

**National Legislative Program Evaluation Society (NLPES)**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Monday, April 13, 2015**  
**Denver, Colorado**

**MINUTES**

**Attendees – EC members and NCSL liaison:**

Wayne Kidd (UT), Chair

Brenda Erickson, NCSL liaison

Nathalie Molliet-Ribet (VA), Vice Chair

Marcia Lindsay (SC), Secretary

**Guest:** Vickie Heller, CO Office  
of the State Auditor

Lisa Kieffer (GA), Immediate Past Chair

Dale Carlson (CA)

Greg Fugate (CO)

**Absent:**

Rachel Hibbard (HI)

Angus Maciver (MT)

Katrin Osterhaus (KS)

Charles Sallee (NM)

Linda Triplett (MS)

**1. Call to Order, Introductions, Opening Remarks** – Wayne called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Wayne welcomed all to the Spring Executive Committee meeting at the NCSL offices in Denver, Colorado. He thanked Brenda for setting up the meeting space and for breakfast. Wayne went over the schedule for the day.

**2. Approve minutes from Raleigh meeting** - Lisa moved that the meeting minutes from the October 5, 2014 meeting in Raleigh, NC be approved. Katrin seconded the motion and the committee unanimously approved the minutes.

**3. Subcommittee work** – *The committee broke into its subcommittees to discuss their work.*

**4. Meet with NCSL Staff** – Members of the NCSL staff joined our committee to discuss how NLPES and NCSL can work together. NCSL staff included:

- Bill Pound, Executive Director
- Nancy Rhyme, Deputy Executive Director
- Caroline Carlson, Director of Development, NCSL Foundation for State Legislatures
- Larry Morandi, Director, State Policy Research Division
- Tim Storey, Group Director, Leader Services and Legislator Training Program
- Laura Rose, Group Director, Legislative Management Program

Wayne thanked the NCSL staff for taking the time to visit with us and for letting us use their offices for our meeting. NLPES executive committee members introduced themselves.

Bill Pound stated that he was glad the executive committee was there and said it was good to have staff groups come to Denver and visit NCSL's offices. He commented that NCSL has many resources and commented on the following:

- Training – There are several webinars per month now and NCSL is happy to look at other training opportunities or needs. He also mentioned the Professional Development Seminar for NLPES.
- Website – The traffic on this website has been up phenomenally in the past year. He said the website was redone in October 2013. The heaviest users coincide with state capitals, but there are hits from all over. Last year, the champion topic was minimum wage and the press was interested. There are also blogs.
- Standing Committee Process – This is where policy is made. Both legislators and staff are involved and staff plays a formal role in our organization, which is two-thirds legislator and one-third staff. Legislatures are busier than they ever have been so they need the standing committee to develop policy.
- Most responses and questions are handled electronically.
- NCSL is always interested in what makes the best programming for the Summit. Suggestions for programs and topics with broad interests are welcomed from you to us.
- NCSL works out in the states. We conduct peer reviews and have done compensation and classification studies. A compensation and classification study done at NCSL found that NCSL is behind the market in Colorado and in Washington, D.C. NCSL has made one attempt with salary adjustments last fall and is working on one more this fall.

Nancy Rhyme told everyone that she came from Wisconsin. She spends most of her time in outreach to engage legislators and staff. She wants to help legislative staff do their jobs better. She also works on the Foundation, website, and meetings. Nancy said that they do a lot of outreach, but can probably do more. She said she would be open to talking to us about what we do and what other information we can get from NCSL for our states.

Regarding how to get information from NCSL, Nancy stated that when we go to the website, if we see something that doesn't seem good, organized, or thorough enough, NCSL wants to know that. She said the website can always be improved. She said she welcomes our thoughts to make it better.

Wayne asked if we have some offices which are less active, how can we help them to become more active.

Nancy responded that she has had staff section liaisons come to talk through what NCSL can try, including flyers, letters from the chair, and podcasts. She said NCSL can do so much electronically and is happy to offer those discussions.

Larry Morandi told the committee that he has been at NCSL longer than Nancy, but not as long as Bill! He said that we are lucky to have Brenda as our staff person. If a legislator calls about an institutional question, they usually go to Brenda. Larry said that he deals with state policy research and issues that NLPES states are evaluating. He said his research staff looks at a lot of issues that are currently being evaluated. The NLPES listserv is the most active that it has been.

Larry commented about the Legislative Staff Coordinating Council (LSCC). He said there are four meetings per year and two officers from each section meet with other officers to pick up new ideas and network. He said he tries to take care of legislative staff and have more opportunities this year at the Summit. There were four recommendations for two sessions and NCSL was able to get two of the four. He announced that Sari de la Motte will be back. Also, Ken Jennings (famous Jeopardy winner) is coming to talk about how to use your knowledge. The third segment on the last morning will address changes in the workplace and how to adapt. Larry finished by saying that he is an advocate for staff.

Laura Rose stated that she came to NCSL from Wisconsin and has been a staffer for 30 years. She is trying to get to all the PDSs for all the sections. She is looking at how NCSL involves staff who are not involved with the staff sections. She suggested that maybe we could brainstorm about this. She said NCSL tries to make the legislative branch as best as it possibly can be. She also said that Brenda is great at addressing institutional questions NCSL receives.

Caroline Carlson stated that she has been with NCSL for 14 years and primarily works with fundraising from the private sector, which helps to fill the funding gaps. She said that fundraising has gone from \$500,000 in the past to \$2.3 million this year. Nancy interjected that it was actually a low of \$350,000. The fundraising funds the LSMI and E-learning. She said it has also funded the redesign of the website and she works to fundraise for PDSs. She said she has a strong prospect for the staff luncheon to be funded. She commented that there is a job summit every other Fall and PEW is involved. They have recently looked at tax incentive effectiveness.

Tim Storey said that his responsibilities have two prongs: strengthen legislatures and provide network and communication. Tim coordinates with people at NCSL and other states. He has seen growth in the leadership staff to include majority leaders, minority leaders, and pro tempores. He said they customize efforts to see how to help individual leaders. There are 30,000 staff across the country and 7,300 some odd legislators.

The Legislative Staff Management Institute (LSMI) is training that runs from Saturday through Saturday in Sacramento, CA. It used to be held in Minnesota. Cal State and the University of Southern California do it together. Brian Leiber will be managing the program. There are about 35-40 in each class. Invitations go to the directors of evaluation offices and it is on the website. They accept nominations. The program content is targeted for senior management level. It is a top-shelf training program. Bill interjected that if you are concerned about succession in your office, it is a good program.

Larry stated that the national big issues right now are about health exchanges, higher education performance budgeting, criminal justice, transportation, and human services. Utah tends to be the model and comes out with plans before others. Larry invited us to send questions to him directly at [Larry.Morandi@ncsl.org](mailto:Larry.Morandi@ncsl.org).

Greg stated that Colorado uses the NCSL research division to get comparative research. He asked if that type of research can be blast on the NLPES listserv as outreach. Nancy answered that NCSL is always looking for ways to let folks know they have comparative data and best practices. Greg said that he feels that the information he has received from NCSL is independent and non-partisan.

Linda said that they were pushed into performance budgeting in her office. They had asked if there are some performance measures in a depository about that. Larry commented that the Fiscal Affairs Division has evaluated performance budgeting and has done a lot of work on this topic. There is some comparative data and lessons learned.

Katrin said that NCSL normally contacts the head of the agency and wondered if NCSL maybe needs to add more email contacts to get into the bowels of the agency. If staff doesn't know of opportunities, we can't make a pitch to attend things like LSMI.

Lisa said that LSMI can provide information on other trainings at the PDS. She said they "lived on" the ethics section of the NCSL website. She asked what NCSL suggests NLPES should highlight for staff about NCSL's website or services.

Nancy answered that highlights should be:

1. The depth and breadth of information NCSL has is valuable. We want to change the dynamics of you having to come to us.
2. Networking with other staff.
3. Attend our meetings and be engaged in training.

Bill said that staff should use the website. LSMI is featured pretty regularly on the website this time of year. Tim added that a mobile app is coming and the executive committee members could be ambassadors for how to use the website. Make a checklist of how to start a review and put “check the NCSL website” or “email a NCSL staff person” as one of the items.

Charles said he thinks NCSL offers non-partisan solutions. In New Mexico, they are getting new polarization that they haven’t seen in years. Greg added that he believes that partisan staff use has grown.

Bill interjected that term limits have been a challenge. NCSL stresses to its staff that they must be non-partisan. They try to be sure the research is not biased. NCSL has held focus groups and legislators don’t think of NCSL’s work as partisan. Legislators want their staff to use NCSL.

According to Bill, staff discusses the ten most important state issues and the ten most important federal issues. It is a most interesting conversation and his group puts verbatim discussions in the minutes. Ultimately, there is usually a solution in the middle.

Charles asked if there is orientation training for new members. He was told that staff is sent to the Kennedy School. Nancy stated that NCSL does a significant amount of outreach to newly-elected legislators and Tim also does training for new committee chairs. This past session, NCSL went to 20 training presentations for new members – legislators and legislative staff.

Debbie Smith is interested in developing a program for emerging leaders. This year, at the Summit, there will be some relatively-new legislators and we’d like to know what would be helpful to them.

Tim commented that things are always changing and there is more polarization. At the Hewlett Foundation, it is looking at ten states, including Colorado and Virginia, to see what the feds can learn from the states on polarization. Greg said that there is a lot more partisan staff in leadership. In his office, it is non-partisan and they are trying to navigate the audit process in this new atmosphere.

There are 48 staff on LSCC and maybe three are partisan. Tom Wright, from Alaska, thinks there needs to be more partisan staff to address communication issues between partisan and non-partisan staff. We have difficulty with the question: “what can we offer partisan staff?”

Wayne asked if the NCSL panel had any advice or feedback for us. Bill said that one of the stronger staff sections is the Clerks and Secretaries because they are the oldest. He said he was the first staffer for NLPES when it was formed. Comparative data reports came from NLPES.

Larry added that NLPES is well structured and organized and he would encourage us to get outside of our group. You can push your work out to other groups.

At this time, Wayne thanked the NCSL staff for joining the executive committee and we adjourned for lunch.

**6. Lunch** – The executive committee broke for lunch at 12:20 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

## **7. Subcommittee Reports**

### **A. Awards**

Nathalie stated that the awards subcommittee is all set to start accepting applications for all awards. She said the website has been updated and the judges for all awards are in place. We already have one impact submission and Virginia is working on at least two submissions. She knows that Colorado, Hawaii, and Mississippi are all sending award submissions.

Nathalie said that the criteria has been tweaked over the last few years and the subcommittee has not received any feedback from judges or states regarding needed changes. She noted that last year the wording for selecting the winner of the Research Methods award was clarified to better explain when there could be more than one winner. This was added to the selection matrix for the judges: “you should consider awarding more than one if the applications are of equal quality or rankings are close.”

The subcommittee made a few administrative changes and formalized and adopted a timeline from December through May. Dale asked how we can make sure that when we come up with timelines like this, they are maintained as historical documents. Brenda said that she could keep these documents and some groups pass physical notebooks down. She said that virtual notebooks can also be passed along from one subcommittee chair to the next. Nathalie said that she thought Brenda and the subcommittee chairs should both have this information for redundancy.

Nathalie always said that, to increase diversity of judges, the subcommittee focused on geographic diversity this year. In the past, we considered which states come to the PDS and which ones submit award applications. This year, we recruited new judges who either have not judged or have not been involved with the PDS. We have Missouri judging the Excellence Award, West Virginia and Tennessee judging Research, and Illinois for Impact. The head judges have been determined:

- Pam Taylor – North Carolina – Excellence
- Jon Courtney – New Mexico – Research Methods
- Dana McNeil – Nebraska – Impact

Charles asked if the posting of the previous Excellence narrative was to be on the website. Brenda said that she has it, but hasn't had a chance to post it. She would try to do it this week. Wayne asked if she can post it or if she has to have someone else post it for her. Brenda answered that she was the only one who can make word modifications. Marcia asked which NCSL staff worked on the website. Brenda said that Ed Smith and Karen do. Dale said that there seems to be a "disconnect" since NCSL wants us to give them things for the website, but it takes them a long time to put it up. Lisa asked if there is anything we can do to speed up the process. Brenda answered that most of it is her workload and that they need more administrative staff. Lisa asked again if we can do anything and Brenda said that, no, they are down three people and other things like information requests take priority. Lisa asked if there is a time of year that Brenda is busier than others. Brenda said that there are a couple of slower months and it is just her sometimes. She said it has been hard this year. Dale asked if these were permanent reductions and Brenda responded that they are in the process of hiring, but with a new director, there is training time to consider.

## **B. Communications**

Dale reported that Rachel got the fall newsletter out and the subcommittee drafted a spring letter for Wayne's signature.

Dale said that the social media idea is dead and it will likely be dead as long as he is the subcommittee chair. He said they looked into it and polled states. It was overwhelming that it would not be beneficial to us as an organization. Dale said he knows of one staff section that has a Facebook page and it is a huge time drain. Also, this is the third time the subcommittee has looked at using social media.

Under old business, Dale asked Katrin to write a couple of sentences inviting people to come to Denver to the PDS and that will go in the spring newsletter.

Dale said that nobody sent anything in for the "In the News" section of the newsletter. Rachel has volunteered to ask for feedback on the newsletter. They have considered using Survey Monkey, but opted not to because of the time it would take. We can discuss this more in Seattle.

Kathy McGuire has told the subcommittee that she will be collecting information for "Ensuring the Public Trust". Kathy told Nathalie that she would write a blurb for the newsletter and Kathy

said she hopes to finish the booklet in April. This may be presented as a “Coming Soon” kind of thing.

Regarding the Question of the Month, the old ones are in the archives and NCSL has issues with the servers crashing. Brenda was asked the best method to keep this material and she believes it should be kept in one other place too.

Katrin asked if we have a redundant process for the newsletter. Brenda said that we probably do since they are saved as PDFs and HTMLs are transferred to PDFs. She would like to convert the Word versions to PDF to keep as historical versions.

Dale said that he has reminded Lisa about her article for the newsletter. Greg has written a blurb about coming to Denver.

In new business, Dale reported as follows:

1) Dale talked about the website content and said he and Charles had been working on a schedule for keeping the website current and up-to-date. Brenda has told Dale that NCSL wants us to have content more current. Under the “Featured” section on the right side, we don’t know if we have control over that. They are currently linking it to the fall 2013 newsletter. Brenda said that she is going to find out who is in charge of that. Charles said that he will bring a proposal to Seattle.

Dale said that the subcommittee would like to get the six sub-boxes up-to-date and possibly move the pieces physically. The subcommittee has a schedule and Charles and Dale will talk next week about this and get with Brenda.

Wayne commented that the Raleigh PDS is still on there and that is a concern. He has received at least six calls from other states asking about the upcoming PDS. Greg noted that we can send a blast out on listserv. Brenda said that she cannot put the PDS up on the official site until the executive committee adopts the budget. She can put in generic “shell pages” to which she can later add text. Brenda said that she is already starting to create a shell for the new PDS. Rachel said that they would like a “Save the Date” notice. Brenda said that she’ll create the shell pages for each of those boxes. Greg and Dale agreed that we should have a Save the Date page for the PDS. Nathalie suggested maybe putting the Save the Date on the “In the News” section.

Dale asked that if someone posts a report on the ListServ, can it go straight to the webpage and eliminate the human contact in the process. Brenda said that she can create a background page with those blurbs. Dale said it would keep the content current. Greg commented that there are no feeds like that on the NCSL site.

2) Dale said they would like the PDS registration information on the website by July because a lot of states are doing their training planning around that time. Brenda said she would try to get the brochure up in May. There is usually a June 1 target date for states to determine how to use their training money. Greg said that frontloading information that will entice people to sign up would not be best if we are not ready to accept registrations.

Dale said that putting out the dates, registration fees, and hotel costs would not be a problem if it says that registration will come soon. The only problem is that there will not be a lot of content about the PDS.

3) There is a need to speed up the updating of the website.

Linda asked if we weren't supposed to write something for State Legislature Magazine. She was told that it was decided to wait to see other submissions first.

### **C. Professional Development**

Katrin reported that the hotel contract for the Denver PDS has been signed; the food and beverage minimum is \$15,000. Almost everything will be held at the hotel. There is at least one speaker to whom an honorarium will be given. Greg has played with the schedule regarding having 75-minute or 90-minute sessions. There have been 22 topics determined by Greg and he will survey the states for their interests and check speaker availability. He believes that they have developed some good topics with the three main themes being 1) motivation, 2) policy trends, and 3) fiscal issues. Linda will give a short speech regarding the PDS being in Mississippi in 2016 and will have a table with goodies and pamphlets. They need to get started on the contract. Later, there will be a discussion about the use of excess funds and possibly hiring another speaker.

Katrin talked about the webinar initiative. There was a webinar in September 2014 on pivot tables and it had 140 registrations. It is hard to say how many people it reached and there were a few technical issues with the webinar. The subcommittee hopes to do a soft skill topic, such as ethics, by the end of June or July. They are working with Brenda on timeframes and applying for money for the webinar. Katrin asked that we all let her know if we have ideas for a 60-minute or 90-minute webinar.

Leslie McGuire and Lisa did an hour-long session on AGA for government accountants. We may want to talk to Leslie. It covered why you should care about ethics and had a case study. For yellow book states, it could address why ethics are important with independence. Katrin said that she would like to reach a broader audience. She said that NCSL has an Ethics Center and

we do not want to duplicate what they are doing. Brenda said that it should be tailored to our functions, as program evaluators.

#### **D. Peer Review**

Lisa handed out a list of historical peer reviews and which ones are coming up. Nebraska will have one in 2015, then Hawaii. She and Angus talked in Raleigh about a two-prong approach: 1) how to market our services and 2) how to capture information for those serving on peer review teams. Wayne will take on the marketing arm. New Mexico's report review will make sure folks know that there are other options than the standard peer review.

Lisa said that she plans to have a "cheat sheet" at the Summit outlining the goals, the "how to" approach, etc. It will be used as guidance for the overall structure. It will have questions for a jumping off point, time commitment ideas, etc. Lisa asked if South Carolina is going to have another peer review because it is up for one in 2016. Marcia said she would have to discuss with her director.

**8. Election Update** – Lisa reported that there were three openings on the executive committee and there were three folks interested: Nathalie Molliet-Ribet, Shunti Taylor, and Patricia Berger. Their terms will start at the PDS in the fall. Lisa noted that the previous minute's link is not live. She provided a spreadsheet showing the term limits.

Dale asked how fast the minutes can go up. He asked if the minutes from this meeting could be up by May. It was noted that they would have to be approved by email. Lisa said that items to post need to be prioritized and sent to Brenda. Rachel commented that it could be six months before the minutes would go on the website even if they were sent. Nathalie asked if anyone besides members of the Executive Committee cared if the minutes are on the website. Katrin said that if NCSL wants us to keep information on the webpage updated, this may be one way. Wayne said that there would be no problem approving them by email. The consensus was to try to type the minutes up in the next month or two, send them to Wayne and Nathalie, then to the other executive committee members for approval by email. Marcia noted that she would try, but that this was an especially long meeting and she had already taken over 20 pages of notes.

#### **9. Revolving Account Update**

Wayne gave out a handout regarding our funds. He said we need to discuss ways to use the excess money we currently have. There has been an ad hoc revolving account subcommittee and that subcommittee agreed that we should keep \$15,000 in the fund. Nathalie asked what the expenditures are now and Brenda responded that the expenditures that came out of the fund are those not covered by registration fees. In 2010, \$414 was expended for the executive committee

meeting and, in 2011, \$1,100 was probably for the executive committee meeting, but Greg could not confirm that. Brenda said that it could be expenses that came through after the accounting had been completed and we pay that out of the revolving account. Wayne said that we have too much money on hand and that maybe we should consider spending down \$5,000 per year.

## **10. 2015 Professional Development Seminar**

Programming – Vickie Heller, Performance Audit Supervisor and Team Leader (who joined our meeting), and Greg have been the ones mostly brainstorming the topics. Greg gave out a handout listing potential topics. Greg commented that this PDS will be a three full-day conference and there will be a plenary session each day.

They plan to have Chariti Gent to speak about the behaviors of highly effective teams. The cost to have her will be \$1,500 plus travel costs. NCSL staff can present the Fiscal State of the States, and Julie Lays will discuss policy trends, such as what is coming up and what we may be auditing. Sari de la Motte's fee is \$5,000 and Greg said he was not sure if we wanted to pay that much. He asked that we give him speaker ideas. As of now, there are 18 concurrent sessions, but some of those may be dropped or they may evolve. He said they want some topical panels to discuss health exchanges, marijuana, and vulnerable populations. There is room for another topical session. The rest of the topics are geared towards human resources' policies and there are panel discussions on recruiting, retention, and supervising.

Nathalie asked how we can ensure that the speakers for the roundtable discussions are those coming from states with best practices. She said we have to be careful how we select folks. Greg said that we have to put a lot of faith in states offering staff. The moderators have to be more in control and have game plans to keep things moving. Katrin asked if we have ever had 5 to 7 states volunteering for the same topics. Greg said that we usually do not have that problem.

Greg noted that with a 75-minute session, there should probably be one moderator and just two panelists. Katrin wondered if we could give registration discounts to the panelists. It was decided that we believe we are putting on a quality conference for a great price of \$350 and would rather not discount that for panelists.

Greg asked the executive committee for other topics and said that they have tried to balance soft skills with auditing. Angus told Greg that possibly someone from the GAO could come over to tell us what is happening from the yellow book perspective.

The next steps, according to Greg, will be to send out other ideas, survey the states to get their level of interest, develop other ideas, etc. He said that the last session on the last day will be an

emerging issues roundtable. It is a unique forum to share ideas. He said attendees can put ideas on cards to use at this session.

This PDS should offer 21-23 hours of CPE, depending on the length of the sessions. He thinks there is a good mix of topical and technical. Last time the PDS was held in Denver, it was too much of people talking about their reports. Charles asked if you can combine topical and technical in one session. For example, discussing Medicaid and how agencies approached methodologies and things they found that are upcoming issues. Greg commented that the moderators are critical and must understand the legislative intent to assess program effectiveness. The most positive feedback is on sessions that share information. Greg gave an example of evaluating health exchanges and said that the discussion could be when you are thinking about auditing this, this is what I wish I knew.

Lisa commented that there was discussion in Austin about a poster session which would involve a room with reports with contact people for each. We could bring in people who want to talk about specific reports. Greg said that to be effective, all states would bring people to talk about key reports. Lisa asked if Greg could include this on the survey to see if there is interest. Having a poster session is like a science fair. We would ask each state to bring one report to be able to ask about. Charles said we may be able to tap into NCSL on this and wondered if the NCSL policy folks could have a table.

Nathalie asked if we could keep it flexible and mix and match time frames with the number of presenters in the session. Greg responded affirmatively and said he hoped to get a feel for the states' interest through the survey results. He said we have to manage the flow of the conference too.

It was noted that we got a free one-hour reception, to be held on Tuesday, and it may include hors d'oeuvres. We think we can do a reception on Sunday night at the hotel and have an off-site social on Monday, which will cost \$3,000 (food and beverage minimum) or \$1,000 (food and beverage minimum) at a pool hall. We hope to have a private tour of the capitol on Wednesday. We'll have lunches provided all three days and need to discuss breakfasts. It is a full schedule.

Dale said that California did a poster session and it didn't go well. He said he will try to find out what the pitfalls were. Greg said that we may have the Impact award winners present their reports at the poster session.

Budget – Greg passed out three handouts, which were all discussed thoroughly. The key differences are the food and a reception. Morning and afternoon refreshments, coffee, breakfast, and other options are available. For drink breaks, options include yogurts or granola, with

refreshments going all day. Other differences in price are from having different foods. There was also discussion about alcohol costs and those options.

Brenda stated that she has started with a basic budget, then it will be adjusted based on registrations. We only have to meet the food and beverage minimum. Katrin asked why we would not offer breakfast, since we have the money. It was noted that none of the three budgets presented have it all. Greg asked for the authority to have giveaways like a bag of popcorn or little tote bags. It was suggested that we could go to the Dollar Store to buy goodies.

Wayne said he thinks we should have breakfast, lunch, receptions, afternoon snacks afternoon, and water all day. We are leaning towards version #3 with afternoon snacks and welcome gifts.

Greg noted that Colorado is sending 20 people, which is 10 more than is in the budget.

The fact that PEW has offered stipends to participants in past years (2011, 2012, and 2013) was noted. The option of possibly discounting registration fees to panelists or moderators was raised again. It was decided that \$350 is a great value and some other conferences charge \$950 - \$1,150 (IAA conference) for registration fees.

Lisa asked if there is anything we can do for outreach. A brochure was suggested. Lisa said she can contact Brian Weberg.

Based on the options being discussed and a deficit of \$7,200, we could authorize a \$10,000 deficit from the revolving fund. Dale moved we authorize at \$10,000 deficit. The motion was seconded by Katrin, and it passed. Katrin commented that we could create a nice looking brochure promoting the conference.

Brenda said she will revise the budget reflecting the change to 20 participants from Colorado, adding snacks in the afternoon, welcome tote bags (\$1,000), and based on 100 participants. This will be version #4. It was decided to leave the registration fee as is.

## **11. Other Business**

**a.** Wayne mentioned the preliminary agenda for the Summit and noted there would not be a general welcome session on Monday afternoon. He noted the staff sections programming. The NLPES executive committee could possibly meet on Wednesday from 3:30 to 4:45 p.m.

Brenda added that Egil Krogh, who was involved in Watergate, will be the Monday afternoon speaker and will discuss integrity.

There was discussion about whether we would like to sponsor a session on how performance measures add value to the legislative process. Brenda suggested having a conference call.

It was agreed by the committee that the executive committee meeting during the Summit will be Tuesday from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. Also, our session would be Wednesday from 3:30 p.m. to 4:45 p.m.

Charles said he could talk to Gary Van Landingham (Results First) about tagging on to his standing committee and adding NLPES as a sponsor. Brenda said that there is an effectiveness committee that we may be able to sponsor. She can find out what other staff sections are doing.

**b. Date for the next meeting:** Denver – October 11-14, 2015

**c. PDSs – Looking ahead:** Jackson, Mississippi in 2016.

NLSSA has changed and has decided to go to Hawaii in 2017. Brenda will poll directors about how many they would send to Hawaii. Wisconsin has said that they could also host. Appearance is the problem. Lisa said that in 2007-2008, we did not have the numbers yet. Greg said he had a list of potential attendees. The executive committee agreed that Brenda should survey the directors about a possible Hawaii PDS. Utah is on the schedule for 2017 if it's not in Hawaii.

**d. Other Items:** None

## **12. Adjourn**

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marcia A. Lindsay  
Secretary