

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING**

**March 17, 2006
Washington, D. C.**

Executive Council Present:

Cliff Zukin – President

Rob Daves – Vice President/President Elect

Nancy Belden – Past President

Jennifer Rothgeb - Secretary-Treasurer

Paul Beatty – Associate Secretary-Treasurer

David W. Moore – Conference Chair

Patricia Moy – Associate Conference Chair

Nancy Mathiowetz – Standards Chair

Thomas Guterbock – Associate Standards Chair

Kat Draughon – Associate Membership and Chapter Relations Chair

Steve Everett – Associate Publications and Information Chair

Executive Council Absent:

Shapard Wolf – Publications and Information Chair

Brad Edwards – Membership and Chapter Relations Chair

Susan Pinkus – Councilor-at-Large

Robert Y. Shapiro – Councilor-at-Large

AAPOR Executive Office Staff:

Michael P. Flanagan – Executive Coordinator

Guests

Nancy Whelchel – Conference Operations Chair

President Cliff Zukin called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.

President's Report – Cliff Zukin

Cliff Zukin informed Council that he has invited the leaders of several sister organizations (AMA, CASRO, and CMOR) to attend the AAPOR Annual Conference in Montreal. AAPOR will provide complimentary registration and host a “summit” meeting with these individuals. At this point, there is not a set date and time, but that will be put in place once the registrants are known

Cliff said the AAPOR Executive Office received an inquiry last week from Marc Dresner of RFL Communications regarding AAPOR participating in a G8 Summit (September 27 – 28) on declining response cooperation. After consulting with Nancy Belden and Rob Daves, it was agreed that Bob Groves would be the right person to represent AAPOR and Bob has agreed to participate. Cliff will write Marc Dresner and advise him that AAPOR's has appointed Bob Groves to be its representative to the meeting.

Cliff provided an update on the Kids Survey Network project being developed by TERC (Mathematics and Science Education for the Future). TERC is moving ahead with their proposal to NSF's Math Directorate. No action is required of AAPOR at this time.

Vice President/President Elect's Report - Rob Daves

Rob Daves requested Executive Council members to forward to him any suggestions about where and when Council meetings should be held next year. Rob said that Cliff started a tradition of having the first post-conference Council meeting at the following year's conference site, but with the 2007 site being Anaheim, CA, a meeting there could be expensive. Rob said he will send an e-mail to old and new Council members once the election results have been determined, informing them to bring their calendars to the May Council meeting. At that meeting, the dates, times and locations of next year's Council meetings will be determined.

Kat Draughon stated that she thinks having a Council meeting at the next year's conference site is priceless for Council members. In subsequent meetings when the Conference Operations Chairperson is discussing various conference issues, the Council members can visualize what is being discussed since they have been to the conference site. She encouraged the Council to visit the Anaheim site and thinks sooner is better than later. The current Conference Operations Chair, Nancy Whelchel stated they she is in complete agreement with Kat's comments.

Executive Office Report - Mike Flanagan

Mike Flanagan reported that the AAPOR Executive Office has been processing membership renewals that continue to come in. There are currently about 600 persons who have not renewed their membership yet. Mike stated that typically we get back about 450 members between now and the conference. In the past few years, membership seems to be flat. Issues about membership recruiting and retention will be raised later in the meeting when the Long Range Planning initiative is discussed.

AMP is also working on getting the electronic balloting for the AAPOR elections up and running and that should go live on March 20, 2006. Nancy Belden is working closely with Monica. In response to some questions, Nancy Belden stated that the mailing is not being done until March 20 because of timing issues related to the AAPOR's By-laws. She mentioned that rolling out the electronic voting this year has been time consuming, but she expects the voting to be very easy for members to do. Mike said that typically you

see very positive results from electronic voting. DCAAPOR and NYAAPOR are also going to use the same electronic voting vendor that national AAPOR is using.

The AMP staff has also been working with the Conference Chair and Co-Chair, as well as the Conference Committee on all aspects of the upcoming annual conference in Montreal in May. Missy Johnson is gathering information on potential sites for 2009

Cliff requested conference registration numbers for this year compared to last year. Mike will provide those data to Cliff.

Secretary-Treasurer Report – Jennifer Rothgeb

Council Meeting Minutes

Jennifer Rothgeb asked if there were any other corrections to the minutes of the AAPOR Executive Council of January 9 -10, 2006. There were none.

RESOLVED to accept the AAPOR Executive Council Minutes of January 9 -10, 2006. Motion made by Nancy Mathiowetz and seconded by Tom Guterbock. Motion passed unanimously.

A discussion ensued regarding the ability to quickly research meeting Minutes from the past five to ten years to extract resolutions that have been passed by Executive Councils. Currently, if you want to find a particular resolution, you have to read through all the Minutes and this can be time-consuming. Mike said there are hard copy Minutes going back to the 1970s. There are electronic Minutes for 1993 forward. Mike Flanagan suggested that the Minutes could be codified with just the resolutions listed by topic. Cliff requested a time and cost estimate for AMP to do this research.

Cliff Zukin said that if the AAPOR Executive Office sends him the electronic files of the AAPOR Minutes for the past ten years, he has a graduate student who might be able to work on this project. (Nancy W. and Patricia Moy also mentioned potential graduate students who may be available for this effort.) Cliff said that if there were any AMP costs involved, that the Three-presidents would make a decision on that aspect.

Nancy Belden raised the point that if we go through this exercise to extract resolutions from past Minutes, we should probably have AAPOR's Secretary-Treasurer do it on a routine basis when preparing meeting Minutes.

Jennifer Rothgeb reviewed each item on the To Do List from the January Executive Council meeting and carried over those items that were not successfully completed.

Financial Report

Jennifer Rothgeb reported on the AAPOR Financial Statement as of February 28, 2006. Jennifer was also reporting on the mid-year financial position of the association.

Currently, AAPOR has about 47% in reserves which is good. However, AAPOR's current budget is in a deficit, particularly if you look at the operating budget separate from POQ and the Endowment. Jennifer mentioned that as AAPOR's Secretary-Treasurer, it was unsettling to present a budget to Council last September for approval when the budget showed a projected deficit. Cliff Zukin said this also makes him uncomfortable. Cliff commented that members are getting a lot of services for their dues.

The positive side of the budget process is that the new contract with Oxford University Press (for the publication of the POQ) has been lucrative. In addition, the revenue generated from the annual conference has also risen due to a significant increase in sponsorships.

Jennifer distributed budget analysis data for 2002 through 2005. The net gain from conference revenues and expenses was only about \$63 per attendee last year. The AAPOR non-conference net gain (loss) shows that AAPOR was losing about \$50 per member last year. Jennifer mentioned that the cost of servicing each member continues to rise and that is the reason AAPOR raised its membership dues effective January 1, 2006. However, the increase in membership dues alone is not enough to provide enough revenue to keep ahead of the costs of all the added services we now provide our membership and the additional costs just to keep AAPOR running well as an organization. Additionally, some of the new initiatives that the Long Range Planning Committee is proposing will have expenses associated with them which is another reason why AAPOR needs to consider returning to our September discussion about raising conference registration fees.

Cliff Zukin said that the Annual Conference should be looked at as a business proposition and profits are a percentage. AAPOR has been making a small profit the last three years. However, the question is, as a matter of policy, how much do we want the conference and membership to be self-supporting and how much should the annual conference support membership services. Conference Chairs are given a budget and they are abiding by that budget as well as making a small profit for AAPOR.

Rob stated that the question is, should the Conference Chair be given a budget that challenges them to make a profit that can, in turn, service the members. Rob thinks this is a policy issue for the next Council to address. The conference does bring in money, but also has considerable expenses.

Kat cautioned that while the conferences have brought in profits in recent years, it would be very easy for circumstances to arise which could cause a conference not to have a profit in some years.

Time Analysis

Jennifer Rothgeb said that she received a detailed report on the most recent Time Analysis from AMP and they are completely on target at this point in time. This is an

improvement over recent years and is a result of the new contract and the additional hours that AAPOR has purchased.

Conference Chair's Report – David Moore

Annual Meeting Program

David Moore said that conference planning is well underway. He acknowledged that Patricia Moy has been an excellent co-chair and thanked her for her assistance.

David Moore stated that Nat Stone, the 2006 WAPOR conference chair offered AAPOR the opportunity to have Nik Nanos, President of the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association speak at AAPOR's plenary or dinner. However, we don't have an appropriate time slot in the conference schedule for him to address AAPOR.

The Preliminary Program is on the AAPOR website and will be mailed out to each AAPOR member within a few weeks. David commended Tara at AMP for the great work she did on the program design and that her suggestions made it much better.

Jennifer raised a question as to whether there should have been a line on the Conference Registration Form to allow individuals to contribute to the Endowment Fund. Mike Flanagan said he would research that question. (Post meeting note: In past years there has not been space on the Conference Registration Form for contributions to the Endowment Fund.)

2006 Awards

Innovators Award

There will be no Innovators Award winner for 2006. The committee, chaired by Susan Pinkus, unanimously decided that there was nothing particularly notable for this year's award. Nancy B. asked that if the restrictions are too limiting; that perhaps we need to look at the guidelines and make changes. After discussion it was decided that the guidelines are satisfactory.

Book Award

Cliff reported that Bob Shapiro, Book Award Committee Chair, informed him that the 2006 AAPOR Book Award is: *The Psychology of Survey Response* – Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. The AAPOR Book Award winners will be showcased at the conference and they should have their book there and available.

Policy Impact Award

Nancy Belden, Policy Impact Award Committee Chair, reported that her Committee has two finalists for award and the Committee is split. It was concluded that if both finalists

are meritorious, then two awards can be given. Nancy will check with her committee to determine if they want one or two Policy Impact Award winners in 2006.

Lifetime Achievement Award

Cliff Zukin informed the Council that his committee includes Dick Kulka, Diane Colasanto, Don Dillman, and Sheldon Gawiser. The committee is working on the selection of a Lifetime Achievement Award winner and has a conference call scheduled for later in the month.

Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award

Patricia Moy said that the 2006 AAPOR Seymour Sudman Student Paper award winner is Magdalena Wojcieszak from the University of Pennsylvania. There are also two honorable mentions from the University of Michigan. The Student Paper Award winner will present her paper at the conference. There were seven submissions this year.

Conference Operations – Nancy Whelchel

2006 Update

Hotel Rooms

Nancy Whelchel said that the AAPOR sleeping room block at the Hilton is sold out (room block is 225 plus/minus on various nights.) There are plenty of rooms available at the Marriott (room block is 237 and only 17 are reserved thus far.) The Hilton is referring AAPOR folks to the Marriott hotel.

Missy Johnson is making room reservations for the Executive Council members, short course instructors, award winners, and incoming council. She will try to assign concierge-level rooms, dependent on availability. Hotels will send hotel confirmations to individuals.

Sponsorships

Currently there is a total of \$82,250 in sponsorships.

Nancy Whelchel, Linda Dimitropoulos and Monica Evans Lombe are working on the detailed guidelines for Sponsorships and related logistics. They tried to contact Karl Feld, but haven't yet heard back from him.

There is a new sponsor that is going to provide wireless access in all the meeting rooms. Two sponsors cancelled. The Marketing Prospectus that AAPOR sent out to sponsors states that there will be a cancellation fee of 50% of the sponsorship amount. The parties are aware of this fact and have no objections. The question was raised as to whether AAPOR should be keeping 50% of the sponsorship funds and not giving anything in

return. We could put their name in the final program or somehow acknowledge them. Nancy W. will followup to see what sponsorship we can offer them for the funds we're keeping, if they want the publicity. Mike Flanagan said that the industry standard is to keep 50% of a sponsorship amount when a party cancels. The reason is that a sponsor could pull out after everything is printed and get almost the full advantage of sponsors who do not cancel. Mike warned AAPOR about setting precedence in establishing procedures other than what is already stated and agreed to in the Marketing Prospectus.

The golf course pro shop is going to provide a couple of prizes for the game winners.

Unofficial Sponsored Activity

There is a group (Templar Research, Elaine Brieu Marketing Research, inc.) that wants to sponsor a private activity which would be an unofficial activity, separate from the conference. Various options are being considered such as taking folks to a bar, providing free drinks, etc. Nancy Whelchel said this could be a revenue generator. Views it primarily as an "access fee." The group wants AAPOR's stamp of approval, but the event would not be advertised in the conference program. It would be advertised on a flyer inside the packet received at registration. Missy Johnson is putting together some rules and regulations. However, we have to be careful that this activity does not conflict with any scheduled AAPOR events. It was suggested that it could be "last call" after the Pub Crawl. The Council concluded that if it is fun, AAPOR should do it as long as it does not conflict with any of the official AAPOR schedules.

Meals

Nancy Whelchel said that AAPOR is going to make about \$25 per meal. However, we cannot count on this happening every year. This year is unusual because of the location and the favorable exchange rate

Book Exhibit

Mike Xenos is doing a good job on the publications side and several publishers have been contacted and are sending books to Montreal. We still have not heard from Wiley Press.

Volunteers

Kat Draughon is in charge of the Conference Volunteers Program. The call for volunteer will go out in April. There will be a Friday morning breakfast which will be a training session for the volunteers. A suggestion was made to use them to distribute and collect the Short Course evaluation forms.

Banquet

Nancy Whelchel asked the Council if they want to proceed with the Banquet and the Banquet Program similar to what we did in Miami in 2005. After discussion, it was

concluded that that we would proceed with the program as was done last year. The Lifetime Achievement Award announcement will also be distributed in the same manner as last year, separate from the Banquet Program. Steve Everett said that he will do the group photos from around the conference. Steve Everett said that he can also accept pictures from anyone if they are digital. (Photos are projected as a slideshow during the banquet.)

T-shirt Slogan

Nancy Whelchel said that the T-Shirt slogan has been selected. Tom Guterbock said that in the future if there is not a clean winner of the slogan that there should be an initial and final vote. Kat stated that a runoff election for the slogan is what they have done in past years when there is no clear winner. But this year there was no need for that since there was a clear winner.

2009 Annual conference.

Nancy Whelchel said that RFP's were sent by AMP to Chicago, Florida beaches and Philadelphia. Chicago is sold out. Philadelphia only has one viable hotel (Marriott Downtown) which is very pricey (\$250, but can be negotiated down). Nancy is concerned about concessions in general since Marriott was not very responsive. But the hotel is available, the meeting space is good and it is convenient to the airport.

In Florida, Daytona Beach, and Ft. Lauderdale Resort Beach and Spa have good space. But she is concerned about the high price. There is also the Marco Island Marriott Golf Course and Spa; however that is about 50 minutes from the Ft. Myers airport.

According to the contract between AAPOR and AMP, AMP is only required to send out three RFPs. If we want them to do more, we have to enter into a Letter Agreement. Nancy Whelchel said that she would like to get a sense of what the council wants to do. What other cities do we want to look at? Cliff asked Nancy W. to request a cost estimate from AMP for doing a new RFP.

To maximize our use of the three RFPs AMP sent out, we may want to consider obtaining more information about Chicago as a potential site for 2010 since it is sold out for 2009.

The question was raised as to why we can't have a list of potential cities that fit AAPOR's parameters, so then we have a list to select from and don't always have to start from scratch. Previously, Nancy W. requested AMP to put such a list together, but it hasn't yet been done.

The question was asked about continuing on with Philadelphia. As we proceed, we have to look at 8% growth. If 2009 does not work for Philadelphia, we should look at Las Vegas in May in 2010 or 2011. After discussion, the Council concluded that we should look at Philadelphia for 2009, Chicago for 2010 and Las Vegas for 2011.

Another location mentioned was Boston, but was quickly dismissed because hotel rooms are very expensive. Washington, D. C. was also suggested. The major concern with Washington, D. C. might be not being able to fill our room block because the Federal Government conference attendees from the DC area would not have lodging paid for. This could significantly impact the costs of meeting space. Cliff requested that AMP look at the AAPOR database to determine how many conference attendees come from the Washington, DC. area.

2008 New Orleans Site Visit

Nancy Whelchel reported that she, Linda Dimitropoulos and Missy Johnson visited New Orleans in late February. All expenses for the trip were paid for by the contracted conference hotel (Sheraton). The conference hotel currently has FEMA workers in 800 hotel rooms. However, when the workers leave FEMA is paying for complete renovations to those rooms. The city obviously does have extensive disaster areas and there is still evidence of the looting which took place last August. The French Quarter is in good shape. The highways are fine. Most of the disaster area is far from the hotel. Nancy Whelchel said that AAPOR will proceed with preparations for the AAPOR Annual Conference in New Orleans in 2008, but we might want to have other cities in our mind, just in case there are more hurricanes which cause additional damage.

Long Range Planning Committee

Overview – Cliff Zukin

Cliff Zukin reported that the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) has been in place since the Council meeting last June. The LRPC focused on five areas to address different functions of the organization. The five areas include Conference, Education, Outreach, Membership, and Research. Cliff was scheduled to report back to Council with a schedule and agenda for LRPC and he is doing that today. He believes the Conference and Education proposals are ones in which we can take action today. Council members had opportunities to review proposal drafts for these two areas. For the others, he expects we'll have discussion today, have them redrafted, and take action on them after they are brought back to Council at the May meeting. He would like to have the job completed by the end of the AAPOR year so the new Council does not have to be re-educated about the LRPC.

The Report on Education is focusing on AAPOR broadening from short courses to continuous activity of outreach. It would be a continuing education process rather than just at the annual conference. The Executive Council had the opportunity to previously review the proposal

Cliff Zukin said that Communications Outreach proposal is ready to go and Nancy Belden will present that today. In the area of membership, AAPOR has to decide what they want to do in that area. The research function will not be dealt with other than a

vision statement.

Cliff Zukin said that what the Executive Council has to do today is make decisions on the Education and Conference pieces. The Executive Council can then have a discussion of the two other pieces today so they can be redrafted and voted on at the May Executive Council meeting.

LRPC Proposal for Conference Guidelines – Rob Daves

Rob Daves and Diane Colosanto primarily worked on the LRPC Proposal for Conference Guidelines. They received feedback from David Moore, Patricia May and Paul Beatty. The original proposal was revised to reflect this feedback. In a cover memo, Diane Colosanto provided the reasons for not accepting certain recommendations and clarified some issues which were potentially confusing in the original proposal.

Rob thinks the Council should view this proposal as three things.

- (1) A set of Best Practices recommended to Council based on collective experience. (There were two conference chairs on the LRPC.);
- (2) A set of directives to create and enhance certain goals such as infrastructure; and
- (3) Experiments. The conference is growing. A few years ago we expanded the start of sessions to Thursday afternoon. So perhaps in 2007, we may want to try starting Thursday morning.

Rob emphasized that the LRPC wants to expand the type of things we offer in the conference program. The LRPC thinks we might want to use the conference as a way to expand membership to target sectors within the survey research community. The conference continues to grow, but we want to increase interest internally and externally. The annual conference fulfills all of our missions. However, we need to make it more interesting, exciting and maybe news worthy. It needs to be easy for members to manage with certain aspects of the conference format standardized from year to year. And the conference should have diversity in the content and the method of presenting that content. Rob presented an overview of the proposal, briefly discussing each of the four sections of the proposal: Decision-making, Content, Structure, and Other.

Decision-making

It is important for the Conference and Co-Chair and the Council to know how they all can work together. The Council should be able to ask the Co-Chair about the conference one year ahead of time. This keeps the Council in the loop and sets a deadline for the Co-Chair to think about things ahead of time. There needs to be guidelines on how the Conference Chair is to work with the Council.

Content

In terms of content, a couple of things are stressed. AAPOR should continue with what we have been doing well, but spread out and have diversity in some of the content. AAPOR also needs to get more diversity in the different types of sessions at the

conference.

Structure

In the area of the structure of the conference, we have listened to what the conference attendees have said in the surveys. They say they want no more than five presenters, including a discussant.

For the next two years, the LRPC is recommending that we try to do some sessions on Thursday morning as an experiment. We will need to track attendance in the sessions so we have data to inform decision whether to continue this practice once it is tried.

Council Discussion of the Proposal for Conference Guidelines

David Moore discussed some of his issues with the document. He stated that he understands why some things require Council approval, but he thinks others issues might just require guidance from the Council, not approval. He thinks the plenary topic and speaker should be shared with the Council, but doesn't think everything should require Council approval. He questioned the approval line that says it must be approved by two of the three Presidents. He thinks that is a bit too much and thinks equal weight should be given to the conference chair and that there should be more leeway. He thinks it's useful for the Council to know as much as possible, however there are times when decisions have to be made and it would be very time consuming to run so many decisions by the Council. He provided an example of when he needed to recruit responders for the plenary speakers. To approach specific folks to determine if they are willing and available and then to have to bring the names to Council and then get back to potential plenary responders would be time consuming and awkward (if Council did not approve someone who was already approached.) Cliff agrees that responders to plenary speakers should not have to be approved.

David said he does not think the Conference Chair should need approval for the appointment of discussants and presenters or for invited sessions. David Moore did agree that the Council may want to be involved with the approval of the plenary topics. He is more concern about other details having to be approved. David said that he felt the Conference Chair should have the ultimate approval on discussants and presenters.

The Executive Council then reviewed the Long Range Planning Conference Report paragraph by paragraph and Cliff Zukin make changes to the Master LRPC document.

After discussing the first paragraph of the Decision-making section, it was concluded that the Conference Chair shall involve the Executive Council in the process of selecting the conference theme, plenary topics, visual concept, main plenary speakers, but not the discussants and chairs. It was also concluded that there was a need to keep in that two of the three Presidents must be in agreement before approval is made to any changes in the theme, plenary topics main plenary speakers or visual concept. .

Council members discussed the second paragraph of the Decision-making section,

offered revisions to text, which Rob noted, and will be presented in a revised document.

The third paragraph was acceptable to the Council.

Nancy Whelchel stated that the conference proposal should have something in the document about last minute requests and the need to involve the Conference Operations Chair in discussion of those requests. After discussion, it was concluded that the document should say something to the effect that the Conference Chair needs to work closely with the Conference Operations Chair to make sure that the conference needs are logistically feasible. .

In discussing the Content section, David Moore stated he agreed with the whole section. But he thinks the limitations on conference presentations should have language of “shall normally be limited” so this allows it to happen in case of need. He also doesn’t think the limitation should include the role of discussants. After discussion, it was concluded that the language should state “shall normally be limited to no more than 2 times” for the primary presenters of a paper or a poster.

It was concluded that AAPOR should not be too restrictive for Roundtables. Paul Beatty said he felt there was too much emphasis on invited sessions. We want to make sure that the Conference Chair does not take control of the program content. The language would be better suited if it stated: “The conference chair is encouraged to create invited sessions...”

It was concluded that AAPOR needs to look at the quality and quantity of the abstracts each year.

Consensus was reached on revised text which Rob will present in a revised document.

There was much discussion about the Structure section. The recommendation in the proposal to experiment for two years with Thursday morning sessions prompted Nancy W to state that it needs to be made clear that this can be done only if it’s operationally feasible. We need to check the contracts for 2007 and 2008 to see if we have the meeting space available for Thursday morning sessions.

The question was asked as to how many sessions we want to have. The document says we want to have only six sessions or panels in a given time slot. David Moore is concerned about the move to allow no more than six sessions in any given time slot, rather than the current eight sessions per time slot, which allows for a total of 84 sessions. To go to six sessions per timeslot we’d have to reject more papers. Expanding the conference to Thursday morning, but reducing the number of sessions per time slot does not give us the opportunity to have more papers. Nancy Belden explained that the session limitation is recommended because it seems there is just too much happening at the same time during timeslots and people have to make hard choices about what they are going to go to attend. David Moore proposed that we expand to Thursday morning sessions if logistically feasible, keep the number of sessions constant, and consider

reducing the number of contemporaneous sessions.

The Council agreed that for a two-year experiment, we should expand to Thursday a.m., if logistically feasible, and keep at least the same number of total panels, as well as consider the possibility of reducing the number of contemporaneous panels.

RESOLVED to adopt all the changes in the Proposal for Conference Guidelines document, as recorded by Rob Daves, for inclusion in the Long Range Planning Committee Report. Motion made by Nancy Mathiowetz and seconded by Paul Beatty. Motion passed unanimously.

LRPC Proposal for Education – Nancy Mathiowetz

The Long Range Planning Committee's Proposal for Education was prepared by Nancy Mathiowetz and Scott Keeter. Nancy summarized the proposal they circulated to the Executive Council. The goal is to facilitate the planning and implementation of a range of education initiatives: an appropriate mixture of short courses at the annual conference; the expansion of short course offerings to locations around the country; seminars targeted at special populations of interest; web-based lectures and workshops; the provision of white papers on best practices and other materials and methods as needed.

Three alternative models were presented in the proposal. These included: the "Conference Operations Committee" Model; the "Elected Chair" Model; and the "Paid Coordinator" model. The LRPC recommends a hybrid combining Models 1 and 3 with a trial period of at least one year. The recommendation is to have an Education Committee that is not unlike the Conference Operations Committee, but which is not an elected body. Nancy sees the highest priority as getting the Education Committee established and obtaining a cost estimate from AMP for staff time since Nancy expects there will be the need for some support from an AMP staff person. Then the committee can determine how to carry out what's recommended in the proposal. For the first year, the liaison will be the individual who wins the election for President-Elect.

In the proposal, it is recommended that there be five or six short courses at the annual conference. In addition, there is a suggestion for developing a five to ten year plan of short course offerings that includes a set of rotating introductory courses targeted towards new professionals. Perhaps there could be a core set of courses with set course objectives and content. The plan is to move short courses beyond the annual conference as well as to make it a revenue stream for AAPOR. We can also work with chapters to offer short courses as something for their conferences.

Cliff expressed that most immediate priority should be the short courses at the conference and taking those courses on the road. Cliff also emphasized that it is important that we be a source of ongoing education for our members. Nancy M. says the first step will be to talk to the 2006 short course instructors and see if they would like to take any of their courses on the road. Nancy M. stated that the education offerings might help to bring new members into the Association. Cliff also suggested that perhaps AAPOR could run

short courses at other associations' conferences. Nancy M. thinks in a couple of years we'll have a better idea of what kind of person is needed for head the Education Committee. Until then, Cliff thinks we should recruit an Education Committee Chairperson from within AAPOR. Nancy envisioned needing about ¼ to ½ half of an AMP staff person's time to assist the Education Committee. Cliff cautioned that we shouldn't try to do everything at one time and he envisions less time needed from an AMP staff person.

There was some discussion of how AAPOR can also serve the non-survey professionals targeting such groups as journalists, teachers, lawyers, physicians and IRBs. AAPOR needs to expand our educational role to the general public.

The AAPOR Executive Council is requested to approve the formation of the Education Committee as well as the monetary investment for AMP staff time.

Some of the work of the Education Committee will dovetail into the responsibilities of the Communications Director. While there is a lot of preparation work for the establishment of an Education Committee, we need to start now and stagger this over the long-term. AAPOR can use its volunteers for the projects, but will eventually need to have an Education Committee Chair with a set job description.

RESOLVED to accept all of the recommendations of the Long Range Planning Committee's Education Report which will be incorporated into the Long Range Planning Report that will be presented to the Executive Council for approval. Motion made by David Moore and seconded by Nancy Belden. Motion passed unanimously.

Cliff Zukin said that there will be a final Long Range Planning Committee report that will be presented to the Executive Council for approval in May and then a Summary report will be presented to the membership at the Annual Business Meeting in Montreal.

RPC Proposal on Communication Outreach - Nancy Belden

Nancy Belden and Clyde Tucker prepared the Proposal on Communication Outreach which was distributed to the Executive Council. Nancy began by summarizing the main points in the document. She said that AAPOR needs to take steps to address public relations and communication outreach. She stated that the overarching concept of the proposal was authorized by the May 2004 AAPOR Executive Council and \$25,000 in funding was provided in 2005 by AAPOR and an additional \$25,000 was provided by an two other sponsors. Rob Daves said that this effort was started because AAPOR has a public relations problem, and that we need a Communications Director to we have arms and legs on the ground to respond to public issues. Cliff stated that because we have brains within the Council we do not need an Executive Director, but rather the ability to respond quickly to issues which arise and require our attention. He said, for example, there are times when we need to get messages out or a statement on the website regarding specific situations with 48 hours. Currently we do not have the ability to respond

quickly. We need someone like a hill staffer to be able to address issues which arise immediately.

The Long Range Planning Committee is recommending that AAPOR amend the bylaws to change the name of the Publications and Information Committee to the Communications Committee. Six AAPOR members will be asked to serve on the committee for terms of four years, with two people rotating off each year providing for a stable core. The proposal also recommends hiring a full-time Communications Director that would work under the direction of the AAPOR President and probably, but not necessarily, located in Washington, D. C. The new position could be funded by fundraising or through AAPOR itself.

It is anticipated that AAPOR would need a budget of \$75,000 a year which would include benefits. Nancy Belden suggested the position could be filled by someone from Capital Hill or journalism at a salary of \$45,000 or \$50,000 a year, plus benefits, and work under the direction of the AAPOR President. A draft job description has already been presented to Council.

Nancy B. reported that AAPOR recently hired a fundraiser who is getting ready to produce a list of foundations from which to obtain grants or raise funds.

Nancy Belden asked the member of the Executive Council to provide her with comments on the Proposal on Communication Outreach by March 23rd. She will then incorporate comments and send a revised document to the LRPC.

LRPC – Membership – Cliff Zukin

Cliff Zukin, Brad Edwards and Kat Draughon worked on the Membership Committee of the Long Range Planning Committee's to address issues related to AAPOR's membership. Cliff Zukin reported that AAPOR membership for the past three years has been flat. However, conference attendance has risen considerably. Cliff Zukin asked the questions: Can we grow? Do we want incremental growth? Where do we grow? Cliff, Brad and Kat looked at three ways in which membership could grow. First, examine what we can do to better retain members. Can we look at who we lost over the past three years? Second, Cliff said that AAPOR wants to get more of a balance in the academic sector. Some related associations (American Political Science Association and the International Communication Association) have been targeted for AAPOR to market membership. Cliff Zukin said that on the commercial side, we have pretty healthy relationships with CMOR, CASOR, MRA and the Qualitative Research Association. He thinks we should try to swap mailing lists with these organizations and fish within their survey methods sections. Third, AAPOR needs to have more outreach to sister organizations. Currently, AAPOR is involved in conference calls every two months with representatives of MRA, CMOR and CASRO and this outreach to sister organizations is positive. They all have concerns on standards, membership, conferences, ethics, and image. They all agreed that it was time for a face-to-face meeting and representatives from these organizations are coming to Montreal for a meeting to discuss common goals.

AAPOR now has a membership booth that can be taken to other conferences and staffed with volunteers. Cliff said that AAPOR needs a membership plan. We lose about 200 members a year. Brad Edwards and Kat Draughon will be looking at the capacity of the AAPOR membership database to see if the characteristics of the 200 members we are losing each year can be determined.

David Moore asked what we do to follow up with folks who don't renew. Mike Flanagan stated that Brad Edwards is currently developing a questionnaire to send to non-renewing members to ask them about why they didn't renew their membership.

We need to find other areas of potential AAPOR members. Cliff raised the possibility of obtaining list of individuals who have submitted articles for POQ so we can target them for membership? Nancy Mathiowetz will raise the question with Peter Miller, POQ Editor, to see if the POQ authors list can be used by AAPOR for target marketing for membership. Nancy W. suggested also targeting the Survey Methods Section of the American Sociological Association.

Rob Daves mentioned that all of the other proposals coming of the LRPC have detailed plans of how the proposals will be implemented and asked if what is being discussed needs to be written as a guide for Membership and Chapter Relations and then just have them carry out what's been discussed. Kat thinks a Guide will be sufficient and doesn't require additional staff to carry out the proposal. Cliff will circulate a draft within the week for comments from the Executive Council.

Cliff asked if AAPOR needs to develop a strategy to guide membership. Do we need that detail? Cliff will write up the Membership document and submit to the Council in May.

Fiscal Year

Cliff said that, recognizing budgetary implications, the Long Range Planning Committee looked at the AAPOR fiscal year which currently runs from July 1 to June 30. They are wondering if it makes sense to change the fiscal year to a calendar year or from October to September. This change would make the fiscal year more consistent with the actual financial cycle of AAPOR, since by October, most conference expenditures have been fully resolved, whereas that is not the case when we begin a new fiscal year in July. This would make it much easier to get a clear picture of where the organization stands financially. Cliff reported that the LRPC agreed to look into this issue.

Executive Council Committee Reports

Membership Committee Report – Kat Draughon

Update on Membership

Kat Draughon reported that AAPOR currently has 1,433 members as of January 31st.

This is a normal dip for membership since not everyone has renewed and some folks don't renew until they register for the conference. The AAPOR renewal year ended December 31, 2005. At that time we had 1,982 members. In 2006 we have had 44 new memberships.

Outreach to Sister Organizations

Kat reported that she and Brad are conducting outreach to sister organizations and discussed with MRA the idea of trading membership booths at annual conferences. However, AAPOR is unable to have MRA place their booth at the AAPOR conference this year because there is no exhibit space left. MRA is willing to let us have our membership booth at their conference. Anytime we use the AAPOR Membership Booth, we will have to have it staffed with AAPOR volunteers. We also have the MRA mailing list in case we want to promote the AAPOR conference. We might want to consider offering a rebate on the registration fee of \$50 for MRA members. Nancy W. is concerned about doing it this year because of the constrained meal space at the conference hotel in Montreal. We are only able to accommodate 800 very tightly for lunch.

After discussion, the Executive Council decided that it would be better to send out a postcard, not necessarily promoting the conference (nor offering a registration rebate, but pointing them to the AAPOR website. Next year's conference space in Anaheim will be a better place to promote because we will have more room.

Responding to Volunteers from the Volunteers Survey

Kat Draughon talked about the volunteers' survey sent out to members in which AAPOR asked for persons interested in volunteering for committee work. Kat Draughon said AAPOR has an over-whelming list of volunteers and currently we don't know what to do with them. AMP forwards the various lists to the committee chairs in case they need members, but we doubt that anything really gets done with the list. It appears that no one is responding to the individuals who volunteered for the committees.

The question was raised as to how do we respond to those who volunteer? There was agreement that we need to answer those who volunteered. If we can't use them, we need to let them know. We also need to think more about what we need specifically and the vehicle by which to solicit for the volunteers needed. After discussion, it was decided that the Membership Committee would decide what volunteers AAPOR should be looking for.

Chapter Tax Exemption

Kat reported that the New York Chapter would like to be under AAPOR National's tax exemption for their 2005 tax filing. They do not have their own tax ID. Chapters have to file a tax return if their gross revenue exceeds \$25,000 which the New York Chapter does. Mike Flanagan has been discussing the issue with AMP's Accounting Department.

Mike says the problem is that the Chapters are separate entities and not considered to be part of AAPOR National. The basis for this is that you can be a Chapter member but not necessarily have to be a member of National. Therefore, the Chapters cannot be easily recognized as part of National. The issue is tricky and may ultimately require a legal or tax attorney opinion for all the Chapters. It was suggested that perhaps the NY Chapter should file and get their own tax ID number so we don't assume any liability for them. Nancy M. mentioned that this same issue came up when she was Secretary-Treasurer on the Executive Council and she thinks it's a policy decision and is in the minutes from back in the mid-1990s. Cliff asked Kat for Brad and Mike to resolve this issue.

Publications and Information Report – Steve Everett

Web update and testing

A conference call was held with Westat who has agreed to fund and conduct the usability testing of the updated AAPOR website. The usability testing will take longer than originally planned because it will be much more comprehensive.

Steve wants to get the AAPOR logo and new banner on the existing website and not wait for the revised website to be in place. The navigation and content will not be revised until the usability testing is completed.

RESOLVED to change the logo design on the mast head of the website and delay the redesign of the website pending the results of the usability study currently being conducted by Westat and at the time of implementation of the new website design, that AAPOR move the hosting to the Third Party Website Provider recommended by AMP . Motion made by Nancy Belden and seconded by Kat Draughon. Motion passed unanimously.

Currently there is not a target date for the launch of the new site. We have to follow the Westat schedule, but we expect to have the results of usability testing by the May Executive Council meeting and Steve hopes to have the website redesigned and up and running by the mid-Summer.

Shap Wolf is working on the AAPOR Newsletter.

AAPOR Logo Use Guidance for Posting to AAPOR's Website

Nancy Mathiowetz circulated the proposed guidelines for posting to AAPOR's website. There was on minor change to the document and that was changing Members to individuals and organizations.

Update on New "E-zine" Publication:

Cliff summarized the history of the E-zine task force. In September 2005 Bob Groves presented an outline of a proposal to the Executive Council which had been prepared by

him, John Kennedy, and Sandy Berry. The Executive Council previously authorized the task force to proceed with development of a proposal and initially funded them for \$5,000 for a start up.

Cliff Zukin said that the Task Force has developed a good proposal of a model for an e-zine, but have come back with only one model rather than the requested three models. Cliff said that the goal for today is to open up the discussions for any concerns of the Executive Council and then get back to the Task Force so they can prepare a final proposal to be presented to the Council in May for decision. Nancy Mathiowetz will take the notes back to the Task Force along with any concerns.

Cliff Zukin said that AAPOR needs a vehicle for a forum for discussion that would not normally be published in POQ. The Council questioned what the design layout would look like and what would some of these articles be like? The E-Zine would be different from *Public Opinion Pros*. It would have to do more with operations and the business of doing public opinion research. It is intended as a quick-turnaround publication for survey practitioners.

John Kennedy joined the meeting via conference phone to discuss the e-zine proposal with the Executive Council members.

Cliff Zukin expressed some concern that the proposal now looks like it's purely survey methods related and lost the public opinion aspect. Cliff referred back to the proposal from September which he doesn't think is reflected in the current document. John Kennedy said that if this is not the direction the Executive Council wants to go, then the Task Force can go back and redraft the document. David Moore said it would be unfortunate to limit E-zine to survey methodology. He writes many articles for Gallup and can think how they might fit into the E-zine. Nancy Belden questioned how readable the survey methods part would be to the non-trained eye.

he e-Zine should serve all AAPOR members and there is the danger of getting away from the original concept of this plan. John Kennedy said that public opinion research has not been addressed, but the E-zine proposal deals more with survey research, survey practices and survey researchers. John Kennedy said that he will take the Council's suggestions back to the Task Force and have them come closer to what the expectation is and make adjustments to it.

Cliff raised the question about governance of the E-zine. Who appoints the editorial board? What mechanism is there for reporting to AAPOR? He thinks whatever mechanism exists for appointing the editorial board of POQ could work for the E-zine.

Nancy Belden said that the E-Zine doesn't have to be a POQ model, that it could possibly be part of the Communications Outreach. The revised document should put forth the reporting relationship for the E-zine.

There is currently no revenue anticipated for AAPOR from the E-zine and no

recommendation at this point in time. Would it need its own website or be part of the AAPOR website? Is this a membership benefit? Nancy M. stated that the vision was to have it more open so it could channel new members into AAPOR, rather than just serving AAPOR.

After discussions, Cliff Zukin said that the Executive Council would have one week to provide comments to Nancy Mathiowetz on the proposal for incorporation into the new E-zine. Nancy Mathiowetz will be the liaison. Nancy Mathiowetz will send the Executive Council members a reminder.

The cost to have the E-Zine on a website would be minimal however; the revenue is going to be an issue. The Task Force estimates a budget of \$30,000 - \$43,000. The Task Force has to come back with a cost justification. Are these good investments for us? We can make investments if we want to. With all the potential initiatives that we have, we need to prioritize.

Cliff Zukin said that AAPOR recently raised the dues and he had in mind that it would raise approximately \$50 or \$60. Mike Flanagan will look to see what the spreadsheet says on this.

The question was raised as to whether this would be a three year commitment? AAPOR would have a better opportunity if there is a three year frame. How will we know if the E-Zine works? This should be part of the revised proposal. The suggestion was made that perhaps the AAPOR newsletter could be folded into the E-Zine and the Newsletter budget line used for the E-Zine. We could also look at some sponsorship dollars, but need to be careful that we don't overtax out generous sponsors.

The E-Zine Task Force should look for clarification and reexamine the proposal to look for web hosting dollars as well as the hardware and software expenses. They should consider alternative ideas about expanding the current AAPOR Newsletter and use the mechanism that we have in a hard copy version.

To proceed as the proposal outlines, AAPOR would have to charge each member around \$20 for the E-Zine. The comment was made that perhaps AAPOR should give the E-Zine free to members and charge non-members. AAPOR should do some advertising for this in order to raise revenue.

Cliff requested that the Task Force revise the proposal based on today's discussion and pay particular attention to the substantive content issues, governance, and funding.

Standards Report – Nancy Mathiowetz:

Nancy Mathiowetz reported that two Standards Cases had been resolved by electronic votes of the Council and they were both unanimously approved. Thomas Guterbock asked what happens to the records from the standard cases. Will AAPOR have any history at all? After discussion, it was decided that when the standards cases are closed,

they should be sent to AMP for the repository.

Nancy M. and Cliff commented that AAPOR should make a public statement on the appropriateness for the margin of error in nonprobability samples and margin of error of online polls. There should be a statement on margin of error and we can send as an attachment when questions come up. AAPOR could put a statement on the website about margin of error. Rob Daves suggested that someone on the Standards Committee produce such a statement rite on the margin of sampling error and circulate to the Council. Cliff said we can deal more generally that call-in and opt-in polls are not generalizable.

Nancy M. stated that AAPOR needs a White Paper on Robo Surveys. These surveys involve interactive voice response polls in very large numbers. These surveys are different from push polls. Tom Guterbock is putting together a group headed by Evan Witt which will write a White Paper on Robo Surveys. The group membership is not yet determined. Toms wants to get something that looks like AAPOR's push poll statement on our website. The goal is to have the White Paper on Robo Surveys on AAPOR's website before the congressional elections. The group should aim to have the White Paper developed, and up on the website by September 2006. Rob Daves stated that he would like to see a draft White Paper for the Executive Council's review by the early Summer Executive Council meeting.

Miscellaneous Reports/Updates

AAPOR Election - Nancy B.

Nancy reported that most of the information was discussed earlier. She reiterated that ballots are going out on Monday, March 20th. The postcard mailing with the discreet code will not be done because of security problems. Persons without e-mail addresses will receive complete ballots packets in the postal mail. The deadline for voting is April 17th. Nancy stated that she did not have any trouble getting people to agree to run for the various offices and that it's a very strong ballot.

Endowment Committee – Jennifer

Jennifer reported that the Endowment Committee received 8 applications for Roper Scholarships. Five Roper Scholars were selected (4 from universities, 1 from a private firm.) All who were selected accepted. Three thousand dollars in award money will be distributed. The number and amounts of the awards for the Roper Scholars are:

Two \$500 awards

Two \$700 awards

One \$600 award

The characteristics of the Roper Scholars this year are:

our – First time conference time attendees

Three are graduate students

three received employer support.

Two also get short course support.

Other New Business

Patricia Moy reported that Paul Lavrakas contacted her a couple of weeks ago wondering if AAPOR would allow a two day conference on cell phone methodology immediately preceding the 2007 AAPOR conference in Anaheim. Alternatively, he proposed a cell phone track within the AAPOR conference.

Cliff said he's concerned that a two day conference before AAPOR would distract from our conference attendance.

Patricia stated that the previous two cell phone summits were by invitation only and. Paul wants this one to be more open. Rob suggested using the session track and Paul was enthusiastic about that idea. Paul will be responsible for providing the marketing for the session track.

Patricia also suggested to Paul that a short course be offered on cell phones in addition to the cell phone track. She will need to coordinate with Paul. He and a few others want to be section heads who reviewed potential abstracts. Patricia will report back to Paul telling him that the Executive Council is okay with having a short course on Thursday and a cell phone session track within the 2007 AAPOR conference.

There being no further business, the Executive Council moved to adjourn. Motion made by Jennifer Rothgeb and seconded by David Moore. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Rothgeb
Secretary-Treasurer
