

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH  
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING  
May 16, 2007  
Anaheim, California**

**2006-2007 Executive Council:**

**Robert P. Daves** – President  
**Nancy Mathiowetz** – Vice President/President Elect  
**Cliff Zukin** – Past President  
**Paul C. Beatty** - Secretary-Treasurer  
**Dawn V. Nelson** – Associate Secretary-Treasurer  
**Patricia Moy** – Conference Chair  
**Frank M. Newport** – Associate Conference Chair  
**Thomas Guterbock** – Standards Chair  
**Charlotte G. Steeh** – Associate Standards Chair  
**Katherine (Kat) Draughon** – Membership and Chapter Relations Chair  
**Carl Ramirez** – Associate Membership and Chapter Relations Chair  
**Steve Everett** – Publications and Information Chair  
**Mark M. Blumenthal** – Associate Publications and Information Chair  
**Robert Y. Shapiro** – **Senior Councilor-at-Large (absent)**  
**Mark A. Schulman** – **Junior Councilor-at-Large**

**2007-2008 Newly Elected Executive Council:**

**Dick Kulka** - Vice President Elect  
**Kate Stewart** – Associate Secretary-Treasurer  
**Vince Price** – Associate Conference Chair (absent)  
**Mary Losch** – Associate Standards Chair  
**Adam Safir** – Associate Membership and Chapter Relations Chair  
**Michael Brick** – Associate Publications and Information Chair  
**Scott Keeter** – incoming Junior Councilor-at-Large (afternoon only)

**AAPOR Executive Office Staff:**

**Michael P. Flanagan** – Executive Coordinator, AMP  
**Monica Evans Lombe** – Association Manager, AMP  
**Patricia Lewis** – Communications Director, AAPOR

**Guests:**

**Nancy L. Whelchel** - Conference Operations Committee Chair  
**Linda Dimitropoulos**– Assistant Conference Operations Committee Chair  
**John Kennedy** – Survey Practice Editor (section report only)  
**Mollyann Brodie** – Education Chair (section report only)  
**Peter V. Miller** – *POQ* Editor (via phone, section report only)

President Rob Daves called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. PDST.

Rob asked if there were any changes to the Agenda. There were none.

**RESOLVED to adopt the agenda as presented.** Motion made by Dawn Nelson and seconded by Paul Beatty. Motion passed unanimously.

**Secretary's Report – Paul Beatty (8:40-8:45am):**

Paul Beatty asked if there were any changes to the minutes from the March 15-16, 2007, Executive Council meeting. There were two minor changes: replace Cliff Zukin's name with Tom Guterbock as the person who seconded the motion during the meeting and correct notes to reflect that Tom Guterbock's changes do not require a vote by AAPOR members at the Annual Business Meeting.

**RESOLVED to accept the March 15-16, 2007, minutes as corrected.** Motion made by Dawn Nelson and seconded by Cliff Zukin. Motion passed unanimously.

Paul noted that the "to do" list will now be reported upon during council members' individual reports rather than at meeting's start.

**Executive Office Report – Mike Flanagan (8:45-8:50am)**

Mike Flanagan reported that the AAPOR Executive Office staff has primarily been working on the conference since the last Executive Council meeting. He reported that they expect 770 to 800 conference attendees and that AAPOR membership now stood at 1596. He pointed out that AAPOR usually picks up a great deal of members at the annual conference, but he also raised the issue of considering re-tooling the membership year and that this should be discussed by Council.

Mike reported that Nancy Mathiowetz recently visited the AMP offices and it was suggested that every year the President-elect and President make a visit to AMP.

Mike reported that Missy Johnson, AAPOR's Meeting Manager, would be leaving her position at AMP on May 30<sup>th</sup> and that AMP was in the process of searching for her replacement.

At the suggestion of Cliff Zukin, Mike informed the new Executive Council members about the AMP staff and their day-to-day functions for AAPOR (see attachment for details). There is Mike and Monica who AAPOR has the most contact with. Missy is the meeting manager; Jeanie Harper takes care of incoming phone calls, and Beth Crowley usually comes on site to help with the conference

Mike reported that on the To Do list from the March 2007 meeting he completed all the tasks, except he had not check to see who the official AAPOR contact is for CASRO. Dawn Nelson stated that she thought the contact was Reg Baker. Others concurred.

**President's Report – Rob Daves (8:50-9:11am):**

Rob Daves reported on the resolution of a three-year old request for AAPOR and WAPOR to look into another country's exit poll for which WAPOR had taken the lead. Specifically, two documents on the issue from WAPOR President Mike Traugott. First is a report by WAPOR that there is not enough information to confirm any standards violations; and a second document that outlines standards and procedures for international exit polling. The Executive Council accepted these guidelines, in part, because they mirrored our values and beliefs closely and agreed that this was not a standards issue for AAPOR. Rob reported that he wrote letters to WAPOR president Mike Traugott agreeing with the two documents and closed the loop on this issue.

During the March Executive Council meeting, Council members approved a request to fund \$10,000 seed money for an international conference in Berlin in 2008 even though they had expressed concern over the accounting practices as well as the length of time of repayment of profits from past donations. To address this concern, Council requested that Rob include a cover letter when sending the check to Brad Edwards, the conference organizer. Rob reported on a discussion he had with Brad Edwards: Brad was agreeable to these terms and Rob also requested that AAPOR receive a quarterly progress update and noted that AAPOR wants to be paid back within a year of the conference. Brad Edwards was agreeable to signing a letter of agreement in principle that these requirements will be met and AmStat is to provide a balance sheet quarterly so AAPOR knows everything is on track. Mike Flanagan stated that when the check is written a letter should go to Dawn as Secretary-Treasurer and then AAPOR would write a check.

The Executive Council discussed the whereabouts of the proceeds from the TSMII conference from January 2006. Mike Brick said he checked with Clyde Tucker (who was Mike's TSM-II conference co-organizer) who said that the TSMII money would not be released to the participants until all of the books have been published. This will be done in October or November, 2007, but payment might not be until 2008. Nancy Mathiowetz raised the point that there are two issues: 1) royalties and 2) seed money to be repaid. Mike Brick was tasked with keeping tabs on the repayment of the seed money and AMP is responsible for tracking payment of the book royalties.

Rob Daves said that he has developed a contact list of all the organizations with whom AAPOR has a relationship or potential relationships and if anyone wants a copy, they should contact him. Rob said he would send the list to Dawn per her request .Nancy Mathiowetz pointed out that this is exactly the type of document that will go up on SharePoint once all Council members are up to speed on it.

Next Rob reported on the status of *POQ*. Rob Daves said that a group within AAPOR believes that *POQ* needs an enhanced capacity to deal with all the methodological issues

that are happening today. The request to look into this issue came from Bob Groves, Eleanor Singer, Stan Presser and a dozen other prominent AAPOR members.

Vince Price is going to chair an ad hoc methodology committee to examine the issue of increased pages dedicated to methods. Sandy Beery, Scott Althaus and Mike Traugott will serve on this committee with Vince. They are to report back to Executive Council in September with a recommendation. The *POQ* Advisory Committee will be looking at negotiating a new contract with Oxford University Press (OUP). The current contract expires on December 31, 2008, but OUP needs to be apprised of AAPOR's decision to remain with OUP or seek a new publisher no later than December 31, 2007.

Peter Miller's term as Editor of the *POQ* will also expire on December 31, 2008, and AAPOR needs to begin the search for his replacement. Peter Miller would like to have the new editor in place by the middle of 2008 so he/she has time to receive, review and edit submissions for the fall issue. The *POQ* advisory committee, chaired by Bob Groves, is responsible for heading up the search for a new editor. That process will begin this summer.

Rob put forth and Council agreed that it is best to first address the request on expanding the capacity of *POQ* because that will impact the decisions on publisher and new editor.

Rob said that AAPOR definitely needs to market itself better. Although Pat Lewis handles public affairs for AAPOR, Executive Council also needs to focus on marketing the association. A new Marketing Committee will be appointed by Nancy Mathiowetz.

Rob invited a couple of individuals from the Poynter Institute to attend this year's annual conference, but he was unsure as to whether they would attend or not. The Poynter Institute (who has the contacts and the mode to educate journalists) has partnered with AAPOR to develop a series of courses for training journalists about polling. This effort is being headed by Mollyann Brodie, chair of the education committee.

At Cliff Zukin's request, Rob said that over the past year, representatives from several of AAPOR's sister research organizations have been getting together for a conference call every few months. However, lately those calls have dropped off and he hopes they will resume because he felt there is benefit from the organizations working together.

Janet Streicher (Heritage Interview Committee Chairperson), has been working with the Kaiser Institute to digitize all of the completed Heritage interviews.

Rob said that at the last meeting there had been some concern raised by Tom Guterbock about survey researchers at academic institutes organizing a separate association to discuss issues specific to academic survey organizations. The concern was that these researchers may feel that AAPOR was not meeting their needs. After deliberations Tom Guterbock and Jim Wolf agreed that AAPOR does not need to be concerned with their issues and we wish them well.

Rob said that AAPOR needs to explore in more depth the New Jersey Chapter and its struggles. Rob said there seems to be two things that are going on. One appears that there is not a strong interest on behalf of the core group of people involved with the New Jersey Chapter. Also, there does seem to be some competition from the New York AAPOR Chapter. Rob Daves said that AAPOR should continue to keep in contact with the New Jersey group and that the Membership and Chapter Relations should follow up with this and continue to ask for reports on their status.

Cliff raised the questions of whether the chapter was raising money and we need to have some accountability of who is keeping track of the chapter's funds. Kat Draughon reported that she has asked for reports on all accounting but has not received anything, Kat suggested that the Membership Committee look at the possibility of folding the New Jersey Chapter into the New York AAPOR Chapter. If all else fails, we may want to uncharter the New Jersey Chapter. Carl Ramirez was tasked with looking into the issue further. He planned to raise the issue at the chapter meeting during the conference to see who has the money for the chapter.

**Vice President/President Elect's Report – Nancy Mathiowetz (9:11-9:18?am):**

Nancy Mathiowetz began her report to Council saying that during election cycles the President and past-President are inundated with requests from the media for quotes and that AAPOR needs to establish an ad-hoc Rapid Response Team to expedite responses to these requests. For 2008 we need a group of people who have been involved with election polling. To date, three people have agreed to serve on the Rapid Response Team: Cliff Zukin, David Moore and Paul Lavrakas. Pat Lewis can also use this group for statements she may be working for the website.

Nancy Mathiowetz reported to the Executive Council on her recent visit to the AAPOR Executive Offices in Olathe, Kansas. Nancy said that AMP and AAPOR have a variety of database issues that we have struggled with over the past year. First is orientation: AMP is a membership collection organization whereas AAPOR Executive Council members are research scientists. The types of membership analysis that interest Executive Council members are very different from AMP's current use of the database. Second, AAPOR Executive Council is interested in analyzing information that does not currently exist on AMP's database. In order to resolve this issue, AAPOR will need to add these "variables" to an AAPOR member form (such as renewal form or conference registration form). As a stop gap measure for this year, AMP has agreed to produce our full membership database in Excel format on an "as needed" basis, with the first one being produced on June 1<sup>st</sup> (when AAPOR membership should be at its year high). This will allow us researchers to analyze our data however we please. The database will be loaded onto SharePoint so Council members can easily access it. Updates will be available and are not difficult and should be made available to membership. It will be up to AAPOR Council to decide how frequently we want updated copies of the database as well as who else can access this information (e.g., individual chapters). Nancy noted that next year Dick Kulka and Pat Lewis will join Nancy when she visits AMP's offices again.

Nancy said that AAPOR's current member year is from January 1<sup>st</sup> of any year through December 31<sup>st</sup> of that same year. People who have not renewed by February 1<sup>st</sup> are dropped from the membership roles. One thing that AAPOR may want to consider is shifting membership year to July 1 through June 30<sup>th</sup> to coincide with what the organization is already doing (e.g., conference attendance). This would allow AAPOR members to renew their memberships when they register for the conference. Looking into the implications of changing the membership year was tasked to the Membership and Chapter Relations chairs and to the Secretary-Treasurers.

**Past President's Report – Cliff Zukin (9:18? – 9:21am):**

Cliff Zukin reported that we recently heard from the New York Times Foundation regarding our petition for funding to educate journalists. It took them a very long time to respond, but they have now given AAPOR \$2,500 for "training journalists." . Cliff said that one of the requirements is that AAPOR needs to report to the New York Times Foundation on our activities; otherwise, the money is pretty much unrestricted. Nancy Mathiowetz pointed out that although the amount is a lot smaller than what we had initially requested, receiving NYT Foundation money can help leverage more money in the future from other grants

Cliff spoke about being more active in writing grant proposals and to bring money to the organization.

**Treasurer's Report – Paul Beatty (9:22-9:45am):**

Paul Beatty started his report by saying that AAPOR's long-range plans put into place ambitious goals (specifically hiring a communications director and funding a new online publication) and that the task ahead is to find out how to pay for these goals. For the first time in AAPOR's history the organization has approved a deficit budget. Based on conservative estimates we have a \$79,000 deficit. There is no problem paying for the deficit this year because of our significant savings; however, for the long term if the organization continues to run deficits it is more of an issue. But right now we have cash and have put some money into CDs (CDARS) that are getting 4.6% interest.

Paul said that as of April 30, 2007, AAPOR has a gain of about \$332,512 since the beginning of the year because AAPOR has just about received all our revenue and not paid out very many of our expenses. Paul said that it is a tough time of year to track finances. It is a lot easier to judge after the conference bills are paid and the June 30<sup>th</sup> financial statement will be the true picture of where we stand at which point tough decisions may be necessary to make (e.g., raise dues or cut services). However, we may learn that we are in a better financial situation than we expected. Paul said that AAPOR may want to raise dues or make other cuts if they see their reserves being depleted. Nancy Mathiowetz pointed out that AAPOR received \$45,000 revenue from the digitized *POQ* library.

During the past year the Executive Council created a Subcommittee on Conference Profitability and appointed members. This is a proactive committee and is looking at how AAPOR can generate more income and trim excessive costs from the conference. Paul Beatty and Nancy Whelchel will be rotating off this committee since their Council roles are expiring. We have done about all we could do prior to this conference, but we should reconvene one last time after the conference to perform a post game analysis (what we could have done better; what we will do different next time)

Paul distributed a two-page handout noting that AAPOR has a very healthy reserve, but we need to be proactive about monitoring these funds and watch our spending.

When Sandy Beery was Treasurer two Councils ago, she thought we had too much money in low yielding funds so she created an Investment Committee and tasked them with investing AAPOR funds into very, very, very, conservative investments – government securities and bonds. This investment policy has been in place for a few years and has been very successful and it is now time to take our investment to the next level. AAPOR still has too much cash in low yield funds - - in particular, the Endowment Committee has over \$50,000 doing nothing. The Investment Committee and the Endowment Committee each thought the other was doing something with these funds but the reality was that no one was doing it. After consulting with a financial adviser at Morgan Keegan, the next step is for the Investment Committee to finalize a draft of AAPOR's Investment Policy and discuss this with the Executive Council. The policy will outline how much money to invest and where to put it. Council will need to approve the policy and then the Treasurer will move funds accordingly.

Paul Beatty will continue on the Endowment Committee for the next three years. The Investment Committee consists of Paul Beatty, Dawn Nelson, Mike Flanagan, Mark Schulman, Kate Stewart, and Dan Merkle who chairs the committee.

Paul Beatty said that the role of Treasurer is becoming a full time job and that the AAPOR Executive Council may want to look at the Secretary and Treasurer roles and see if they should be split. Cliff Zukin suggested looking into having a guest note-taker attend the meeting since it is hard to type notes and participate in the meeting. Rob Daves thanked Paul Beatty for his service to the Association. Paul Beatty agreed to do a debriefing memorandum on his role as Treasurer for the new Executive Council.

After taking 15 minute break, the Executive Council resumed at 10:03am. Before moving on to the next Council report, Mike Brick updated the Council on a conversation he just had with Clyde Tucker: the final profits from TSM-II conference will not be distributed to the donors until the proceedings book is mailed to the conference participants since postage expenses are part of the conference budget. The book is currently slated for Oct/Nov 2007 publication.

## **Councilor-at-Large Report: Mark Schulman (10:05-10:30am)**

Mark Schulman's report to council touched on three issues: 1) ISO international standards; 2) legislative issues that CASRO is working on; and 3) push-poll legislation.

Mark said that CASRO is the coordinating organization for the ISO international quality standards. These standards are procedural and mechanical in nature and not what we at AAPOR would think of as quality standards (such as response rates). The ISO standards themselves are set in stone, but there is variation on compliance. At this point in time, there is a great deal of debate over how organizations should respond. CASRO has endorsed the standards but may not recommend we adhere to adopting them. There is a big difference between endorse and adopt. If we adopt, we need to go through financial audit by an outside firm; this is not the case if we endorse the standards.

CASRO stopped short of the audit process. There are a number of alternatives that CASRO is considering. 1) do nothing; ISO does not have much impact at this point.; 2) self-declaration (where US firm declares it meets the standards without further exploration); 3) third party declaration where CASRO or another entity declares that we meet the standards; or 4) fully accredited (with fully accredited audit). audits. Audits costs about \$5,000 a year.. Cliff asked if clients ask for ISO certification and Mark replied that it is rare for international organizations to require/request an ISO certification. It was agreed that Council needs to request a report on ISO from eg Baker. Tom Guterbock said that he has had conversations with Diane Bowers, Tom Smith and Reg Baker about the ISO standards and has learned that the self-declaration just mentioned is a bit of a misnomer. A company cannot declare that they are "ISO Certified" without paying the \$5000 annual fee. However, a company can declare that they "meet the ISO standards" without having to pay the fee. Nancy Mathiowetz asked Tom if this would be a revenue generating or depleting endeavor for AAPOR. Tom said he wasn't sure but it may be revenue generating.

Rob Daves has spoken with other survey organizations/groups on this issue and they all believe that CASRO and AAPOR are the two right groups to be involved on this issue. Also, the fee will be used to offset expenses. Rob emphasized that we don't want to let someone else have all the say on this issue and that we should be involved.. On the members-only section of the AAPOR website there is a free draft posted of the ISO standards

Next, Mark Schulman said that there are legislative issues that we need to be aware of that CASRO and CMOR are taking the lead on. One is the regulation of Robocalls which are prerecorded messages for or against a candidate. There are a number of states that are considering legislation to regulate these Robocalls. Each state defines Robocalls differently. Missouri is the most active and far reaching - - they have introduced two bills (one being putting RoboCalls on the DNC list).

Another legislative issue related to our Push Poll Statement, since it may influence some of the discussions about push polls. There is a House bill right now that wants to



eliminate push polls and there is much debate on what is a push poll. When AAPOR considers a new push poll standard and statement, we need to determine how our standard/statement correlates with the legislation that is being proposed. We are not being proactive on stressing the importance of our push poll statement with CASRO and CMOR. Mark feels that our definition of a push poll can impact the legislation and current debate.

Mark Schulman said that we also need to look at the difference between message testing and a push poll. Some bills define how many individuals can be contacted before the study/poll is considered a push poll. Cliff stated that AAPOR needs to have a very clear statement that everyone feels happy to export. Mark agreed and then added that we need a coordinated effort with CASRO and others. Rob remarked that we want the push poll definition to come from our values and that we want to force legislation to cue to that rather than having AAPOR be reactive to something Congress creates.

Adam Safir noted a few years back he had worked with Nancy Belden on a subcommittee where they looked at push poll legislation and learned that approximately 10 states have worked on push polls. Adam agreed to touch base with Nancy Belden to see if she summarized this information since everyone agreed it would be helpful information to possess.

Rob noted as part of their mission, both CMOR and CASRO keep an eye on federal and state legislation related to our field and Mark Schulman sits on both Boards. Pat Lewis has been in contact with folks at CASRO and CMOR on this topic and she will serve, for the time being, as AAPOR's liaison between the organizations. However, AAPOR does not have the staff to monitor all federal and state laws and so, will continue to rely on CMOR and CASRO.

### **Conference Report – Patricia Moy & Frank Newport (10:30-11:06am)**

Patricia Moy said that it has been an interesting and fun year. AAPOR has three plenary speakers. Patricia said that she was supported by the outpouring of support and thanked everyone for their support.

Patricia Moy said that this year AAPOR tried an experiment of starting the conference on Wednesday opposed to Thursday. It seemed to work out and she would support doing it again. She said it did not affect the accepting of papers. 450 abstracts, which is an all time high. The cell phone track did not have a ton of submissions by itself but Paul Lavrakas and his team constructed 6 coherent sessions.

There was also a Cell Phone track at this conference. Patricia said that this came to us as a proposal for a separate conference to tack on either before or after our annual conference. Charlotte Steeh raised that the system by which "tracks" are used should be fairer because in the past some members who asked for a racial attitudes track were not looked upon favorably. Rob Daves pointed out that some of this is serendipity and Dick Kulka said that in 2002 there was a post-9/11 track. So timing matters a great deal.

Patricia remarked that “track” was not designed to be a public term; rather, we had 7 concurrent sessions that did not overlap with each other.

Frank reported on 2008 conference planning. He noted that 2008 conference venue is New Orleans which is a unique location, and lends itself to: 1) conference theme; and 2) opportunities for membership to do good. Frank said that he is thinking about his theme for the New Orleans Conference and may go with: “Polls for the Public Good.” This is a working theme and one that stresses polls can be a positive force for the betterment of society and emphasizes the research we do and how “knowledge for its own sake is a good thing.” New Orleans lends itself to doing some public good for the conference. Not feasible to do an actual survey but some other ideas are:

1) might it be possible to build a plenary session on a review of all existing data that is out there in the area? There are a lot of surveys out there but they are scattered around. The AAPOR membership might find this intriguing and important to pull our data all together and perform an overall analysis (meta analysis). Then at a plenary we invite mayor and/or governor and explain that one of our contributions to New Orleans is this meta analysis: we present them with these data and then explain how they can use it for the public good.

2) Wiki-technology for the months leading up to the conference. Membership could build on the meta analysis which would have dual virtues: membership involvement leading up to conference as well as the resulting analysis.

Nancy Mathiowetz noted that she’s been working with some folks in LA (LA Recovery Act out of the mayor’s office) and that they have a broad variety of data needs. Perhaps AAPOR could conduct focus groups to inform that issue? Also, historically black colleges: we could do some training to help them conduct surveys. Perhaps we could work with Kaiser and their huge data collection effort (they were in the field collecting data in New Orleans before Katrina); we could use these data; where they see gaps; where they see opportunities. So, rather than build homes, there is a crying need for data.

Another group Nancy has had contact with is the Women of the Storm who coordinate tours for high level people. They would work with AAPOR for those who want to see the Ninth Ward.

Dick Kulka suggested that AAPOR may want to consider “Survey and Polls in the Public Interest” as a possible alternative theme. We could also solicit topics on this topic and we could have a track on it or not. What is it that we could be doing differently?

**RESOLVED to work the 2008 conference theme around surveys, polls in public interest, for public good.** Motion made by Cliff Zukin (polling matters) and seconded by Mark Schulman. Motion passed unanimously.

Kate Stewart suggested looking into foundations that may be willing to fund some of the work AAPOR may do.

Newport asked for comments on last year's post conference survey. The survey will be on-line with GMI similar to what they did last year. There is a question about having a shorter version. Survey may be somewhat shorter and cover a wide variety of topics. Some suggestions includes: testing the cell phone sessions, Thursday start, changing the times; sponsors and exhibits; and others.

Frank Newport will circulate a final draft of the post-conference survey to the Executive Council members about a week after the close of the conference. There will be two surveys, one for the membership that did not attend and one that did attend.

With respect to planning for future meetings, Nancy Whelchel said that if AAPOR went to two hotels, then we would have a different capacity. When we put out bids, we need to not lock ourselves into certain weeks in May. AAPOR is constrained by Mother's Day and Memorial Day as well as graduations. If you move the conference into June, you run into vacations. There was discussion on what and how to ask preference for when to hold the conference in the post-conference survey. There are so many permutations that nothing was concluded and left in Frank's hands for the questionnaire.

#### **Conference Operations Report – Nancy Whelchel (11:06-11:20am)**

Nancy Whelchel said that AAPOR is right on target with past conference registrations and sponsorships. Nancy is guessing we will be around 800 conference attendees (our budgeted number; we had hoped for higher (860) but don't think we'll see that this year). We are also good on our room block and have not had any attrition. This is a flat year, definitely no growth, at which point Carl Ramirez reported that we had 164 new attendees at the conference, which is comparable to last year. On sponsorships we projected \$80,000 and we are well over that amount when including exhibit booths and advertising. All total, we are about \$20,000 ahead on our budget.

The short courses are a bit low on registrations, but that may be picked up as more individuals do on-site registrations (e.g., 100-125 register on site)

More call this year for special meetings (breakfasts and lunches)– at least 16 to 18 different groups. In the future think about the need for extra rooms for these types of meetings. Dawn Nelson suggested having these special groups come earlier to the conference. Nancy W said this depended on the contract with the hotel. Carl asked if any of the groups wanting meeting space had to be turned away, to which Nancy replied that all groups requesting space were given space. Pat Lewis asked for a list of the groups and Nancy said they were the committees (education, communication, GSS, advisory message testing, Lars Lyberg's editorial board)

This year we are doing sponsorship and exhibitors focus groups. We want to get the opinions of our vendors. As a result, we are conducting a survey of the vendors and meeting with them. Adam Safir and Mandy Shaw put together the focus group protocol guides and post conference survey. The focus groups will be held on Friday and Saturday

during lunch as well as some sit downs with individuals. Next year we will have the same size of exhibitor space, so we will need to grow in other ways

Tom Guterbock asked about t-shirt sales and Nancy thought they were comparable to other years, even with the controversial slogan.

Nancy reminded the group that the 2008 conference will be in New Orleans; the 2009 in Florida; and the 2010 in downtown Chicago. Looking ahead, Nancy thought next year would “blow us out of the water” as far as attendees. Also have high hopes for Florida and Chicago.

**2011 Conference Site Selection Report – Linda Dimitropoulos (11:20-11:42am)**

Linda Dimitropoulos reported next on site selection noting that AAPOR is ready to start the 2011 conference site selection process. AMP will send out RFPs to three cities. Requirements at the moment include seating for 1,000 at meals; 8 breakout sessions and one hotel. More options if more than one hotel; options limited in other places because of expenses, unions (e.g, Boston), and other considerations.

Dawn Nelson asked for more information about the constraints on one hotel -- was it not enough rooms or something else. It was explained to Council that as the conference grows one hotel is difficult because of the time it takes to flip the rooms and set places for 1,000 to seat for meals. Having two hotels would alleviate this problem. We would all still have meals together but one of the hotels could manage the meal while another did a plenary or some type of arrangement. It was agreed that the conference committee could look into two hotels as an option.

Linda reminded the group of the geographic regions they selected for the 2007-2010 conferences (2007 West (Anaheim, CA), 2008 South (New Orleans, Louisiana), 2009 South / East (Ft Lauderdale, Florida), and 2010 Midwest (downtown Chicago, IL)) and then requested their input for the 2011 conference. After discussing the topic, the Council decided to look at the east coast and south. Linda noted that she has a short list right now and will do some preliminary research on the following list locales:

Hilton Head or Charleston, SC

Boston or Danvers, MA

Atlanta, GA

Richmond or Norfolk/Virginia Beach/Williamsburg, VA

Portland, Maine

Philadelphia or Pittsburgh, PA

Linda reminded the group that at the March Executive Council they had talked about the need to have someone fully devoted to conference sponsorship - - how it was a very critical role for achieving our conference profitability goals and one that would be very time consuming. Council members had suggested a few AAPOR members for this role, noting that an outgoing personality was a must, that marketing/business background was a definite plus as was being a long time AAPOR member and conference attendee. Linda next recommended that Nancy Whelchel be brought back to work on sponsorships.

Nancy welcomed the opportunity but wanted to make clear to AAPOR Council that she does not have a marketing background. Council felt her vast experience with AAPOR conference operations makes her a good fit for this important job. Next, Linda reminded the group that at the March Executive Council meeting they had approved Linda's choice of Dave DesRoches as the new associate chair of the conference operations committee. This now means she needs to find a new Social Coordinator, since Dave had been serving that role on the conference operations committee. Linda mentioned that she has two viable options but requested that Council members notify her if they are aware of anyone else who would like to be the Social Coordinator for the 2008 conference.

When asked if AAPOR will be creating a CD of the 2007 conference presentations, Patricia Moy concluded this committee report by noting that we will have online access to the presentations and program once the conference is over.

### **Education Committee Report: Mollyann Brodie (11:42-11:58am)**

Mollyann Brodie said that this year's conference sets the stage for where we need to be next year. The Short Courses are good and she is pleased with the short courses. The Cell Phone course is full. The Intro courses are lower, but they are in competition with the sessions.

Thanks to Adam Safir, AAPOR is going to be doing a course evaluation on-line after the conference. This will allow us to be able to have an institutional memory of the course evaluations. Folks who participated in the short courses are to receive their evaluations on the Monday after the conference. Some concerns were raised about sending out another survey in addition to the post-conference survey as well as concerns about waiting too long after the courses to do an evaluation and Tom Guterbock said that their experience had been that online evaluations did not work as well as the paper. These concerns were noted future evaluations.

Journalist education is going forward through a polling course that will be sponsored by the Poynter Institute and NewsU. There are formal steps in the Poynter Institute's process. The Institute constructs the courses based on substantive materials provided by AAPOR members and then the AAPOR advisory committee reviews them. We build the course in modules and we can work on the contacts for the future modules. We have a topic/module list. The first course is moving forward with a launch date of August 31. The list of modules:

- 1<sup>st</sup>: Understanding the Science and Methods of Polls (basic course)
- 2<sup>nd</sup>: Election Related Polling
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Writing and Interpreting Polling Results
- 4<sup>th</sup> Polling Issues to be Aware of (eg cell phones, push polls)

The course content is coming from AAPOR committee comprised of Rich Morin, Mollyann, Mike Traugott and soon Cliff Zukin. This committee gives the folks at Poynter/NewsU the content and then they put it into the system they have already set up

and then the committee reviews the final presentation to make sure it meets AAPOR standards.

Everyone on Council praised Mollyann and her committee on the progress since the March meeting.

Mollyann said that the Poynter Institute has two conferences that they had established. One will be in June in Iowa. AAPOR will not be formally participating in that one. However, we will be involved with a session in the Fall at Poynter. This will involve polling relating contacts for reporters and editors.

During the Education Committee's meeting on Saturday, we will start working on the multi-year core curriculum for the 2008 short courses. Mollyann will forward the topic list to the Executive Council when it is compiled.

Mollyann said that Karol Krotki should be thanked for his hard work on the Education Committee.

### **Communications Committee Chair's Report - Steve Everett:**

#### 1. Survey Practice Report: John Kennedy, Editor (12:30-12:50pm)

John Kennedy gave a status report and noted that Survey Practice was approved a year ago. Diane O'Rourke (methods), David Moore (public opinion) and Andy Peytchev (features) are working with John on this electronic publication. Survey Practice has a temporary website right now, but it will be part of the AAPOR website when it comes up. They have purchased surveypractice.org. John Kennedy said that the submissions have not been what he hoped. To date he has received about 10 or 12. Two research articles are ready to go. Unfortunately, there are no submissions on the public opinion side. David Moore is excited about recruiting articles for public opinion at the conference.

John Kennedy said that he would like to receive some feedback on the mixture they are aiming for: First, John said they would like to have a mix of public opinion and survey methods articles as well as analysis to help people do their research better. Second a mix of authors – 1 to 2 academics; 1 to 2 people emerging in the field. The goal is to show that this is not a Public Opinion Quarterly "lite," but that it is open to many people and aimed at the entire spectrum of the AAPOR membership. Finally, John Kennedy said that they are aiming mostly for non-technical articles. He does not want Survey Practice to be overly technical and easy for everyone to read. Make it open and accessible to everyone.

They want to have the first one out by the end of this summer and then have it come out quarterly with about 8 to 10 articles per edition. John said they want to have articles that have a shelf life longer than a newspaper article. Mark Schulman asked if there was going to be "how to" articles and John Kennedy replied not yet but thinking about an "ask the expert" column and recruiting Bob Groves.

John Kennedy asked what about the mix and the level? Is this what you are thinking about? Cliff Zukin said that this is exactly what we wanted and we will have to see what the first issues look like and what the reactions will be. John Kennedy should talk with Pat Lewis about content and they should work together. Mark Blumenthal should be included also.

John Kennedy said that anyone can submit an abstract and an outline. If you are a presenter at this conference then you have the basics for an article. Dick Kulka and Nancy Mathiowetz both raised that the methodological briefs being presented this year fit perfectly with the Survey Practice.

John said that he has received no guidance with regards to copyright issues. The current plan is to leave the copyright with the authors. However, AAPOR needs to make a formal decision on this. John also said that he needs money for a copy Editor and an Assistant Editor. John's budget would be put through the Communications Committee.

Next Council turned to Pat Lewis' report. Pat Lewis reported that she will work to market Survey Practice and believes that this is a great resource. Also, the AAPOR website is on target for a mid-July launch. Pat said that the new website design will be accessible and work well for us as well as to help AAPOR build a brand. Right now they are trying to identify the resources that are available and what documents need to be revised or eliminated. They also want to identify what the new resources are and who are we going to get them from, sister organizations, staff members, etc.

## 2. Communications Director Report – Pat Lewis (12:50pm)

Pat Lewis said that the new push poll statement, conference theme for New Orleans, and the rapid response team on elections will be good marketing opportunities. The question was asked as to if there is any way of tracking how our press releases are doing? Rob Daves will forward a proposal from one of those services who could do at a better price through search engines.

Pat Lewis said that if you see things you think we should be commenting on, let her know. Also, if you talk to reporters, follow up by sending Pat their contact information. This is the list we will send future press releases to.

## 3. Communications Committee Update– Steve Everett

Steve Everett reported that the main work of the Communications Chair has been the redesign of the website. He said that the AAPOR.org website looks the same. He still has some pages that need to be updated and he hopes to have this finished up at the end of July.

Regarding the AAPORNet list serv, Shap Wolf says something some day will change at Arizona State University that is the host for the website. He said that the tone is starting to change. Shap Wolf said that he can't vouch for it, but believes that ASU would give

AAPOR at least a six months notice before they would stop our list serv. However, we might be thinking about our alternatives right now. .

Steve Everett said that we all have the ability get an aapor.org e-mail address and that we should be able to change our [AAPOR-info@goamp.com](mailto:AAPOR-info@goamp.com) address now.

Mark Blumenthal said that the AAPOR Newsletter came out. Mark recommends that we do it as a web resource each time. However, he believes the newsletter could be a lot shorter and be replaced by regular updates on the website instead of being a semi-annual pdf on the website. There was some concern that we are removing a service from members and other council members thought the issue needed more thought. Mark Blumenthal will come back with a solid recommendation along the lines of some of the concerns on the newsletter.

### **Membership and Chapter Relations Chair's Report – Kat Draughon (1:12-2:08pm):**

Kat Draughon said that all of the AAPOR chapters are participating in the All Chapter Party. The New York chapter is totally incorporated and all the tax forms have been completed. PAPOR has their application in and the appropriate papers for the tax exemption are still being worked on. SAPOR, MAPOR and DCAAPOR are all incorporated and still working on tax forms.

Chase Harrison is working on the revitalization of the New England AAPOR Chapter. Kat gave the New England Chapter a list of members in their surrounding area and PAPOR also has asked for a similar list.

Kat Draughon said that the Executive Council provided funding to send the Membership Committee Chair to various AAPOR chapter conferences. Kat Draughon thinks that this funding should be kept in the budget so the Membership Chair can attend all the Chapter Seminars. Kat requested more money so that the Chair can go to more Chapter meetings in the fall. There was some discussion of the budget and Rob Daves stated that since we do zero-based budgeting, the Committees should put the money in the budget but he cautioned on Council voting on adding money during the year. Paul Beatty said that the Membership Committee has \$15,700 (up from \$7500) of which \$2,000 (up from \$0) is slated for travel

As of April 30, 1007, AAPOR's membership is at 1596. Last year the membership was at 1785 at the same time. Further, as of January 31 of this year, membership stood at 1233 compared to 1433 the prior January 31<sup>st</sup>. So, it appears that we have lost 200 members and if that is the case, we need to look into the matter. After the final numbers are known, we need to find out about these 200 members and we definitely need to move on the non-retainers survey.

After some discussion about what happened to the 200 members it was decided to wait to see what the numbers are after the conference and then do some analysis. Carl and Adam have been tasked with looking into this issue in more detail.



Kat Draughon said that she was in charge of the Docents Program this year and the docents will be matched with the new members. Kat said that if you see people with Disney characters on their name badge, please welcome them. They are excited about the program. Make the conference experience a positive one for them.

Turning to the membership and retention surveys that are being planned, Kat Draughon said that there will be pretests in July and a full test in October of the membership survey. There are a number of issues that need to be resolved: 1) the new AAPOR website needs to be up and running before we do the survey; 2) currently there are no firm offers on who would do the survey; and 3) getting the names from the database as well as the non-renewers. Nancy Mathiowetz stated that given her visit to AMP there is no concern about the database and that this information will be available in the June 1 dump of database into Excel.

It is proposed that we do a paper and/or a telephone follow up. The question is, how much do we want to spend and do we want to do a census or a survey.

Kat Draughon said that the 1996 membership survey is the baseline. Nancy Belden did a memberships survey a few years back, but it was web based.

Next, the concern about drop in membership was again raised. There was discussion on how AMP has gotten more serious in dropping people from the membership when they do not renew. Some people raised suggestions to look into whether there needs to be more snail mail reminders or moving the membership renewal date to be more in conjunction with the conference. This issue was raised at the March meeting and AMP has no problems with changing the date. Currently we are on a calendar year renewal basis. We may want to consider July 1 through June 30<sup>th</sup>. The Secretary/Treasurers need to look at how this might affect our accounting.

Given the drop in membership, it was discussed whether the retention survey or non-renewers should be prioritized. The question is, what should we focus on first, the members' survey or the retention survey. We have experienced a real drop in membership so we need to do more on retention. Should we put the money on the retention survey? We are interested with the survey, but should it be mail or telephone? Or web? A telephone survey would be expensive. How much do we want to spend on retention? We could always do a web survey and then do a follow up with the long lost members.

Carl Ramirez and Adam Safir were tasked with drafting proposal for the retention and membership surveys and a new timetable

Kat Draughon said that there has not been much done on the sister organizations outreach. Also, part of this will be transferred to Pat Lewis. Kat said that we should walk away from these joint membership plans, but we can swap booths, mailing lists, etc.

## **Standard's Committee Chair's Report – Tom Guterbock (2:08-2:45pm)**

Tom Guterbock said that there were no member comments to his solicitation for comments regarding the minor changes to the Standards procedures.

**RESOLVED to adopt the minor changes to the Standards procedures.** Motion made by Tom Guterbock and seconded by Nancy Mathiowetz. Motion Passed unanimously.

Charlotte Steeh said that John Loft of RTI is a new member of the Standards Committee.

Tom Guterbock said that he held a conference call on his proposal to look into message testing and wrote a prospectus. This initiative has now been funded and Larry Sabato is going to underwrite the cost of the research -- \$30,000 – not AAPOR but the UVa Center for Politics(with Tom as PI) will carry out the research with an advisory committee comprised of Mark Blumenthal, Scott Keeter, Charlotte Steeh and others.

The Standards Committee has developed a new draft of a new statement on Push Polls that went under major revisions after getting feedback from Scott Keeter, Mark Blumenthal, Nancy Belden and Pat Lewis. The new draft makes it clearer that these polls are not really surveys at all, and that distinguishes “political telemarketing under the guise of a survey” from legitimate message testing polls. This draft has been circulated to some practioners and Tom and Charlotte have received their feedback as well.

Although the draft is not ready for passage at this time, Tom Guterbock would like to go ahead on what they have seen and the task force will do another re-write. This is close enough that it could be put on the June Executive Council Agenda. The Push Poll statement is a serious policy document for AAPOR and should be considered for voting before we get too far into the 2008 elections. Tom asked that Council members get their feedback to him by June 1 and he and Charlotte would get revisions to Council by June 15.

Charlotte Steeh and been working on negotiations with CMOR regarding YOC – Your Opinion Counts. CMOR wants to put the YOC Logo on surveys. CMOR has joined the program and **they can be any standards that they want to be bound by. If a respondent thinks that they have feelings, YOC would direct the complaint.** [WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?] The Standards Committee came up with a list of issues that need to be worked out before they can support the program and the list is 14 issues long.

The Executive Council went into executive session while Tom Guterbock discussed specific Standards Cases. The Executive Session began at 2:30 p.m. and ended at 2:45 p.m.

### **Transition from the old to new Council:**

Rob Daves asked if there was any further old business to discuss. There being none, with small gift tiems, Rob thanked all of the associate chairs, all of the outgoing council

members, and welcomed in mass the incoming associate chairs. He gave the presidential gavel to Nancy M and then dismissed the outgoing Council members.

**RESOLVED to adjourn the Old Council.** Motion made by Nancy Mathiowetz and seconded by Paul Beatty. Motion passed unanimously.

Nancy Mathiowetz called the new Council to order at 3:00 p.m. PDST.

First, Nancy wanted to set the stage for the upcoming year and said the biggest challenge will be fiscal conservation while addressing the long-range plan. President Cliff Zukin had ideas that were adopted as part of the long range plan; Rob Daves put them in place; and now we need to think about funding new endeavors.

Look to places of revenue: *POQ* has \$75,000 in revenue and helps AAPOR stay in black which is very rare among professional organizations. We shouldn't just balance our books on *POQ*..

Moving forward, Nancy Mathiowetz said that in an effort to keep the costs of council meeting down and keep workload on a more even plane, she wanted to do a couple of things. First, she would like to return to the old meeting schedule and have the next time we physically meet in September. In the meantime, she would like to do monthly conference calls and limit them to two hours maximum. This way when we meet face-to-face, we can handle policy issues.

After discussion with the Executive Council members, the following dates were selected for Executive Council meeting. All meetings will be held in Washington, D. C.

September 6-7, 2007

November 1-2, 2007

January 17-18, 2008 (two-day meeting because of need to discuss nominees)

March 13-14, 2008

The Executive Council Conference calls will be held on the second Friday of the month at 11:00 a.m. EDT (10:00 a.m.CDT) and will be agenda based with a pre-circulation of all documents. If the chair of a committee can't make the conference call, then the associate chair should make the call. Nancy wants as much participation as possible. The calls will be in June, July, August, October, December, February and April. The goal is to spend more of the face-to-face time engaged in energetic discussion of important issues.

Nancy Mathiowetz said that we are going to try to do a document sharing program called SharePoint. One of the points of this concept is to post the documents on the SharePoint,

***POQ* Presentation – Peter Miller – *POQ* Editor (3:15-3:56pm):**

Peter Miller said there are four things of note regarding *POQ*: 1) that we have a fairly high submission rate this year. Currently we have about 160 manuscripts compared with 185 a year ago. We are down about 25 manuscripts. 2) We have a fairly high acceptance rate this year. Peter said that submissions to the special editions did not meet a lot of resistance and there were a number of articles from the previous year. 3) Also, the number of days to decision has gone down thanks to the help of the associate editors. 4) The subscriptions to the Journal have gone down by about 200 for institutions (2965 volume 70 while volume 69 was 3151). Some go into consortium arrangements. This is the same for every journal that OUP is working with. AAPOR is still charging half what our competitors charge.

Looking ahead Peter said there are three large issues: 1) Some things that AAPOR may want to consider is expanding the number of pages in *POQ* or go from four to six issues a year. Some of this may happen when they bring forth the proposal on methodological articles. Committee headed by Vince Price is looking into this issue. Peter Miller pointed out that this decision has implications for the replacement editor because if the Journal expands the new editor will need to deal with this; and it also has revenue implications. It is not the scenario that we will lose money. Probably make money because they will charge more. Libraries will have to pay more. AAPOR will not lose money whether you expand or stay the same.

2) Peter Miller said that his time as Editor of *POQ* will end in December 2008, and that the whole editor process will need to be thought through.

3) Contract with Oxford Press: It was suggested that we should ask Oxford University Press to draw up prices to see what they would look like under different page and volument scenarios. Peter said that \$50,000 is not enough for the editorialoffice, so when you negotiate, you should remember the editorial office. Right not Peter does not take any money and passes the money on to assistant editors. The money also covered a part-time person and her benefits. This person's time increased recently because of the electronic submission. So the \$50,000 is not enough, especially because the next editor may require some funding and have space issues. Oxford has said agreed to a higher payment for an editor, but Peter noted that most organizations subsidize their journals. Most associations do not use their journals to keep the association financially afloat like AAPOR does. Oxford University Press needs to know if we are going to continue our arrangement with them or not. This information must be furnished to them by December 31, 2007.

Peter Miller said that if AAPOR goes out to bid for publishing *POQ*, you open the possibility of changing the current format. You might go to a different system for submissions, review, etc. Experience has been that Oxford University Press has been very good on the side of the on-line system. Also if we go to other publishers they will look at *POQ* and say raise the price. It is ranked highly and is half the cost. Double the cost and you will reap large benefits. AAPOR has been reluctant to raise the price before because it would increase the cost to members.

Right now AAPOR has two sets of archives – JSTOR and an Oxford archives. AAPOR will reap a one-time royalty because Oxford University Press has sold access to its archives throughout the world. AAPOR would still have JSTOR. Peter Miller said that if you change things, do not change the on-line submission process (it's a 2 year timeline to understand it).

The *POQ* Advisory Board will solicit and bring forth names to the Executive Council for approval. The RFP should go out sometime in the Fall and it is hoped that we can bring a name to the Executive Council in the Spring with the goal of having a new Editor in place next summer (2008) and then take over on January 1, 2009.

Peter Miller said that it probably is not a good plan that the *POQ* contract expires at the same time that the *POQ* Editor is leaving. The Councilor-at-large needs to think about how issues in the new contract should look. Raising the price of *POQ* could be a possibility, but you would not want to double it. It is an unknown. Also, AAPOR should select an Editor who is well known and then promote like crazy. Also expand the pages of *POQ*.

Peter Miller said that the ISI rating on *POQ* has never been better. Peter had a meeting with Sage Publications and Sage proposed a big increase in money. So could use the threat of more money and of going with Sage as a bargaining point with Oxford. Dawn Nelson asked if there were any advantages signing up early with Oxford. Peter said Oxford was eager to nail down the contract. It was also pointed out that it would be harder for a new editor to do a switch.

Asked his opinion on the issue, Peter recommended sweetening the deal with Oxford and stay with them. In terms of adding pages, it is a mission call. Do you want to be known as the place for methods? This is a judgment call. What do you want our organization to be known for. Dawn Nelson asked his advice on raising the price. Peter said it has to go up. We may lose some people but focus on selecting an editor who is very known and can market it.

Nancy Mathiowetz thanked Peter Miller for his service as *POQ*'s Editor.

Nancy Mathiowetz talked with the Executive Council about the possibility of making a change in the membership year. Nancy said that the Secretary/Treasurer should think about this and the Membership Chair and the Secretary/Treasurer should make a recommendation as to whether we should or should not move the membership year. AAPOR has already changed its fiscal year. The recommendation should be made within the next two months. They should also consider the issue of multi-year payments. Nancy Mathiowetz said that AMP said they cannot do an automatic charge to a credit card each year, but they could do a multi-year membership.

Monica Evans Lombe did a demonstration on SharePoint technology for the Executive Council. After the conference, Monica Evans Lombe will enroll all of the Executive Council members in some standard feathers and then do a Webinar. Adam asked if use

of SharePoint could be expanded *POQ* to the Chapters, to which Monica replied that we have the license so we can extend to chapters if Council decides to do so. Nancy Mathiowetz noted that if we make this decision to expand to chapters, it will have impact on our AMP services contract (since they will have additional folks to serve).

Nancy asked if there was any new business that needed to be raised with the Executive Council. There was none.

**RESOLVED to adjourn the Executive Council.** Motion made by Dawn Nelson and seconded by Dick Kulka and Scott Keeter. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m. PDST

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn V. Nelson  
Secretary-Treasurer