

**National Legislative Program Evaluation Society (NLPES)**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Sunday, September 22, 2013**  
**Austin, Texas**

**MINUTES**

**Approved 4/5/14 (Raleigh, NC)**

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

Angus Maciver (MT)

Dale Carlson (CA)

Greg Fugate (CO)

Karl Spock (TX) – immediate past chair

Katrin Osterhaus (KS)

Lisa Kieffer (GA) – chair

Marcia Lindsay (SC)

Nathalie Molliet-Ribet (VA)

Rachel Hibbard (HI) – secretary

Wayne Kidd (UT) – vice chair

Charles Sallee (NM) – via telephone

Brenda Erickson (NCSL liaison)

1. **Call to order.** Lisa called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., thanking Karl for his work in the past year as chair and in putting together this year's PDS.
2. **Minutes from last meeting approved.** Greg moved that meeting minutes from the 8/14/13 meeting in Atlanta, GA be approved; Katrin seconded the motion. The committee approved the meeting minutes from the 8/14/13 meeting in Atlanta, GA.
3. **Nominations and elections of Vice Chair and Secretary.**
  - a. *Vice Chair* – Lisa opened nominations for vice chair. Nathalie nominated Wayne for vice chair. Dale seconded Wayne's nomination. Hearing no other nominations, Lisa closed nominations for vice chair. The nomination was accepted by the candidate and unanimously approved by the committee.
  - b. *Secretary* – Lisa opened nominations for secretary. Greg nominated Rachel for secretary. Marcia seconded the nomination. Hearing no other nominations, Lisa closed nominations for secretary. Nomination was accepted by the candidate and unanimously approved by the committee.
4. **Update on 2013 Austin PDS.** Karl reported there are about 130 paid attendees for the PDS, approximately 40 of whom are from TX and about 90 from other states. This is up from last year's attendance of about 112.
  - a. All of the panels are set; volunteers from the Sunset Advisory Commission, State Auditor's Office (SAO), and Legislative Budget Board (LBB) will shepherd attendees between the hotel and outside sites.

- b. Facilities – kick off will be at 8:30am on Monday at Capitol. Moderators must stay on time.
  - c. Opening social event – The opening social event will include a reception, dinner and dancing. Much of the organization was done by NLSSA. All set for ‘The Dump’ (recycling center / exotic game ranch). Attendees must sign wavier form; panels must finish on time to board buses at 5pm.
  - d. A few of the sessions will be streamed for those not physically attending the PDS – the first (Pew), and the first two concurrent sessions.
  - e. Karl expressed thanks to all those who helped organize the PDS, specifically Emily Johnson, who organized the programs/panels; Faye Rencher, who organized the facilities and A/V; Michelle Cranes and Amy Tripp, who organized the social events; Brenda Erickson, who organized logistics at the hotel; and Cecelia (Cee) Hartley, who put together the map and program. **Motion was made to authorize \$25 gift cards to each of the five people (excluding Brenda) who assisted with organizing the Fall PDS. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by the committee.**
  - f. It was noted that elevators at the hotel are very slow; attendees may need to take into consideration when getting places on time.
5. **NCSL website redesign.** Brenda reported that NCSL staff have had training on the new website. NCSL is now starting its interim conversion to a new platform. It is expected that the Beta website will go live to the NCSL executive committee, LSCC members (i.e., Lisa and Wayne will have access), and NCSL staff for outside review for about 2-3 weeks in the beginning of October. The website is scheduled to go live on 10/21/13. Brenda asked that any problems be reported to her to pass on. Dale asked that, as Communications Subcommittee chair, he be given access to review the site, too. Brenda said she would ask.
6. **Naming of primary substantive subcommittees.** Lisa announced the 2013–2014 subcommittee assignments as follows:
- a. Communications – Dale (chair), Charles, Rachel
  - b. Awards – Marcia (chair), Wayne, Nathalie
  - c. Professional Development – Angus (chair), Greg, Katrin, Karl
  - d. Peer Review – Lisa
  - e. Elections – Karl
7. **Subcommittee work.** The full committee meeting was recessed for subcommittee meetings. Subcommittees met to work in their groups from 9:50am–12:30pm.

*The committee continued its recess for lunch. Meeting reconvened at 2:25pm.*

## **8. Subcommittee reports.**

### **a. Communications** – Dale reported the following:

- i. “Question of the Month” (QOTM) – will be rebooted, to have a more ‘grassroots’ feel. Subcommittee is working on a new name for it (perhaps “WYNK” – What You Need to Know). Dale will take the lead on developing instructions for how to use the new tool; will try to make it available via the NLPES listserv. One issue is whether to allow anonymous responses; it has pros and cons. Another issue is how to make answers available in a real time or a short timeframe (the old QOTM had a long turnaround).
  - (1) If the NLPES listserv will be used for the new QOTM, Brenda offered to post the questions and compile the responses because 1) the NLPES listserv is set up so that only the person who posts a question sees all of the responses and 2) Brenda posts questions and compiles results for other listservs on a regular basis.
- ii. Newsletter – is back on schedule.
  - (1) Name for the newsletter – the subcommittee proposed naming the newsletter, and suggested “The Working Paper.” There being no other suggestions for a name, **the executive committee agreed to name the NLPES newsletter, “The Working Paper.”**
  - (2) What’s next for the newsletter:
    - (a) Subcommittee proposes to wait about a year before reevaluating/retooling the newsletter, to see how the present format works.
    - (b) Subcommittee also proposes to add a new section to the newsletter, similar to NASACT’s newsletter, with hyperlinks to media articles about recent reports. Angus asked what the mechanism for getting the links would be. Rachel said she is considering soliciting them via the NLPES listserv. Marcia asked how we will select which links make it into the newsletter if some states send ‘too many’ links. Rachel said in that case, she will ask the state contact to choose a few links. Brenda suggested that section of the newsletter could be coordinated with Angus’ Report Roundup feature, and/or highlight different states – which Dale liked.
  - (3) State key contacts – will be rebooted. Rachel will draft an email for Lisa’s signature, to be sent to current key contacts, regarding contact info plus reminders about the listserv, website, and newsletter. Marcia

asked when the key contacts were last updated. Brenda said she does it continually. Dale said this effort would help Brenda keep the list up to date plus put Lisa/NLPES in the forefront of members' minds. Katrin suggested we also say thanks for attending the PDS; Nathalie added that we could also say 'and this is what your participation/membership gets you.'

- (4) NLPES website – Charles is in charge. All NCSL websites are currently in transition, so this duty is in a bit of a lull at the moment until our new website goes live. Dale is trying to get himself included in the new website review process. Dale asked Brenda if we could have minutes from 2012 and 2013 posted on the NLPES website (currently, the latest minutes available on the website are from 8/4/2011). Brenda asked how many years back the committee wants on the website. The committee's consensus was 'as far back as possible.' Currently, NLPES EC minutes are posted back to 1998. Lisa commented that our preference is to have all our minutes uploaded, but if NCSL has issues with that, we will decide at that point (eg., 10 years) – but we will also want to know what NCSL's issue actually is. Brenda noted that one issue is NCSL wants only fresh material to be on the website; Dale noted that is different from the issue of storage space, which is cheap and should not be an issue.
- (5) Improving communication with NLPES members – the subcommittee will keep its eyes open and asks the rest of the executive committee to do the same, and to let Dale/Charles/Rachel know if they have any suggestions for ways we can improve communications with our members.

**b. Awards** – Marcia welcomed Nathalie to the Awards subcommittee and thanked Wayne for his work on Awards in the past year. Wayne is moderating a panel on Tuesday at the PDS in which he will make a plug for getting people to volunteer to be judges in future; he says this method worked well at last year's PDS.

- i. Deadline for applications – the subcommittee has decided that, henceforth, the deadline for application submissions will always be the 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in May – in 2014, this falls on 5/9/14. Dale asked if Marcia could do a 'blurb' on this for the newsletter; she agreed to do so. Rachel will also add this into the email she is drafting for Lisa's signature.
- ii. Number of pages / words per page – this year's judges asked the subcommittee to consider imposing a word, rather than a page, limit to submissions in future. Eg., <2,000 words – research; <2,500 words – excellence; <1,000 words – impact. Greg asked whether we can say, "reasonable 4 pages." Marcia noted that people's interpretation of "reasonable" can vary significantly. The committee as a whole discussed whether this matters and whether a word count should be used. The consensus was to wait another year and see if it is again a problem before imposing more parameters to application submissions.

- iii. Communication with applicants – Marcia noted that this year, Karl called all the major winners and Wayne called all the Impact Award winners and other applicants, ahead of the letters and formal announcements. The subcommittee felt this worked well and will continue it next year. Wayne said that people appreciated knowing, even if they didn't win. Marcia said the subcommittee's recommendation is to limit applicants to submitting a maximum of 5 individuals, (not offices), with addresses and emails, to be notified in the event they win an impact award. For major awards, the subcommittee will ask when they call if anyone else should be notified and will ask if the agency director is aware of the award.
- iv. Lifetime Achievement Award – Marcia noted that the Lifetime Achievement Award is not under the purview of the Awards Subcommittee and is the responsibility of the chair and vice chair of the executive committee.
- v. Publication of winning submission – as agreed at the April 2013 EC meeting, the subcommittee will update the Excellence Award criteria to stipulate that the winner agrees to have their narrative published.
- vi. Solicitation/selection of judges – Katrin asked how that is done. Wayne said it is always a challenge; that the subcommittee has often used past judges but is interested in seeking folks who are interested in being judges. 9 judges in total are needed each year. Wayne will lead one awards panel and Nathalie will lead another, so there is some continuity in the judging. Rachel suggested that, in his plug for judges, Wayne let people know how much time judging is likely to take, as that will impact people's ability/interest in judging. Lisa noted that, historically, the subcommittee strives to balance 'old thinking' with 'fresh eyes' in selecting judges. Greg noted that the online criteria for the Excellence award specify winners "will be expected to serve as a judge in the following year;" Marcia and Wayne suggested the language be changed to "may be asked to," as in the Research Award criteria. The subcommittee will follow-up on the wording regarding judging.

**c. Professional Development** – Angus reported on the following duties of the subcommittee:

- i. Professional development opportunities on the NLPES website – the subcommittee will wait for NCSL's new website's unveiling. There was discussion as to whether past PDS materials are available on the website. Brenda said she has not done it yet.
- ii. Distance learning opportunities (e.g., webinars) – Brenda handed out the publication, "How to Have a Webinar." NCSL encourages staff sections to use webinar money to sponsor webinars. Angus commented on some issues, e.g.: What purpose do we want it to serve? Logistical issues; balancing resources/ responsiveness to the quest. Some offices have expressed interest in providing speakers / content. Angus and Brenda to take the lead on developing our first

webinar. Marcia asked the average cost of a webinar; Brenda said it varies, depending on the number of connections (audience members). Most can be done within the NCSL funds limit of \$1,000. Greg noted, in relation to “e-learning” money, that some staff sections have purchased equipment – i.e., the money does not have to be used for a webinar per se.

(1) “The lost content” webinars (i.e., some archived webinars that have disappeared off the NCSL site, like the Stenersen and Turcotte presentations) – Brenda said she understands there are plans to redo the Stenersen presentation using LSCC webinar funds. There is movement to push redoing the Turcotte presentation, too, but no buy-in on that yet from LSCC. Brenda suggested NLPES may want to do it ourselves, with our own money. Dale asked – in view of avoiding this situation in future, where we do not ‘own’ our own material – whether there is language in the contract with the new website provider regarding ownership of content. Lisa asked whom we should approach; Karl suggested the staff officers work group, including Rick DeLeon, Martha Carter, and NCSL’s Kae Warnock (because Legal Services does the most webinars). Karl suggested that Lisa and Wayne check with LSCC, since both are now members of LSCC. Angus noted that the subcommittee felt that the Stenersen presentation is the most important; but we might ask Turcotte to re-do his presentation in the short- to mid-term future. Greg noted that if we hold a PDS in Raleigh, NC, it might be a great vehicle for redoing Turcotte’s presentation.

iii. Development of PDSs – regarding the agenda for this week’s event, Angus reported there is “general happiness for the content.” The subcommittee asked Karl about its role in organizing PDSs – because the host state mostly does its own content. This year worked well – Texas involved the subcommittee to a good balance, Angus thought. This year’s agenda moved away from report content-type panels to focus more on skills development panels, which is good. Karl agreed. It was noted that the 2009 guidelines for PDSs may need to be updated, because in future there may not be an EC member as part of the host state.

**(1) Future locations discussion:**

(a) 2014 – Raleigh, NC (tentative). Awaiting legislative and other staff sections’ buy-in. Dale noted that NC is a small shop and asked if it will need help from the executive committee. It was noted the NC office has grown considerably of late; plus, NC’s performance group is one of three divisions under the same office, a second being their RACSS group led by last year’s chair Walker Reagan. The Sergeants may also be interested. The decision needs to be made about late Oct/Nov 2013. The fallback position for 2014 will be Colorado. Dale asked about the deadline for hotels, etc. Brenda said it takes a while, especially if we end up having to re-bid. Lisa said that,

historically, we decide by October for Nov/Dec bid, and have a contract in place by March. Lisa said she will keep in touch with John Turcotte; if his answer is not 'yes' by the end of October, we will go with Colorado.

- (b) 2015 possibilities:
  - (i) Kansas City, Kansas/Missouri (Katrin) – very tentative.
  - (ii) Santa Fe, NM – per Charles, NM would really like to host but would need a lot of help because Sept. is the start of their budget season. NM is interested for 2015; would like to partner with NALFO. Greg said CO is willing to help NM if need be.
  - (iii) Utah – per Wayne, UT would prefer 2016 but is committed to hosting again at some point. Wyoming is happy to help UT organize.
- (c) Lisa noted that, by summer 2014, ideally we need to have settled on our 2015 location so we can announce it at the 2014 PDS. Greg noted that all we really need by the PDS is to have a location commitment, including knowing number people and other staff section(s) that can help coordinate, and how long (number of days) the PDS will be.
- (d) Nathalie asked whether PDSs always have to be in Sept/Oct; it's VA's busiest time of year. Brenda noted that no time of year satisfies all states best. Karl noted that one of the reasons we have PDS by Sept/Oct is because we name our new officers at our PDS, and they are then in place to attend as ex-officio members of the fall LSCC meeting.

*4:13pm – Charles signed off from attending via teleconference.*

- iv. Format for future PDSs: There was discussion regarding extending the current 2.5-day conference back to 3.5 days as it has been in past years (Ken Levine, for example, would like to see this). It was suggested that if the PDS be extended, that there be more programmatic content (not more social events, etc.). Wayne noted that a longer PDS makes for more work for the host state. Angus noted a longer PDS would be dependent on concurrence from the host state. Wayne said UT will want to do an extended program. A suggestion for the extended format was to have a round table or informal format for the last session block.

- 9. **Account balance:** is currently \$37,208. Lisa asked how we might use it. Katrin asked if we could use our own money for PDS stipends. It was agreed that we can, but the money would be depleted very quickly. Lisa asked what our prior year Pew stipends have been; Brenda said around \$12-13K in each of the past two years. **Lisa created an ad hoc committee to brainstorm**

**what to do with our money, and asked for volunteers. Wayne will chair the committee with Angus, Greg, and Charles (in absentia; if not, Dale).** Lisa suggested we keep a \$15K reserve and split the remaining pool between active professional development and reserve professional development (e.g., hiring someone to do a webinar).

- 10. Peer reviews.** Brenda provided a handout of states scheduled for future peer reviews. She reported that the Hawai'i peer review report is yet to be completed. Dale asked what NLPES' capacity is to do peer reviews. Brenda said she does not have to be present at a review; but Lisa noted it is very helpful to have Brenda there. Brenda said we could do 2-3 reviews a year, but the timing for her would be tight. It was noted that Texas and Maine are interested in having NLPES peer reviews; and Washington JLARC is scheduled for a review in 2014. Katrin said she is interested in being a peer reviewer and has done NASACT peer reviews in the past.
- 11. Adjourn.** There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.