality models.
6. Consider developing a book from *THP* content, like the ones that have been developed from *PHP* content.

7. Remove out-of-date curriculum materials from the NAGC web site.

On behalf of the Board, Robinson expressed appreciation to Sidney Moon and the Publications Committee for all of the productive ideas and work that has been accomplished since the November meeting, as conveyed in the Publications report.

12. Long-term Planning & Strategic Framework Update

Ann Robinson prefaced the discussion by asking if the goals outlined in the strategic framework are still priorities of NAGC. She then asked if new priorities and initiatives should be added for the future. How can we be prepared to handle the expansion of existing initiatives that are languishing? How should we think about organizational priorities in the short and long term?

Lauri Kirsch noted that all of our goals should answer the following questions: 1. Does it fit into our mission? 2. Can we do it better than anyone else? 3. Does it make sense with the resources we have?

Goal 1. Our Compelling Goal for Leadership

Sidney Moon observed that from the perspective of Publications, we should shift Goal 3 to Goal 1. Del Siegle said that he doesn't see the national renaissance (mentioned in Goal 1) happening, but Sally Krisel noted that the essence of the renaissance idea is working and that we should take the summit idea out of the goal.

Lauri Kirsch added that this goal also needs to encompass administrators; concerted activity to go where they are and give them reasons to participate with NAGC.

Ann Robinson suggested reaching out both to chief state school officers and to the American Association of School Administrators. Nancy Green mentioned that as a result of the administrators' convention and Eugene White, in Tampa, we were able to sponsor a panel of administrators discussing gifted education at the AASA convention.

Sidney Moon suggested that NAGC create and/or disseminate materials to guide teachers and administrators in supporting schools that adopt core curriculum standards.

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius said that NAGC needs to take the leadership role and demonstrate how we are relevant to school reform; she doesn't believe that we are currently out there expressing that view.

Goal 2. Our Compelling Goal to Create Influence and Change

Kristen Stephens mentioned that the bulleted points underneath Goal 2 seem to be really broad; she asked if the goal should get more specific (workplan rather than strategic plan).

Del Siegle noted that the Board is given a strategic plan/workplan. Officers work on specific goals.

Sidney Moon asked that Staff come up with specifics for implementing what is mentioned in Goal 2C:

- C. NAGC will increase public awareness by building organizational identity (tied to renaissance?) and by consistently defining and refining key messages that are also relevant to changing societal issues for use with the media, the public, elected officials, and other national organizations.

It was noted that under Goal 2C, the words "tied to renaissance" should be edited out

Goal 3. Our Compelling Goal for Expertise and Excellence

An edit was suggested for this goal: edit NCATE into CAEP in 2013 revised standards.

Del Siegle agrees that Goal 3 is at the heart of NAGC's mission. It could be our primary focus.

Sidney Moon asked to add core standards to the list of driving forces.

Goal 4. Our Compelling Goal for Organizational Effectiveness

Katie Augustyn highlighted the importance of fundraising in Goal 4.

16. Financial Report/Proposed Budget

With the arrival of Elizabeth Leith from NAGC's audit firm, Haymaker & Associates, the Board focused first on reviewing and accepting the audit. Leith distributed the audit documents, including the management letter, and proceeded to review them.

Her observations included the fact that NAGC remains in a strong cash position, with more than a year's operating budget in reserves. She noted the growth in investments year-over-year. She also raised the single management letter comment that related to reconciling accounts receivable in QuickBooks and in the membership database. Bassett explained that this will be corrected by moving to a month-to-month reconciliation rather than quarterly.

Siegle asked about the lease commitment and Bassett reported that NAGC will be paying full rent starting with the FY12-13 budget.

Motion by Carol Tieso: to accept audit

Second: Katie Augustyn

Vote: unanimous approval of accepting the audit

16.1.3 2010-2011 Operating Budget

Katie Augustyn noted NAGC's improved financial position from a year ago—with help from investments, income is up 3.8% and expenses, managed carefully by the staff, are down 7%. The Board also reviewed the historical comparison of income and expense trends presented by Augustyn (graph handout). The FY2010-2011 full-year deficit is projected to be slightly less than the \$151,000 budgeted level. Augustyn mentioned that the staff is now recording all investment income "below the line" so that investment gains and losses are not included in the operating budget results.

16.1.4 Investments Update

NAGC has \$2.2 million in reserve funds as of February 22, 2011, a \$23,400 increase over last year. NAGC has slightly more than one year's operating in reserve. The long-term portfolio was rebalanced in December 2010, and all SunTrust proprietary assets were sold and reinvested in open-market investments. The long term reserve gained 17.3% in value over the past year.

16.2 2011-2012 Proposed Budget

In the proposed budget, there is a projected deficit of \$81,576 (\$121,576K if parent outreach specialist and staff increases are approved). The \$40,000 increase reflects \$15,000 to hire a parent specialist to supplement the existing \$5,000 line item, an increase of \$3,000 for PHP Editor expenses, and \$24,000 in salary increases for staff.

Del Siegle asked about new sources of revenue. Is it possible to sell articles with the current web site structure? Green replied that the "bookstore" feature could accommodate that idea.

Ann Robinson asked that the Board be flexible enough to increase *PHP* editor salary to reflect additional issues outlined in the new model.

Motion by Del Siegle: to accept proposed budget with modifications (Executive Director, staff raises, parent outreach specialist, and flexibility with *PHP* editor contract -- \$121,576 deficit)

Second: Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Lauri Kirsch cautioned that as leaders, we are too comfortable with spending the money we have in reserves. She noted that the first priority should be to shrink the deficit budget even more rather than adding 40k in expenses.

Stuart Omdal is pleased to see that deficit has shrunk and that we are making substantial cuts over the years.

Katie Augustyn agreed with Kirsch that we should not maintain a deficit over the long-term, but that "it takes money to make money," and the bunker mentality we have lived with for four consecutive budgets should be balanced with a growth mindset.

Vote: unanimous approval for 2011-2012 Budget.

LUNCH (working lunch)

17. Legislative Update

2. Approval of March Minutes

René Islas from B&D Consulting highlighted some of this year's legislative themes in the context of the federal policy landscape, emphasizing collaboration and cooperation. The current climate drives our efforts to carve out a path that helps legislators move ahead in their work. Equity and Excellence, NAGC's first effort at federal support for underserved gifted learners, was a good start; the new bill, the TALENT (To Aid Gifted and High-Ability Learners by Empowering the Nation's Teachers) Act, puts all of the pieces together that we have developed over the last 3 years, with less of a fiscal burden. It also demonstrates NAGC's strong collaboration with CEC. With a divided Congress, Rene noted, NAGC's work will be especially challenging.

The TALENT Act will package the four pillars of NAGC's advocacy efforts in one bill. The Equity and Excellence legislation captured the themes, but Congress will authorize no new spending this time around. One comprehensive piece of legislation now covers it all.

The TALENT Act advocates for:

1. Changes to Assessment & Accountability Systems

- require all state assessments to be vertically scaled
- measure where students are in terms of achievement
- require schools to report growth not just proficiency

2. Classroom practice

-Comprehensive strategy to address needs of gifted and talented students, and gifted education pedagogy for teachers nationwide.

Jean Peterson asked if this is an opportunity to include Frank Worrel and Rena Subotnik (APA) and school counselors such as Susan Gorin (School Psychologists).

3. Focus on Underserved Populations

- Focus on rural populations (REAP)
- Requirement in Title I schools: how to identify and serve low-income students who are gifted

4. Emphasis on Research and dissemination

- research to identify gifted students
- Department of Education will report data on the education of gifted students

Representative Gallegly will be introducing the TALENT Act on House side (and possibly Representatives Guthrie and Payne;) in the Senate, Senators Grassley and Casey.

Islas observed that Congress will likely "come to grips" with ESEA this year. Lots of pressure to change the law, even if it's not fully reauthorized. Democrats are divided between those who have close ties to the unions and traditional education groups and those who are more progressive (e.g., Jared Polis pushing for charter schools).

Before departing the meeting, René Islas informed the Board of his departure from B&D Consulting to take a full time role at the Learning Forward (formerly the National Staff Development Council.) The Board wished him well on the new venture.

14. President-Elect's Report

14.1 Convention Highlights & 14.2 Convention Grid

Paula Olszewski-Kubilius began her report by highlighting the pre-conference activities. Wednesday will feature "Gifted Education Essentials" and conclude with a fireside chat (200 Years of Experience in 90 Minutes: Leadership and Life Lessons from the Field). Thursday will be more in-depth, specialized topics with "Gifted Education Applications," (designed for those with more than a beginning level of knowledge). She then passed around the draft preliminary program that will mail in April.

2. Approval of March Minutes

Bill Nye the Science Guy is confirmed to speak as opening keynoter. Olszewski-Kubilius noted that the Awards ceremony will be held on Thursday of Convention as a Celebration of Excellence. The virtual conference and Parent Day will remain on Saturday. Because we are not in a convention center, we will be offering jam sessions this year (table talks).

The overarching theme of the mini-keynotes is compelling and persistent issues and questions within the field of gifted education; mini-keynoters include: David Lubinski and Camilla Benbow; Joyce VanTassel-Baska moderating a panel on differentiation; and Joshua Aronson on "Stereotypes and the Nature and Nurture of Intelligence". Based on discussions with the Program Committee, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius asked Jean Peterson to organize a mini-keynote on bullying during Parent Day; Olszewski-Kubilius also reported she is planning a session on "Connecting for High Potential" (home and school linkage) and also a session on parenting styles and cultural differences. This year's Conceptual Foundations Network taping will feature Don Treffinger.

The Board was enthusiastic about the event at Mardi Gras World, which will also feature the Torrance Creativity keynote and reception. The Board expressed support for a spouse ticket for events (because of the destination, there may be more spouses at this convention).

Olszewski-Kubilius concluded her report by highlighting the review process. Next year, she will be exploring some different options with the new program chair. Now is the time to step back and re-examine the review process -- the sheer volume of proposals makes the review a huge task.

18. New Business

Olszewski-Kubilius reviewed the GCQ editor timeline with the Board. The position description may need edits, but since a lot of it is policy there won't be much tweaking. The deadline for applications for the GCQ editor is September 1, 2011. Ann Robinson and Paula Olszewski-Kubilius will work on this together with a small group of leaders.

Del Siegle suggested posting the agenda of the business meetings of the Board on the web site (just draft agenda; not attachments; for transparency). Katie Augustyn suggested sharing the approved minutes on the web site too.

Katie Augustyn noted that, due to time constraints, the investment discussion and vote will occur via email.

Ann Robinson concluded the meeting by recognizing the departing Board members—Jean Peterson, Del Siegle, Cindy Sheets, Sally Krisel, Carol Tieso; the continuing Board members applauded their service.

ADJOURNMENT

2:23 PM