

National Education Knowledge Industry Association



2006 Board of Directors Spring Meeting

April 6-7, 2006

WestEd
730 Harrison Street
San Francisco, California 94107



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Schedule of Activities.....	4
Board Meeting Agenda.....	6
2006 Work Plan	11
Reauthorization of ESEA	15
Quality Standards	25
Membership Recruitment and Dues Structure.....	27
Board of Directors Minutes.....	33
Executive Committee Minutes.....	43
Financial Statements.....	47

Reference Materials (Sent under separate cover in the 2005 Board Handbook)

- 2006 Board of Directors
- 2006 Membership list
- 2006 Work Plan
- 2006 Budget
- 2006 Calendar
- NEKIA By-laws and Policy Statements

National Education Knowledge Industry Association

1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 518-0847

March 29, 2006

Dear Members of the Board of Directors,

We look forward to seeing all of you at our meeting in San Francisco on April 6-7, 2006. We anticipate a productive gathering as we move forward together in implementing the new vision for NEKIA that we developed at the retreat in February.

As you will note, our agenda will focus on our immediate advocacy and marketing priorities for effectively positioning the trade association and its members during this challenging period of transitions inside and outside of NEKIA. We will also examine some of the longer term issues relating to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the application of our knowledge use principles, and the development of new membership options.

As always we look forward to being “at the table” with all of you, breaking bread, raising a glass, and working together on our ambitious agenda for the year ahead.

Until then,

Carol Thomas
2006 Board Chair

Jim Kohlmoos
President and CEO

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

To: Board of Directors
From: John Waters
Subject: Schedule of Activities for the Week

You will see below the schedule of activities for April 6-7 and 10. We will do all that we can to make this gathering productive and convenient for all of you. Please don't hesitate to contact me with any changes in your plans or questions about the logistics.

Thursday, April 6

Annabelle's Bistro
68 Fourth Street (between Mission and Market Streets)
San Francisco, CA 415.777.1200
<http://www.annabelles.net/>
Reservation under Max McConkey

7:15-9:30 p.m. Members' Dinner
(Board members, affiliate members and special guests)

Friday, April 7

WestEd Office
730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, 415.565.3000
Board Room, 5th Floor
Directions: <http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/loc/7>

8:00-9:30 a.m. Executive Committee Meeting
(Dwyer, McConkey, Redfield, Thomas, Herman, Kohlmoos)

9:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m. Board Meeting
(Board members)

Monday, April 10

WestEd Office
730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, 415.565.3000
Sierra Room, 2nd Floor

2:30-4:00 pm Membership Recruitment "Tea"
(Board Member and invited guests)

BOARD MEETING AGENDA

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos and Carol Thomas
Subject: Board Meeting Agenda on April 7

As you can see below we have an ambitious agenda for our day together. Of course, the times are subject to change as we proceed through the day. Carol Thomas as the Board Chair will guide us through the agenda.

Location:
WestEd Office
730 Harrison Street San Francisco, 415.565.3000
Board Room, 5th Floor

- 8:00-9:30 a.m. Executive Committee Meeting**
(For Executive Committee members only)
- 9:30- 9:45 a.m. Board Meeting**
- Welcome & Introductions
 - Agenda ---Review (*See pages 7-8*)
 - Minutes --- make decision to approve/modify (*see pages 33-46*)
- 9:45-10:15 a.m. Progress Reports**
- Follow up items from retreat --- get feedback (*see page 10*)
 - Progress report on FY 2006 Work plan --- get feedback and modify if necessary (*see pages 11-14*)
 - FY 2006 NEKIA budget situation --- discuss (*see pages 47-49*)
- 10:15 a.m.-Noon Advocacy**
- Current environment, dynamics, challenges --- discuss
 - Ideas for “bundling” & affinity groups --- get sense of the Board
 - New roles and responsibilities --- generate ideas
 - Reauthorization preliminary plan ---get sense of the Board (*see pages 16-23*)
- Noon-1:30 p.m. Lunch and Group Share**
- Round table short presentations about new developments in each member organization
- 1:30-3:30 p.m. Marketing**
- Quality standards for the Knowledge Use Principles --- generate ideas in small groups (*see page 25*)
 - Proposal for 2007 NEKIA conference --- make a decision about moving forward (*see page 26*)
 - Membership strategy --- get feedback about current approach (*see page 27*)
 - Ideas for restructuring dues structure---generate ideas and options (*see pages 28-32*)

3:30-4:00 p.m.

Announcements and Follow Up

- Status of 2005 Audit Report
- Policy Forum on High Schools
- NEKIA Communicators Institute, June
- “Using Knowledge for a Change” Retreat in Aspen, July
- Annual Meeting and Business Institute, November

Progress Reports

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: Retreat Follow Up
Date: 3/23/06

The flurry of activity towards the end of our retreat in February caused some concerns about follow up. You will find below a quick status report on the short term tasks upon which we agreed. Overall I am pleased with our progress so far but we still have some big issues ahead of us in the coming months, including the overhaul of staff functions, the potential redesign of the membership structure, and the “operationalization” of the knowledge use principles.

*Completed....*Draft vision statement

Partially completed Revise 2006 Work plan and staffing functions. The Board approved major changes in March. We still need to develop indicators for each priority area and revise the staffing functions. This will be done within the next two weeks.

Completed ... Revise 2006 Calendar

Ongoing ... Overhaul 2006 government relations strategy

Ongoing ... Convene task forces

- Advocacy--- Carol, Bernice, Paul, Steve, Nancy, Max
- Membership -- Denise, Carol, Joan, and Chris
- Aspen retreat --- Nancy, Paul, Carol
- Reauthorization --- Paul, Laura, Everett, Steve, Tom

Completed ... Implement transitional affiliate membership plan

To begin in April ... Consider new governance and structural options. The Executive Committee will be taking up these issues next month.

Ongoing ... Short term financial issues. We will continue to be very conservative in our spending and work with the Executive Committee on specific actions if we encounter cash flow problems in the coming weeks (including reducing staff costs and securing a line of credit).

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: 2006 Work plan, Progress report
Date: 3/23/06

As we have done the last two years, we present to you the following progress report on our annual work plan. You will see that at this early stage we are fairly cautious in judging our progress. I will be happy to talk to you about this report in more detail at the meeting.

Progress Ratings

- 5 – Exceptional progress. Anticipate achieving or exceeding the original goal
- 4 – Very Good progress. Anticipate achieving up to 90% of the goal
- 3 – Good progress. Anticipate achieving up to 75% of the goal
- 2 – Average progressive. Anticipate achieving up to 50% of the goal
- 1 – Poor or no progress

	April	Sept	Nov
1.0 Advocacy			
1.1 Appropriations	3 — We are early in the process and just beginning to implement our expanded portfolio. With changes in membership we are also reassessing our grassroots process and the coverage of key members of Congress		
1.2 Implementations	2 --- We need to establish some new protocols for identifying and acting on issues of importance to members. So far we focused on the announcements of the competitions awards and the implementation of report language in the appropriations bill.		
1.3 Reauthorizations	3 --- We have focused primarily on developing our proposal for ESEA. It will be a long term project.		
2.0 Marketing			
2.1 Branding	2 --- We have made some good progress in revising our materials and our web site to focus on knowledge use. This is only the beginning of what should be a long term effort. We have much more to do in this process over the next several months.		
2.2 Communications	3--- We continue to get media attention in the trade press with quotes and references. The policy forum in March was a well attended and acclaimed gathering.		
2.3 Membership	2--- We have in place a more proactive strategy for generating new members. It remains to be seen how quickly the prospects will join.		
2.4 External Relationships	4 --- Our collaborative activities continue to be essential parts of advocacy and leadership work.		
3.0 Management			
3.1 Operations & Governance	2 --- We anticipate starting a reexamination of board functions and activities at the April meeting. We continue to streamline our office operations with new auditing, payroll, and bookkeeping efforts. We are nearly a paperless office now.		
3.2 Member	3--- The retreat in February helped to re-focus attention on the		

Relations	value of “being at the table”, the importance of collective effort and the need for unity of purpose. We have a strong foundation on which to build.
3.3 Finance	2--- With a conservative spending plan for the coming months, our situation still remains fragile. There is a clear need to generate additional revenues through membership and other vehicles. We have not yet developed a comprehensive long term plan.

*****FOR YOUR REFERENCE*****
APPROVED 2006 GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

1. Advocacy: Increase funding and favorable policies relating to the effective use of knowledge in federal education programs.

1.1 FY 2007 Appropriations—Advocate for an increase in appropriations levels for designated “knowledge use” programs.

Key Activities in 2006:

- Develop and implement comprehensive strategy for selected appropriations accounts with specific targets and advocacy tactics
- Provide accurate and timely information, strategic guidance, and training to designated Policy Action Group representatives
- Convene regular conference calls, ongoing email communications, and at least 2 DC-based working meetings
- Maintain “on call” contact with PAG members for advice and sharing

1.2 Implementations --- Ensure the favorable implementation of relevant provisions in Education Sciences Reform Act (ESRA) and No Child Left behind Act (NCLBA)

Key activities in 2006:

- Develop and implement a process for identifying critical implementation issues including the funding and configurations of National R&D Centers, the implementation of agreements for the Comprehensive Centers and the Regional Education Laboratories, relevant report language in FY 2006 appropriations bills

1. 3 Reauthorizations --- Promote knowledge use positions on selected issues in various reauthorizations including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Higher Education Act (HEA), Perkins Act, and other authorization and policy areas.

Key activities in 2006:

- Establish specific positions for the reauthorization of ESEA and develop long term strategy for building support for the positions
- Identify relevant issues and formulate positions for HEA, Perkins and other potential laws and work with coalitions to promote positions

2. Marketing: Expand support for and recognition of knowledge use as a central theme of NEKIA and its members.

2.1 Brand Creation and Refinement --- Create and implement a comprehensive strategy for achieving the NEKIA vision as the preeminent advocacy organization for knowledge use in education.

Key Activities in 2006

- Develop and promote standards, indicators, and exemplars for knowledge use
- Develop and implement a branding and marketing strategy for NEKIA, its knowledge use principles, and its members
- Reconfigure the government relations strategy to promote knowledge use as a central theme including an ESEA reauthorization strategy focusing on knowledge use

2.2 Communications --- Raise public awareness about knowledge use, NEKIA, and its members.

Key Activities in 2006:

- Media Relations—Generate at least five op ed pieces and 10 positive quotes or references in trade publications
- Events— Conduct at least three events to enhance visibility and credibility of NEKIA as an industry leader
- Communicators Network--- Conduct annual NEKIA Communicators Institute with a new focus on helping to develop the branding and communications plan for NEKIA's new vision for knowledge use

2.3 Membership --- Expand and diversify NEKIA's membership in line with NEKIA's new vision

Key Activities in 2006:

- Re-convene Board task force to identify and recruit prospects
- Create rigorous standards for knowledge use to be applied to membership
- Evaluate and revise NEKIA's membership and dues structure

2.4 External Relationships —Actively expand and strengthen collaborative relationships with other industry organizations

Key Activities in 2006:

- Continue active involvement in industry-related strategic alliances including AEP, IEA, CEF, EdLiNC, IGER, OCRE, COSN
- Explore additional partnerships and co-sponsorships with other industry related organizations, National Academy of Sciences, the US Department of Education, NSF, and other executive agencies

3. Management: Strengthen NEKIA's capacity to carry out its mission and new vision

3.1 Operations and Governance—Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of office operations and governance processes.

Key Activities in 2006:

- Use technology and consultants to streamline accounting, budgetary and correspondence processes

- Revise bylaws, policies and procedures in line with NEKIA's new vision
- Continue to expand the Executive Committee's role in overseeing operating processes and maintain the Board's focus on key strategic issues

3.2 Member Relationships --- Create conditions and new opportunities for communication, collaboration, and sharing among NEKIA members

Key Activities in 2006:

- Refine board operations (meetings, retreats, conference calls, task forces) to enable further interactions among members

3.3 Finances --- Expand and diversify revenues for long term financial stability

Key activities in 2006

- Develop and begin to implement a comprehensive strategy for expanding and diversifying revenues for long term financial stability including securing support for knowledge use activities

Advocacy

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: ESEA Reauthorization, Preliminary Plan
Date: 3/23/06

Background

Back in November we formed a task group for ESEA Reauthorization composed of Laura, Paul, Steve, Tom and Everett Barnes. The group has had a number of conference calls to develop and examine various parts of our proposal. You will find below a preliminary plan for moving forward. During our April meeting we will seek your reactions to this preliminary plan.

Timing Issues

In response to our question about the timing of the reauthorization, the Department of Education responded in early January as follows:

“... The ESEA as reauthorized by NCLB runs through FY 2007. The so-called "GPRA extension" adds one more year. Theoretically, the Congress should have the reauthorization completed in time to affect the '08 appropriations, with the extension available in case they need a little more time. But in recent years the schedules haven't seemed to mean much. The current version of the Perkins Act expired at the end of FY '03, and reauthorization still isn't completed. The failure of the Congress to complete reauthorizations on time doesn't keep the appropriators from continuing the flow of money.... ESRA runs through FY 08, plus the extension year.... The Department has only begun to discuss how this Administration will handle ESEA, whether to send up a bill, how to obtain public input, etc. They have not yet decided upon a “point person” but he/she will likely be identified in the ‘coming weeks’.”

Our sense is that the reauthorization will be a significant issue during the 2008 President elections and Congress will not act until the new Administration is in place. If history repeats itself, we will likely not have a new law until 2010.

Most education interest groups have prepared or are in the process of preparing position statements regarding the reauthorization. Some have prepared very technical proposals while others (who don't want to tip their hands yet) have developed general principles. Most aim to have positions staked out in time for potential field and Congressional hearings this year and next. Many will also want to approach both Presidential campaigns with their proposals.

We believe that the time is ripe to prepare and present a general proposal now while having specific suggestions for provisions and technical language in the “back pocket” --- ready for the appropriate opportunity.

Key Tactical and Substantive Considerations

In our task group discussions we considered a number of key tactical and substantive elements including:

1. Make knowledge use the focal point of our proposal and use the knowledge use concept to clarify and complement SBR. (We should do a word search through the current law and find appropriate places to include a knowledge use concept.)
2. Avoid the other more contentious issues (e.g. choice, supplemental services, AYP measures) on which other organizations will focus.
3. Create a link between ESEA and ESRA---that could be our policy niche; e.g. the connector between problems and solutions.
4. Avoid the appearances of growing government or the federal bureaucracy.
5. Use a hybrid approach; i.e. both sprinkle KU ideas/provisions throughout the bill and develop a stand alone section using the KU Act.
6. Look for partners who would help play a substantive role and also for “sign on” friends to support our proposal.
7. Get re-acquainted with authorizing committee staffs in both House and Senate and hold preliminary discussions.
8. Get acquainted with staff in ED who will be involved in the drafting of ESEA proposals--- particularly career staff who will be around when the next Administration takes over in 2009.
9. Prepare a fairly general one page document with our principles to take to the Hill during our visits in the months ahead. We will want to introduce our ideas now and then follow up later with more details.
10. Target members of Congress on the authorizing committees with whom we have relationships but not confine ourselves just to them. We need several champions who resonate to the concept of knowledge use.
11. Seek to have our members participate in Congressional hearings.
12. Seek to have the knowledge use concept raised in other organizations’ efforts such as the new NCLB Commission at the Aspen Institute, PEN’s soon to be published report, and other places.
13. Promote our members’ work as exemplars of high quality knowledge use.

Proposed Principles

We propose to adapt the “NEKIA Principles for Effective Knowledge Use” as follows. Promotional pieces will then be developed based upon these principles.

Guiding Principles for ESEA Reauthorization

NEKIA believes that effective knowledge use in school improvement should be a central organizing theme of the next reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Key provisions in the next reauthorization should reflect five basic principles of knowledge use as follows:

- #1 Sustained Improvement --- Effective use of education knowledge can significantly enhance, accelerate, and sustain the nationwide efforts to improve academic performance and close achievement gaps in k-12 education.
- #2 Useable Knowledge --- Knowledge that is used to shape policy and practice should be derived from the best available empirical evidence as well as informed by sound professional judgment.

#3 Key Stakeholders --- The effective use of knowledge in education requires the active participation of and the on-going collaboration among five key stakeholder groups: 1)Practitioners, 2) Policymakers, 3)Researchers, 4) Developers and Providers, 5) Intermediaries.

#4 Cumulative Process --- Effective knowledge use depends upon dynamic on-going exchanges of data and information among the stakeholders and involves a continuous process of research, application and adaptation. As knowledge is used and adapted, new knowledge is created and applied in a cumulative, iterative fashion.

#5 High Priority Policy --- School improvement policies at the federal, state, and local levels should focus priority attention on the effective use of knowledge and create incentives to stimulate greater demand for and increased supply of knowledge-based solutions.

Proposed Language Inserts

One part of our reauthorization strategy is to embed knowledge use language in as many places as appropriate in the various titles of the bill. We suggest doing the following:

- Support and clarify the concept of “scientifically based research” notations with “effective knowledge-based solutions” wherever possible.
- Define knowledge based solutions by combining the SBR definition in NCLB with our knowledge use principles

Proposed Provision

Another part of our proposed strategy is to create a separate section in the bill for knowledge use using an adaptation of our Knowledge Utilization Act of 2004 as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the `Effective Knowledge Use in Education Act of 2008'.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

- (1) Knowledge use allows information generated by scientifically valid research to be available to, and usable by, educators in the classroom.
- (2) Limited knowledge use has impeded the progress of schools in increasing academic achievement of students.
- (3) Research shows that student achievement increases when education practices based on scientifically valid research are used by classroom teachers.
- (4) To facilitate the coordination and use of knowledge-based practices by classroom teachers, effective knowledge use is essential, including the development and use of products and strategies based on scientifically based research.
- (5) The active involvement of teachers, principals, district administrators, chief State school officers, as well as developers, researchers and intermediaries in knowledge use activities is essential to the effective application of research-based knowledge to policy and practice.
- (6) Although the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.)) requires educators to use instructional practices and innovations supported by scientifically

valid research, such practices and innovations are in short supply and not widely available and coordinated for effective use in classrooms.

(7) Given that a significant percentage of public schools in the United States are not making adequate yearly progress under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, steps must be taken to coordinate the effective use of knowledge by classroom educators.

(8) Particular subgroups of students are not making adequate yearly progress, as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, including economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency. Such students require targeted efforts to ensure that they are receiving instruction supported by scientifically valid research.

(9) More instructional activities and practices supported by scientifically valid research need to be developed to meet the current and expected demands of educators in schools.

(10) Although existing a number of federal research, development, dissemination, and technical assistance programs have been proven to be effective, these programs need to be brought to national scale and coordinated through a national, knowledge use initiative.

(11) Effective knowledge use in education brings together the professional wisdom of practitioners and the best available empirical evidence generated through scientifically valid research.

(12) Too often exemplary innovations in teaching, curriculum, and assessment are demonstrated to be effective, but have minimal impact because they are not brought to scale.

(13) Educational practices that are supported by scientifically valid research need to be brought to greater scale in school districts across the country in order to have broad influence on student achievement.

(14) National leadership is needed to provide targeted initiatives, collaboration, and coordination of knowledge use programs to ensure that classroom educators have access to, and utilize practices supported by, scientifically valid research.

(15) A national leadership initiative to coordinate Department of Education programs and promote knowledge use in education will facilitate the effective implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE FOR EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE USE IN EDUCATION.

(a) Establishment- There shall be in the Department of Education the National Leadership Initiative for Knowledge Use in Education (in this section referred to as the "Initiative").

(b) Goals- The goals of the initiative shall include the following:

(1) Promoting the use of scientifically valid research in education practice and innovation.

(2) Providing leadership to the Nation in developing and promoting policies, practices, and investments that result in the provision of instruction supported by scientifically valid research to elementary and secondary school students.

(3) Developing and promoting policies, practices, and investments that result in bringing to scale successful educational practices that are based on scientifically valid research.

- (4) Informing the public about the significance of using scientifically valid research in education.
 - (5) Encouraging the use of new technologies in appropriate knowledge use efforts.
 - (6) Supporting the effective coordination of current federally supported knowledge use programs, including regional educational laboratories, research and development centers, technical assistance centers and consortia, national clearinghouses, and other entities involved in research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and evaluation.
 - (7) Administering the partnership that may be established pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of this section.
 - (8) Producing the biennial report required by subsection (d).
 - (9) Using the expertise of existing knowledge use programs to assist in the implementation of this section.
- (c) Allowable Activities – the initiative may conduct one or more of the following activities:
- (1) Interagency Task Force-
 - (A) Establishment- To promote coordination and cooperation among Federal departments and agencies administering knowledge use programs and activities, the Secretary may convene the Interagency Task Force on Knowledge Use in Education (in this subsection referred to as the `Task Force').
 - (B) Functions of the task force-
 - (i) identify and review Federal programs, activities, and projects with respect to knowledge use in education (including any plans for such programs, activities, and projects); and
 - (i) prepare, for inclusion in the biennial report under subsection (d), recommendations on ways to improve the coordination and collaboration of such programs, activities, and projects.
 - (C) Membership- The Task Force may include, but is not limited to, the following members:
 - (i) The Director of the Institute of Education Sciences.
 - (ii) The Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
 - (iii) The Director of the National Science Foundation.
 - (iv) Such Assistant Secretaries and other officials from the Department of Education as the Secretary may designate.
 - (2) Knowledge Use Partnership in Education-
 - (A) Establishment- The Secretary may establish a network of private and public entities throughout the Nation, to be known as the Knowledge Use Partnership in Education (in this subsection referred to as the `Partnership').
 - (B) Purpose- The purpose of the Partnership is to promote and advance knowledge utilization in education in conjunction with private and public organizations and entities throughout the Nation.
 - (C) Functions- The Partnership may--

- (i) encourage private-public venture partnerships for knowledge utilization;
- (ii) identify needs in relation to knowledge use programs, activities, and projects supported by the Federal Government;
- (iii) provide general advice to the Secretary; and
- (iv) provide technical assistance to the elementary and secondary education community to encourage the adoption of education practices supported by scientifically valid research.

(3) Advisory panel-

(A) Establishment- The Secretary may establish a Partnership Advisory Panel (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Panel').

(B) Membership- The Secretary shall select the members of the Panel from among individuals who represent entities participating in the Partnership and have expertise in knowledge use.

(C) The Panel may conduct the following functions:

- (i) To advise the Secretary regarding the opportunities and challenges of promoting knowledge use activities at the local, State, and Federal levels through the Partnership; and offer suggestions to the Secretary for promoting knowledge use policies and strategies in the future through the Partnership.

(d) Biennial Report-

(1) In general- The Secretary shall--

(A) conduct a biennial analysis of the state of knowledge use in education practice and innovation; and

(B) submit a report on the results of each such analysis to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(2) Contents- Each report submitted under this subsection shall--

(A) include an assessment of efforts to increase the use of education practices supported by scientifically valid research; and

(B) recommend changes in policies to further promote progress in knowledge use.

(3) Initial report- The first report under this subsection shall be submitted no later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. GRANTS TO PROMOTE EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE USE IN EDUCATION.

(a) Program Authorized- The Secretary of Education shall make competitive grants to, and enter into contracts with, eligible entities to support projects that promote knowledge use in education.

(b) Use of Funds- The Secretary may not make a grant to an eligible entity under this section unless the entity agrees to use the grant for 1 or more of the following:

- (1) Helping educators become more informed consumers of knowledge use programs and services through sustained professional development activities, including annual conferences, summer teacher academies, on-line seminars, and school-based workshops.

- (2) Creating incentives for States and districts to expand and coordinate their investments in knowledge use initiatives.
- (3) Focusing special knowledge use efforts on high-need, low-capacity areas such as rural schools.
- (4) Developing a national corps of regionally based research-to-practice coordinators to work in schools on the effective implementation, use, and dissemination of education practices supported by scientifically valid research.
- (5) Targeting efforts to classroom educators working with subgroups whose test scores indicate that they need improvement under the adequate yearly progress calculation required by section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)), including economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.
- (6) Conducting research on effective knowledge use.
- (7) Coordinating and enhancing existing federally supported knowledge use programs, including regional educational laboratories, research and development centers, technical assistance centers and consortia, national clearinghouses, and other entities involved in research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and evaluation.
- (8) Supporting efforts to identify and disseminate promising practices in the implementation of education innovation that are supported by scientifically valid research.
- (9) Promoting entrepreneurship in developing new solutions, innovations, and choices in education for consumers that are supported by scientifically valid research.
- (10) Establishing fellowship programs to encourage expert capacity in knowledge utilization.
- (11) Using Internet-based technology to enable classroom teachers to access, in all content areas, instructional practice and innovation that are grounded in scientifically valid research.
- (12) Developing means and methods for making the information from the What Works Clearinghouse and other clearinghouses available to, and accessible by, classroom teachers.
- (13) Developing strategies to support the use of scientifically valid research by classroom teachers and school administrators in managing and improving student behavior and school climate.

(c) Applications- To seek a grant or a contract under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(d) Eligible Entities- In this section, the term `eligible entity'--

- (1) means a private or public, for-profit or nonprofit organization, institution, agency, institution of higher education, or partnership of such entities, that has demonstrated expertise in knowledge utilization in education; and
- (2) includes existing federally supported knowledge utilization programs, such as regional educational laboratories, research and development centers, technical

assistance centers and consortia, national clearinghouses, and other entities involved in research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and evaluation.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) Applied research- The term `applied research' has the meaning given to that term in section 102 of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9501).

(2) Knowledge use- The term `knowledge use'--

(A) means the interactive processes involving research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and evaluation in which research-based knowledge is applied to improving instructional practice; and

(B) includes such activities essential to school improvement as--

(i) development and evaluation of practical applications of research, such as procedures, policies, practices, programs, materials, and training;

(ii) the use of research-based technical assistance and professional development for policymakers, practitioners, and other stakeholders;

(iii) collection and dissemination of information, data, and statistics;

(iv) initiatives for building linkages among research, policy, and practice; and

(v) an infrastructure for increasing capacity for the use of research and its applications.

(3) Initiative- The term `Initiative' means the National Leadership Initiative for Knowledge Use in Education established by section 3.

(4) Scientifically valid research- The term `scientifically valid research' has the meaning given to that term in section 102 of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9501).

(5) Secretary- The term `Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

Marketing

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: Quality Standards
Date: 3/27/06

During our board meeting we will focus considerable attention on the following two interrelated parts of the new vision that we generated during our February retreat:

- “to stand for quality”.
- “to ‘operationalize’ our knowledge use principles in terms of standards, exemplars, and indicators”.

As simple as these two notions appear to be, both will have a significant impact on our future membership efforts as well as on our advocacy work in the coming years. Given their significance, we need to collectively give further definition to these ideas and then plot a course for how best to move forward.

During our board meeting we will break into discussion groups, start the conversation, generate ideas and establish a process for moving forward. We plan to use this initial discussion as the basis for our discussions and work at our Aspen retreat in July.

Questions that we will be addressing during our meeting include:

1. What kinds of quality standards and quality assurance policies do our member organizations currently have in place that might be adapted for the trade association’s efforts?
2. What should NEKIA quality standards look like? What types of exemplars and indicators should be linked to the standards?
3. How should the standards relate to the Principles for Effective Knowledge Use?
4. How should these standards be used?
5. What process should we use to develop the standards?

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: NEKIA conference in 2007?
Date: 3/30/06

As part of our marketing priority for this year, we included in our list of activities consideration of convening a national conference on knowledge use. In fact, this idea has been a subject of discussion for about two years. After separate but coincidentally similar conversations with Bernice and Paul, I believe we should move aggressively forward with a planning process for a conference a year or more from now. At our April board meeting we would like to get a sense of the Board for starting the process. Here are some initial ideas:

- Convene a conference on knowledge use that 1) unveils our principles, new standards of quality (to be developed) and exemplars; 2) showcases our members' work; 3) gives visibility to knowledge use as a central theme for school improvement; 4) presents our positions on ESEA reauthorization; 5) draws potential members; 6) provides a new revenue for NEKIA.
- Contract with a conference planner (we have several in mind) to take care of soup-to-nuts comprehensive planning and absorb part of the upfront costs and risks.
- Seek sponsorships but support the core operations through fees.
- Focus content on knowledge use and on the work of our members in various topical areas. Use members' staffs to be the primary presenters and keynoters.
- Schedule the conference at least one year from now and ensure it does not conflict with members' activities or other major conferences.
- Locate the conference in a mid-sized city or conference center. Plan for about 300-500 the first year.
- Make it an invitational conference with each member getting a designated number of spaces for their constituencies/customers.

I suggest that we form a small task group within the Board to develop the basic parameters and present a full proposal to the board for the June conference call.

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: Membership Recruitment
Date: 3/27/06

Following the retreat we formed a new membership task force (composed of Joan, Chris, Denise, Carol, and myself) to reinvigorate the membership strategy adopted by the Board a year ago. The task force has moved forward in a number of ways. Here is the report:

Overall recruitment strategy: We should move forward aggressively in seeking more top quality organizations that will support and benefit from our new vision for knowledge use. We should use the transitional affiliate option if necessary to attract new folks.

Recruitment luncheon after the policy forum on March 24: Chris and I hosted a small intimate lunch after the policy forum on March 24 with representatives from Abt Associates, MDRC and the North Central Association. We received one strong commitment and two strong “interests”. Chris and I believe this kind of personal approach can be very productive.

Recruitment Tea in San Francisco at 2:30 on Monday April 10 at WestEd: We will invite 4-5 guests attending AERA and have an informal discussion with prospects. You are all encouraged to attend and invite guests.

Recruitment Targets: Here are targets we are pursuing for now. Please notify me if you have additional strong leads.

Abt---Chris
Alaska Comp Center --- Marcia
Berkeley Policy Associates --- Tom
Center for Applied Linguistics ---Denise
CNA --- Jim
Discovery Channel ---Steve
Edvance --- Jim
ETS---Jim and Chris (george powell)
Innovation Comp Center --- Marcia
LA County --- Jim
MDRC --- Chris
Mosaica --- Denise
North Central Association ---Denise, Paul, Laura
Rand --- Denise
Research TriangIe Institute --- Chris
Standards and Poors --- Jim
Stanford Research Institute --- Joan and Jim
UNC Rural Center --- wait
Wisconsin Center for Education Research --- Jim

To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Kohlmoos
Subject: Re-structuring the dues structure
Date: March 27, 2006

The membership task force will focus on the issue of dues structure after the April board meeting. At the meeting we would like to seek your advice and thinking on various options. To help your thinking, see below excerpts from various membership reports by the American Society for Association Executives.

Associations as a business --- "...There is the need for operating an association as a business: a mission-driven business, but a business nonetheless. Associations have been moving toward a business model for decades. It is the notion of membership, however, that has stubbornly resisted this evolution. Associations still operate with the same model of membership they have always used: developing a basket of goods and selling it as a member benefits package. This model, however, does not jive especially well with the move toward business operations. For one thing, the basket of goods can become so large and cumbersome that it is a financial drain on the organization. Another factor is that a shift in societal values has de-emphasized the need for association membership. But perhaps most important of all is that market expectations and competition have strained the viability of offering a single basket of goods and calling it membership..."

Dues basis --- "...Groups with institutional members handle dues in a variety of ways. Some charge institutions a flat rate, just like individuals, while others are more creative. The Independent Sector (IS), for example, bases dues on an institution's budget in an indirect way. They have determined that salary and benefits are highly correlated to budget, so the IS asks institutional members to determine what they spent on salary and benefits for the past two years, divide that by two and then multiply it by some factor to determine dues. The Association for Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) uses the full-time equivalent enrollment of the institution as the dues base. In cases like IS and AGB, minimums and maximums are usually applied to keep things equitable for those on both ends of the distribution curve..."

Revenues --- "... According to ASAE's most recent Association Operating Ratio Report, Tenth Edition, dues represent less than 36% of total revenue for most associations today...collect fees for certain programs like certification or data collection, realize funds from the sale of publications, or possibly hold a trade show or continuing education programs.."

Use of dues --- "...Typically, dues have been used to subsidize services and pay for operating expenses. But most groups find there's a ceiling on what members will pay, and that ceiling doesn't usually allow for all desired activity. Thus, you'll hear almost all nonprofit boards and staff today talking about the importance of non-dues income..."

Fee for service --- "... Look for services that are almost universally needed or desired in your constituency and make them a part of the benefits that come with membership. Make the others

part of a "fee for service" program. You may want to set some priorities here, listing services that you'll offer right away and others that you'll phase in as your growth allows..."

Products and services --- "... Most nonprofit organizations provide two different kinds of products or services. The first are products and services that directly benefit those members (or nonmembers) who purchase them, such as publications, insurance programs, special forms or equipment. The second are other activities the organization engages in that benefit the industry or profession as a whole, such as working for more government funding, favorable tax rulings, reductions in regulation, greater public awareness, and increased quality assurance. These intangible benefits are often the reason the organization was formed in the first place, and to some extent will be subsidized by dues and profits from other direct services. Unfortunately, it is a fact of life that nonmembers who give no support to the organization will benefit equally with members through the successful provision of these services..."

Benefits issue --- "...One way to increase membership is to add a new benefit designed to pull in members on the brink. Associations also are notorious for looking at the fringes of their membership markets and designing new benefits to pull those people in. As a result, associations can easily end up with 20 or 30 items in its basket of membership goods. That's great for selling membership, but onerous for servicing it. "A single member may care about four or five of those member benefits," says Raynes. "The other 20 benefits are just wasted effort on that individual."

Unbundling vs Rebundling Services "...De-emphasizing membership as a key indicator of success for associations leads to the de-emphasis of the basket of goods. Taking it out to the ultimate conclusion would be the exciting but controversial prospect of unbundling membership benefits, a.k.a. cafeteria-style membership or membership á la carte. It's been talked about plenty but rarely put into practice. Sirkin notes that the American Association of Retired Persons has unbundled its membership, but that in general it can be very challenging.

'For a lot of associations, unbundling membership benefits and selling them separately is not a cost-effective solution," she says. "To do that, the association then has to be prepared to market each benefit separately from membership.'

The rebundling model consists of grouping membership benefits into different categories. So, instead of having one basket of membership goods, the association develops several different baskets for different constituents. This differs from strict unbundling, which abandons the idea of baskets of goods altogether, making all association offerings commodities. She points out that each association is different and will operate with its own unique set of circumstances, but a rebundling approach can be a productive strategy for many..."

Value --- "...Value or return on investment for membership dues is the most important factor in joining or remaining a member. It may be the only thing companies care about. With increasing cost-cutting pressures exacerbated by mergers and acquisitions, corporations must fully assess what it costs to belong to anything and what they get in return. At each annual budget exercise, the corporate CFO suggests to the CEO that leaving the trade association is an easier choice than closing a facility or letting employees go. From interaction with peers, it is a phenomenon we will

all soon face if we haven't already... all members do not receive the same value I decided we had to devise a dues system that tackled this problem..."

Tiered membership---"... How can you realistically raise dues without adding value and not watch your retention numbers dwindle?" Faced with this question, many associations are rethinking their membership structures. One of the most common structures used by both trade and professional associations is the fair-share structure where membership categories, benefits, and dues are determined by a specific characteristic of the individual or company. For example, a trade association might determine its company member dues based on annual revenue, and an individual membership organization might set dues based on professional specialty categories. As a result of member discontent with the aforementioned model, more organizations are exploring a tiered membership structure in which membership and subsequently dues are based on membership levels or benefits packages rather than on categories determined by specific demographic criteria. "Embracing one of the fastest growing trends nationwide, more associations are turning to a tiered membership structure to replace outdated dues structures that do not communicate value to members," says Moliterno, who has worked with several organizations in their transition from a fair-share model to a tiered membership structure..."

Financial Ratios Reflect New Realities

By Tracy Casteuble ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT, July 2000 *Continuing and emerging trends* Member dues revenue continues to decline. As has been the case since the Operating Ratio Report was first conducted in 1945, member dues are still the largest single source of association revenue. However, they have occupied a steadily decreasing proportion of total association revenue since 1945. As Figure 1 shows, participating associations in 1945 (all were trade associations at the time) reported that 96.4 percent of their revenue came from membership dues. This proportion declined to 59.5 percent in the 1977 edition of the Operating Ratio Report, to 47 percent in 1988 and to 40.2 percent in 1993; it rose to 42.7 percent in the 10th edition. In the 11th edition, dues account for an average of 40.9 percent of total association revenue, representing a 4.2 percent decline in average dues as a percentage of total revenue since the 10th edition.

This general decline in dues as a proportion of total association revenue since the 10th edition is true for associations of nearly every revenue size, membership type, geographic scope, or tax status (see Figure 2). Generally, organizations with the smallest revenue size report increased dues revenue during this period with the one exception being organizations in the \$5-\$10 million category.

Organizational profile relates to dues: One of the main values of the Operating Ratio Report is the opportunity it gives organizations to compare budget category details with associations of similar profiles. When it comes to dues revenue, these categories can offer a number of insights.

- Budget size. As organizational revenue size increases, dependence on dues generally decreases. For example, in organizations with the smallest revenue size, less than \$500,000, dues account for 54.5 percent of total revenue. In contrast, in organizations with the largest revenue size, more than \$10 million, dues comprise 32.3 percent of association revenue. Economies of scale and a wider array of nondues revenue sources in larger organizations

are probably factors in this scenario, although the \$5-10 million category falls slightly outside that presumption.

- Membership type. Organizations with corporate members (trade associations) continue to be far more reliant on membership dues than individual membership organizations (IMOs): trades have an average of 46 percent of total association revenue, compared to 35.8 percent for IMOs.

Sources of non dues revenue expand. As in past editions, conventions, educational programs, exhibit fees, and revenue from periodicals continue to be the top nondues sources of revenue, accounting for an average of nearly 26 percent of total association revenue.

Relative to the 10th edition, revenue from conventions in the current edition is in a dead heat, with 8.9 percent of total association revenue. Revenue from educational program fees, however, is up to 9.6 percent from 8.4 percent in the 10th edition, representing more than a 14 percent increase. This fact helps to illustrate the role of associations in professional development in general, since much of what is essential to the reasons that associations exist is accomplished and shared through educational forums. Apparently, too, despite the explosion of electronic information and distance learning options, association leaders still feel the need to meet face-to-face.

In contrast to the 10th edition, revenue from periodicals (subscriptions, advertising, and "other periodical revenue") is down to 5.8 percent from 6.6 percent in the 10th edition. Possible explanations for this could relate to the increased use of electronic publications-and even the fact that some associations have discontinued their magazines and some of their other publications altogether.

Another area of declining revenue (not shown in the figures) in the 11th edition is grants and contracts from both government and non-government sources (4.7 percent vs. 5.7 percent in the 10th edition).

Several expense areas show significant increases since the last report-personnel and meetings. Associations also reported increases in computer and technology expenses and decreases in printing and photocopying expense.

Personnel expenses. By far the largest cost for associations, personnel expenses, has risen 5.9 percent since the 10th edition (an average of 33.7 percent compared to 31.8 percent)... In general, the larger the association, the smaller will be the percentage of total association expenses composed of personnel costs. ..In associations with the smallest revenue size (\$500,000 or less), personnel expenses rise to 38.3 percent of total association revenue... Another indication of the generally increased skill level required of staff and of the need to retain quality workers once in the organization, personnel training and development expenses have risen to 0.6 percent of total association revenue, from 0.2 percent in the 10th edition, a three-fold increase.

Meetings expenses. While meetings revenue has risen (accounting for 25.9 percent of total association revenue, compared to 24.1 percent in the 10th edition), so have expenses. Comparing meeting expense items that appear in the 10th and 11th editions (meals, equipment rental, facilities rental, and speaking fees), the total has risen to 6.8 percent from 5.5 percent.

Technology expenses. ... New questions were added to the 11th edition to identify Web site expenses in the specific areas described as design/maintenance and service bureau. These two line items added 0.4 percent in line item expenses, which parallels a 0.5 percent rise in computers and technology project and activity expenses since the 10th edition.

Printing expenses. Printing and photocopying are major expenses for associations, accounting for 5.8 percent of association revenues, compared to 6.2 percent in the 10th edition. Increased use of the Internet, e-mail, and fax technologies are obvious explanations for the decline in cost... As associations abandon traditional printed member directories for CD-ROM versions, provide print-on-demand documents on their Web sites, and reduce mass mailings to more targeted electronic and print delivery, this expense reduction should continue...

Expenses by project activity or functional area The largest expenses by project activity continue to be general and administrative (27.8 percent average versus 25.7 percent in the 10th edition); educational programs and seminars (12.6 percent versus 11.8 percent in the 10th edition); conventions (10.4 percent versus the same 10.4 percent in the 10th edition, which included conventions, trade shows, and expositions in the combined total), and membership (8.9 percent versus 8 percent in the 10th edition).

...What's in the future? Associations will continue to require skilled and seasoned talent to meet the challenges of the future. It's a future of increased competition from the for-profit and virtual communities that will be offering many of what were once traditional association products. Increasingly, associations will have to capitalize on the one thing that non-membership competition cannot offer: the sense of community and mutual sharing of expertise and interests often developed during a long history of mutually beneficial relationships.

In addition, associations will have to react and produce products and services much more quickly than they have traditionally been accustomed to doing. Along with this imperative will come the necessity of sometimes dropping long-standing favored projects that associations can no longer afford to support. As traditional repositories of information, associations must face the reality of an avalanche of information now available for free on the Internet. Associations that will still be deemed essential by their members are the ones that will not only collect information, but distill, analyze, and repackage it as knowledge. Such organizations will provide members with information on what they need to be doing-as well as the tools necessary to do it.

Endemic to their status as nonprofit organizations, associations have always operated on small margins. They will continue to do so. At the same time, the new economy demands that they take new risks and enter into uncharted territory. The associations that will succeed financially will invest their resources in top-notch, skilled staff who will be given the latitude to develop products and services for members and nonmembers alike. As Diane James reminds: "We must look at our associations and say, 'What kind of organization would I create to compete with what I'm seeing out there?' Then we have to foster and facilitate an open culture, where knowledge is power-and where we recognize that sometimes our financial plans might include the costs of not doing something."

MINUTES, BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FOR BOARD DECISION

DRAFT MINUTES

NATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

By Conference Call
December 12, 2005

The following Board members or their representatives were present on the call: Robert Allen, Adie Becker, Chris Dwyer, Steve Fleischman, Wes Hoover, Paul Kimmelman, Jim Kohlmoos, Laura Lefkowits, Max McConkey, Jay Moskowitz, Bernice Stafford, Carol Thomas and Ludy van Broekhuizen.

Staff Present: Marcia Knutson and John Waters

Overview of the Meeting

Carol Thomas opened the meeting at 3:04 p.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda.

Updates

- **Appropriations:** Marcia Knutson briefed the board on the process, noting that Congress will stay in session this week until work is completed, and that the Labor/HHS conference will meet tomorrow. Across the board cuts are still a possibility, as is a short-term CR.
- **2006 Membership Status:** Jim informed the board that dues invoices for 2006 had been sent, and that commitments in some cases will be delayed until the contract competitions are decided. NEKIA can offer installment plans for those who request it, though the cash flow situation means any expedited payments would be appreciated.

Affiliate Membership

Jim reviewed the prior discussion on this topic, and presented the definition developed by the Executive Committee in the call's materials. The board discussed the proposal, and emphasized the fact that PAG access for affiliates seems to mean that full members who have comprehensive centers should be able to pay the discounted dues amount.

The board voted 6-4 (with three abstentions) to postpone the acceptance or rejection of the proposal, and agreed to discuss the issue in greater depth at the February retreat in the context of larger strategic issues.

February Retreat Preparations

Jim discussed the retreat plans, noting that the program would try to address what NEKIA should look like by the beginning of 2009. Jim and Jay Moskowitz have interviewed and tentatively chosen a facilitator, who will be conducting some pre-meeting interviews with board members. John Waters will send a reminder with registration information to the board.

Business Development Institute Feedback

Jim briefed the board on reaction to the institute, noting the diversity in interests and needs, and the positive response to Mark Strickland's presentation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

DRAFT MINUTES

NATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

By Conference Call
January 17, 2006

The following Board members or their representatives were present on the call: Nancy Ames, Tom Barlow, Adie Becker, Chris Dwyer, Steve Fleischman, Wes Hoover, Paul Kimmelman, Jim Kohlmoos, Laura Lefkowitz, Max McConkey, Jay Moskowitz, and Carol Thomas.

Staff Present: Marcia Knutson and John Waters

Overview of the Meeting

Carol Thomas opened the meeting at 3:04 p.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda.

Information Items

- **2007 Administration Budget and Education Issues in Congress-2006:** Marcia Knutson informed the board that the 2007 budget proposal, to be released February 6th, will include a 5% cut, though it is not clear how it will be applied. The president's high school initiative should receive emphasis, and NEKIA remains hopeful that the proposal will include funding for the labs. Jim Kohlmoos reviewed the lingering issues from fiscal 2006, including the Higher Education Act, Perkins/Voc-Ed, and the increased oversight of NCLB, which is laying a foundation for the reauthorization of ESEA.
- **Department of Education:** Jim informed the board of the departure of Nina Rees, and indicated that he and Marcia will attend the IES board meeting next week, the agenda for which will include the peer review process and other items.
- **NEKIA's ESEA Reauthorization Task Force:** Jim briefed the board on the work of the task force, which has developed a first draft of a proposal for reauthorization. The proposal focuses on knowledge use, and how NEKIA members can support states and school districts with implementation issues. The task force will continue its work in anticipation of discussion on the topic at the April board meeting. The board also suggested preparation for addressing the issue of definitions for scientifically-based research.
- **NEKIA Center for Knowledge Use:** Jim briefed the board on the ongoing efforts with the DC Department of Regulatory Affairs to change the name of NEKIA Communications to the NEKIA Center for Knowledge Use.

February Retreat Preparations

Jim informed the board that the facilitator for the retreat has been conducting pre-meeting interviews with selected board members. The retreat's primary goal will be to stretch thinking about what NEKIA can and should be within the next three years, and consequently how this will affect NEKIA's government relations portfolio and immediate membership issues.

Updates

- Jim briefed the board on the reception for the Comprehensive Center directors and Department of Education staff, held on January 9th.
- Marcia reviewed the plans for the upcoming PAG Review and Planning meeting on January 26th, and the Legislative and Policy Institute, to be held March 21st-23rd.
- Jim reviewed the preparations for the 2006 NEKIA Communicators Institute, to be held in New Orleans, May 31st -June 1st, in connection with the EWA annual meeting.
- Jim indicated that NEKIA is seeking two volunteers to assist with planning the July 10th-12th professional development institute, to be held in Aspen, CO. Nancy Ames and Paul Kimmelman agreed to help plan the event. The February retreat may provide time to identify NEKIA member needs to serve as a topic for the July institute.
- Jim briefed the board on the plans for the March 24th policy forum, co-hosted by Education Sector and the National Academies; the topic for the forum will be high schools. Jim also informed the board that the next scheduled forum with this group, slated for June 27th, may be postponed.
- Jim briefed the board on the status of NEKIA's 2006 budget and membership levels. NEKIA is spending as conservatively as possible as the membership commitment level is lower than anticipated.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

DRAFT MINUTES

NATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**Scottsdale, AZ
February 17, 2006**

The following Board members or their representatives were present: Nancy Ames, Tom Barlow, Denise Borders, Gina Burkhardt, Chris Dwyer, Glen Harvey, Joan Herman, Steve Fleischman, Paul Kimmelman, Jim Kohlmoos, Max McConkey, Doris Redfield, Bernice Stafford, Carol Thomas, and Ludy van Broekhuizen.

Staff present: Marcia Knutson and John Waters

Overview of the Meeting

Carol Thomas opened the meeting at 11:07 a.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda.

NEKIA Budget

Jim described the thinking behind the creation of the NEKIA budget, and briefed the board on the association's cash-flow situation. The board discussed the possibility of obtaining a line of credit for NEKIA. Steve Fleischman moved that the Executive Committee explore and consider this option, and enact as appropriate; Glen Harvey seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The dues invoices for the 2nd quarter will be sent next week to all members paying via the installment option.

The board suggested that NEKIA develop a plan/talking points to follow up with the new Lab contract awardees. The plan should encompass multiple scenarios and include a compelling reason for joining the association.

The board also recommended that the Executive Committee consider obtaining E&O insurance for NEKIA.

NEKIA Work Plan

Jim presented the NEKIA work plan for review and revision based upon newly articulated priorities resulting from the retreat discussion. The board began with discussion of goal #2 of the plan, and agreed that goal 2.1 should be overhauled in light of the retreat's proceedings. The board also agreed that 2.2 should be adjusted so that it holds a lower priority, and that while NEKIA should no longer work to provide business development for its members, business development activities should remain in play for NEKIA.

The board then discussed goal #3, and recommended moving goal 3.1 to goal 2, or possibly even representing 3.1 in both goals 2 and 3. The board also suggested a review of the roles of the Chair and the Executive Committee with respect to their communication with the board.

The board suggested that the Communications goal (3.3) focus on branding and marketing for NEKIA, and not for individual NEKIA members.

The board recessed for lunch.

Government Relations Plan

Carol reconvened the meeting at 12:56 p.m. and the board turned its attention to the government relations plan, noting that it is a reactive one, and instead needs to be aggressive. The board discussed making the case for increased funding, and emphasized the importance of expanding the entire pot of research dollars. The board agreed that developing 3 lists would be useful: existing funding (keeping current funding), new funding (new opportunities in current/new appropriations), and creating funding (the expansion of all funding for education research). A task force was formed to work on re-conceptualizing and prioritizing these lists: Carol Thomas, Bernice Stafford, Paul Kimmelman, Steve Fleischman, Max McConkey and Nancy Ames.

The board then discussed authorizations positions, and noted the importance of being attentive to where the authorizing vehicles are.

The board discussed the issue of pressure on contractors by the department to do non-rigorous/non-technical functions, since it suits the department's wants. The board agreed to add this issue to the implementation list.

Membership Development Strategy

Jim reviewed the progress on membership development since November 2004. The board discussed the difficulty in sorting out the strategy given the uncertainties of the past year, and suggested that cultivation (or warm-up activities) of potential members before making "the ask" would be useful. A task force was formed to work on the strategy, with the goal of hosting a session in connection with the April board meeting at AERA. The task force members are Denise Borders, Chris Dwyer, Joan Herman and Carol Thomas.

Affiliate Membership

Jim reviewed the issue, which had been tabled after review by the board in December 2005, and highlighted the research he had done into different association models for membership. The board discussed the topic, emphasizing the need to embrace different reasons that organizations have for becoming members of NEKIA. Tom Barlow moved to adopt the creation of a "transitional"

affiliate membership category for 2006 only—as described by #2 in the affiliate membership chapter of the board materials; Nancy Ames seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Follow-Up/Next Steps

The following actions will be taken as follow-up to the retreat/board discussions:

- The board decided to eliminate the sector group meetings.
- The task force formed to plan the July Aspen meeting will convene via conference call.
- Jim and other Executive Committee members will follow up with NEKIA members who did not attend the meetings.
- Jim will revise the NEKIA work plan.
- The “advocacy/funding stream” task force will convene via conference call to begin revising the government relations plan.
- The membership task force will convene via conference call to discuss cultivation activities for the March forum and the April meeting during AERA.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

DRAFT MINUTES

NATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**By Conference Call
March 20, 2006**

The following Board members or their representatives were present on the call: Tom Barlow, Denise Borders, Chris Dwyer, Steve Fleischman, Joan Herman, Paul Kimmelman, Jim Kohlmoos, Laura Lefkowitz, Carol Thomas, and Ludy van Broekhuizen.

Staff Present: Marcia Knutson and John Waters

Overview of the Meeting

Carol Thomas opened the meeting at 3:04 p.m. and adjusted the agenda to allow the board to discuss the revised work plan at the beginning of the meeting.

Revised 2006 Work Plan

Carol initiated the group's discussion of the plan by noting that indicators still need to be added. The board discussed the section of the plan (2.2) that addresses the communicators' network, and suggested that it be re-drafted to clearly emphasize the shift from professional development to the branding of knowledge use for NEKIA. (For NEKIA board members, this re-tasking of the communicators' group should be kept in mind when assigning staff to participate in the group's activities).

The board also discussed specific language in the document, expressing a preference for the use of "need to", rather than "should" in the core principles/key stakeholders section. The board also asked about the process for developing indicators, which is ongoing. The board voted unanimously to approve the document with the above changes included.

Revised 2006 Government Relations Plan

The board reviewed the revised plan, and was informed that most of the changes were adjustments made to the accompanying chart.

Appropriations

Marcia briefed the board on the status of appropriations, highlighting the Senate action on the Harkin/Specter amendment, but noting that without a similar amendment on the House side, the measure could be in trouble.

Budget and Membership Recruitment

Jim updated the board on NEKIA's budget situation and current cash-flow, and informed the board that NEKIA was exploring options for obtaining a line of credit. He also briefed the board on the work of the recruitment task force, including its plans for hosting a lunch after the March 24th forum, as well as the recruitment "tea" on April 10th during the AERA annual meeting.

Updates

- Marcia reviewed the plans for the upcoming Legislative and Policy Institute, to be held March 21st-23rd, and Jim briefed the board on the plans for the March 24th policy forum on high school reform, co-hosted by Education Sector and the National Academies.
- Jim reviewed the agenda for the April board meeting in San Francisco. John Waters will send out logistics information to the board.
- Jim reviewed the preparations for the 2006 NEKIA Communicators Institute, to be held in New Orleans, May 31st -June 1st, in connection with the EWA annual meeting. John Waters will confirm the communicators' designee with all NEKIA members.
- Jim reviewed the development of the agenda for the July 10th-12th professional development institute, to be held in Aspen, CO. The meeting's theme will be: "Using Knowledge for a Change."
- Jim briefed the board on plans to discuss NEKIA positioning with respect to ESEA reauthorization at the April board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

**MINUTES,
EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

FOR BOARD REVIEW

DRAFT MINUTES

NATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**By Conference Call
December 5, 2005**

The following Executive Committee members participated: Chris Dwyer, Joan Herman, Jim Kohlmoos, Max McConkey, Doris Redfield, and Carol Thomas.

Staff participating: Marcia Knutson and John Waters

Overview of the Meeting

Carol Thomas opened the meeting at 4:06 p.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda.

Government Relations Update

Marcia Knutson briefed the committee on the status of the Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill. She informed the committee that, following the failure of Congress to adopt the conference report last month, it is possible that the bill could be re-conferenced, or that Congress could pass a continuing resolution, with funding set at the lower level of either the House or Senate version of the bill.

Status of Membership

Jim briefed the committee on the status of NEKIA's membership, indicating that the complete make-up won't be known until the lab competition is completely resolved. Jim informed the committee that he and John Waters had analyzed NEKIA's cash flow for the 1st quarter of the fiscal year, and has scaled back projected expenses as much as possible. Jim will encourage those members who are able to pay the full dues amount to do so immediately, will continue to discuss flexible payment options with those members who require such consideration, and will consult with Joan Herman to revisit the idea of a (university) group-based membership.

February Retreat Plans

Jim briefed the committee on his ongoing interviews with potential facilitators. The committee noted the importance of the meeting, and suggested that the chosen facilitator identify critical questions that must be addressed, and consider pre-meeting assignments and/or interviews with participants prior to the meeting. The committee also suggested adding the topic of meeting registration to the agenda for the 12/12/05 board conference call.

Affiliate Membership

The committee discussed the memo on this subject that was included in the call's supporting materials. The committee expressed its favor for a combination of the 2nd and 3rd definitions, with recognition that special circumstances and possible exceptions be considered by the Executive Committee and board. Jim will draft a memo for the board conference call materials incorporating these changes.

Business Development Institute Feedback

Jim reviewed the feedback he had received about the November Business Development Institute. He noted the diversity of reaction to the meeting, and emphasized the strong positive feedback for Mark Strickland's presentation. Jim will revisit the issue of a group subscription to Dean Millot's newsletter with the board during the December conference call.

Performance Appraisal Feedback

The Executive Committee will hold a call with Jim at Noon ET on December 19th to provide additional performance feedback.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

DRAFT MINUTES

NATIONAL EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**By Conference Call
March 13, 2006**

The following Executive Committee members participated: Chris Dwyer, Joan Herman, Jim Kohlmoos, Max McConkey, Doris Redfield, and Carol Thomas.

Staff participating: Marcia Knutson and John Waters

Overview of the Meeting

Carol Thomas opened the meeting at 4:03 p.m. and briefly reviewed the agenda.

Advocacy Portfolio

Jim Kohlmoos briefed the committee on the development process of the advocacy portfolio and the revision process for the government relations plan, and reported that votes for the portfolio were still being collected. The committee discussed the portfolio as an internal document, but noted that the goal was a recasting of the advocacy materials as well as advocacy efforts.

Appropriations

Marcia Knutson quickly briefed the committee on the status of appropriations, noting that the process was at the budget resolution stage, even though there may not be a budget resolution this year.

Revised Work Plan

Jim briefed the committee on the revisions to the plan. The committee discussed the plan in detail, expressing a desire to further refine the document. The committee's discussion focused on the positioning in the document of "priorities", and "goals/objectives/activities", emphasis on collaboration and marketing, and creating a place in the document for "indicators". The committee recommended shifting goal 3.3 into 2.1, and also noted that the document should be considered a living guide. Jim will re-draft the plan for presentation to the board for a vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

FOR BOARD REVIEW

Nekia Budget vs. Actuals: FY2006 Budget - FY06 P&L

	Total			% of Budget
	Year to Date	2006 Budget	\$ Over Budget	
Income				
Members- Annual Dues	405,000.00	545,000.00	-140,000.00	74.31%
Members- Bus Dev Initiative		0.00	0.00	
Members- Expense Reimb	12,399.00	36,000.00	-23,601.00	34.44%
Nekia Comm - Expense Reimb		0.00	0.00	
Nekia Comm - Knowl Util Init	0.00	10,000.00	-10,000.00	0.00%
Nekia Comm - Management Fee		21,800.00	-21,800.00	0.00%
Others - Interest Income	1,300.36	1,850.00	-549.64	70.29%
Others - Rental Income	26,865.00	81,600.00	-54,735.00	32.92%
Total Income	\$445,564.36	\$696,250.00	-\$250,685.64	63.99%
Expenses				
Advertising & Promo Materials	5.00	2,000.00	-1,995.00	0.25%
Bank Charges & Fees		450.00	-450.00	0.00%
Computers - Internet Fees	400.77	4,500.00	-4,099.23	8.91%
Computers - Service & Repairs		3,000.00	-3,000.00	0.00%
Computers - Website Maint		2,000.00	-2,000.00	0.00%
Consultants	10,222.26	47,000.00	-36,777.74	21.75%
Dues & Subscriptions	4,794.00	7,000.00	-2,206.00	68.49%
Entertainment & Meals	243.29	4,000.00	-3,756.71	6.08%
Equipment Leases	130.92	1,700.00	-1,569.08	7.70%
Gifts & Awards	0.00	800.00	-800.00	0.00%
Insurance - Business		1,000.00	-1,000.00	0.00%
Insurance - D & O		1,800.00	-1,800.00	0.00%
Insurance - Health	8,546.00	28,175.00	-19,629.00	30.33%
insurance - Work Comp	0.00	1,400.00	-1,400.00	0.00%
Interest Expense		100.00	-100.00	0.00%
Knowledge Util. Init. Expense		10,000.00	-10,000.00	0.00%
Lobbying Fees		3,800.00	-3,800.00	0.00%
Meetings-Board of Directors	0.00	13,000.00	-13,000.00	0.00%
Meetings-Other Meetings	5,971.36	30,000.00	-24,028.64	19.90%
Office Supplies & Expenses	183.32	2,000.00	-1,816.68	9.17%
Payroll - Bonus		5,000.00	-5,000.00	0.00%
Payroll - Salaries	62,679.20	300,885.00	-238,205.80	20.83%
Payroll - Taxes	4,382.06	21,530.00	-17,147.94	20.35%
Pension Contributions		16,640.00	-16,640.00	0.00%
Postage & Delivery	523.48	1,500.00	-976.52	34.90%
Printing & Copying	28.35	1,000.00	-971.65	2.84%
Professional Development	150.00	1,500.00	-1,350.00	10.00%
Professional Fee - Accounting	6,419.57	10,500.00	-4,080.43	61.14%
Professional Fee - Legal		1,000.00	-1,000.00	0.00%

	Year to Date	2006 Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Professional Fee - Payroll Service	424.35	1,500.00	-1,075.65	28.29%
Professional Fee - Pension Admin	655.00	1,850.00	-1,195.00	35.41%
Professional Fee - Real Estate	4,826.02	0.00	4,826.02	
R&M - Equipment Repairs		405.00	-405.00	0.00%
R&M - Maintenance Contract	495.92	2,250.00	-1,754.08	22.04%
Rent	43,221.72	131,400.00	-88,178.28	32.89%
Storage Expense	398.52	1,205.00	-806.48	33.07%
Taxes & Licenses		5,000.00	-5,000.00	0.00%
Telephone, Fax & Cellular	2,505.80	8,500.00	-5,994.20	29.48%
Travel - Local	16.00	1,000.00	-984.00	1.60%
Travel - Long Distance	2,189.34	11,000.00	-8,810.66	19.90%
Utilities	2,283.48	7,400.00	-5,116.52	30.86%
Total Expenses	\$161,695.73	\$694,790.00	-\$533,094.27	23.27%
Net Income	\$283,868.63	\$1,460.00	\$282,408.63	19443.06%

REFERENCE MATERIALS

**(SENT UNDER SEPARATE COVER IN THE
2006 BOARD HANDBOOK)**

- **2006 Board Members**
- **2006 Membership list**
- **2006 Work Plan**
- **2006 Budget**
- **2006 Calendar**
- **NEKIA By-laws and Policies**