



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

**Minutes of Meeting of Board of Directors
February 7, 2011**

- 1. Call to Order.** The meeting of the Board of Directors of California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc. (CAOWI) was called to order by President Amy Oppenheimer at 10:30 a.m. at the University Club at the University of Southern California, in Los Angeles, California. The following Directors were present in person: Amy Oppenheimer, Cynthia L. Remmers, James Cawood, Sue Ann Van Dermynen, Walter Cochran-Bond, Pamela Hemminger, Nancy Bornn, Barry Chersky, Mary Egan, Marilou F. Mirkovich, Debra L. Reilly, Jody Shipper, Vida Thomas, and John Lohse. Director Martha Wood participated by telephone. Also present in person was Stephen P. Angelides, Executive Director. Membership Committee member Prem Bajaj participated by telephone in the portion of the meeting regarding the JobTarget proposal.
- 2. Approval of Minutes of November 6, 2010 Board Meeting.** It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors of November 6, 2010 be approved. The motion carried.
- 3. Approval of Minutes of November 6, 2010 Annual Meeting of Members.** It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the Annual Meeting of Members of November 6, 2010 be approved. The motion carried.
- 4. Report of Board Decisions by Unanimous Consent Regarding Listserv Agreement.** The Executive Director, by memorandum to the Board of Directors dated February 1, 2011, reported that on December 6, 2010 the Board of Directors, by unanimous written consent without a meeting, made certain decisions regarding the Listserv Agreement, and adopted the Amended Listserv Agreement. By unanimous consent the Board decided that the Executive Director's memorandum, which includes the amended Listserv Agreement, would be included in these minutes. It is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 5. Ratification of Executive Committee Approval of Job Announcement for Assistant to the Executive Director.** The Executive Director reported that the Executive Committee, by unanimous written consent without a

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermynen, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood • Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

meeting, had approved the job description for the Assistant to the Executive Director position, attached hereto as Exhibit B. It was moved and seconded that the Board ratify the decision of the Executive Committee. The motion carried.

- 6. Ratification of Executive Committee Decisions Regarding 2011 Annual Conference.** As set forth in the Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting dated December 21, 2010, attached hereto as Exhibit C, the Executive Committee decided that the 2011 annual conference would be held at the Hilton Hotel in Glendale, California November 13-15, 2011, approved the proposed contract with the hotel, and authorized the Executive Director to execute the contract on behalf of CAOWI. The Executive Committee also decided that non-members would be charged \$150 more than members to register for the conference, which would also entitle them to complimentary membership. It was moved and seconded that the Board ratify the decisions of the Executive Committee regarding the 2011 annual conference. The motion carried.
- 7. President's Report.** President Amy Oppenheimer reported that additional Board member involvement was needed. In particular, she requested Board members to assist the Membership Committee, specifically in welcoming new members, in contacting members whose memberships are about to expire, and in encouraging members to participate in the Listservs. Several Directors volunteered to assist in these tasks. The President also reported that the agenda of this meeting includes a number of immediate issues on which specific policy decisions are needed, whereas the main topic of the May 20 meeting will be long range planning.
- 8. JobTarget Proposal.** Membership Committee member Prem Bajaj summarized for the Board the information in the memorandum she prepared regarding the proposal by JobTarget. The memorandum is attached hereto as Exhibit D. It was moved and seconded to request CAOWI's counsel and Membership Chair to negotiate the terms of the proposal with JobTarget, and that thereafter the proposed agreement will be presented to the Board for comment, and then to the Executive Committee for decision. The motion carried.
- 9. Executive Director's Report.** Executive Director Stephen P. Angelides reported that due to the press of his work for CAOWI, and also to save CAOWI some money, he had delayed announcing the job opening for the Assistant to the Executive Director position. He reported that after the webinars and seminars are launched, he will announce that position. He also requested, and the Board agreed by unanimous consent, that he could ask knowledgeable CAOWI members to advise and assist him regarding the implementation of social networking for CAOWI.

- 10.2010 Financial Report.** The Executive Director presented the 2010 Annual Financial report, attached hereto as Exhibit E.
- 11. January 2011 Financial Report and Budget Adjustments.** The Executive Director presented the preliminary January 2011 Financial Report and proposed budget adjustments, attached hereto as Exhibit F. He recommended approval of the proposed budget adjustments set forth therein. In addition, he orally recommended that \$750 be taken from the travel budget for Board Meeting Expenses. It was moved and seconded that the written and oral budget adjustments recommended by the Executive Director be approved. The motion carried.
- 12. Membership Statistics.** The Executive Director presented a report on membership statistics, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit G.
- 13. Nominations, Elections and Annual Meeting.** The Executive Director presented a memorandum containing recommendations regarding the 2011 nominations, elections, and annual meeting, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit H. He noted that recommendation number 15 sets up a framework within which any issue the Board decides to put to a membership vote can be decided by written ballot. It was moved and seconded to adopt recommendations 1-15 set forth in that memorandum. The motion carried.
- 14. Proposal for Co-Sponsorship of Mediation Society Conference.** It was moved and seconded that CAOWI co-sponsor the April 2011 Mediation Society Conference. The motion carried.
- 15. Co-Sponsorship of Future Conferences With No Cost.** It was moved and seconded that CAOWI co-sponsorship of future conferences with no cost was delegated to the Executive Committee. The motion carried.
- 16. Dissemination of Event Information.** It was moved and seconded that CAOWI will disseminate information about the events of other organizations only through the Off-Topic Listserv, and that CAOWI will not use its email or newsletter to disseminate information about events unless CAOWI is a sponsor or co-sponsor. The motion carried.
- 17. Local Circles.** The Executive Director distributed a memorandum listing the Local Circles of Colleagues, their conveners, and the number of members in each. A copy of the memorandum is attached as Exhibit I. There was discussion about how to increase participation in the local circles, but no action was taken on that issue. It was suggested that a monthly calendar showing all local circle meetings be distributed to all members, with links to the e-mail addresses of the conveners. The Membership Committee will obtain and provide the information regarding

domains wiassn.com, wiassn.org, and wiassn.net, and he did so during the meeting.

- 25. Certification.** The Certification Committee presented a report, attached hereto as Exhibit J. Due to lack of time, by unanimous consent, at the request of the Certification Committee, discussion of that report was postponed until the May 20, 2011 meeting.
- 26. Publications.** It was moved and seconded that an e-mail will be sent to all members including a link to the latest *CAOWI Quarterly*. The motion carried. The Board commended Debra L. Reilly, Chair of the Publications Committee and Editor of the *CAOWI Quarterly*, for the excellent quality of the publication.
- 27. Best Practices Committee.** Vida Thomas, Chair of the Best Practices Committee, reported that the committee is currently developing guiding principles for workplace investigations. It was moved and seconded to delegate to the Best Practices Committee the authority to change the name of the committee to reflect its current work. After discussion revealed that the consensus of the Board was that the current work of the Best Practices Committee is appropriate, the motion was withdrawn.
- 28. Legislation Committee.** Discussion of Legislation Committee issues was postponed until the May 20, 2011 meeting.
- 29. Strategic Planning Committee.** The Strategic Planning Committee is meeting February 23, 2011 to formulate recommendations regarding the May 20, 2011 Board meeting.
- 30. Upcoming Board Meetings.** The Long Range Planning Meeting will be held on May 20, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Oakland. There will be an optional dinner. Jim Cawood will make the arrangements for the meeting. The August 1, 2011 meeting will be held by telephone conference.
- 31. Adjournment.** There being no further business to come before the meeting, President Amy Oppenheimer adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Ann Van Dermeyden
Secretary



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

To: CAOWI Board of Directors
From: Steve Angelides, Executive Director
Re: Board Decisions By Unanimous Consent Regarding Listserv Agreement
Date: February 1, 2011

On December 6, 2010, the Board of Directors, by unanimous written consent without a meeting, made the following decisions regarding the Listserv Agreement, and adopted the amended Listserv Agreement as attached.

1. The Listserv Agreement shall be added to the membership application, so submission of a separate form is not necessary for new members.
2. Submission of the Listserv Agreement shall automatically trigger subscription to the On-Topic and Off-Topic Listservs, and to the Listservs of the Local Circle and any Committee in which the member is included. The member will have the option to subsequently opt-out of any or all of those Listservs. Paragraph 9 of the Listserv Agreement shall be modified accordingly.
3. Members who have already submitted the Listserv Agreement shall be informed of that modification by e-mail and informed that they have been automatically subscribed and of the procedure for unsubscribing should they choose to do so.
4. The revised Listserv Agreement shall be sent by e-mail to existing members who have not yet submitted the agreement and they shall be offered the opportunity to consent to the agreement by reply e-mail, rather than being required to login to submit the form.
5. The requirement that notice of potential conflicts of interest be given shall be eliminated. Accordingly the last sentence of unnumbered paragraph 8, which previously so required, shall be deleted.

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermeyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc. Participation Agreement for CAOWI Listservs

I understand that the execution of this Agreement is a prerequisite to my ability as a CAOWI member to participate in the CAOWI Listservs and that, by executing this Agreement, I am agreeing to abide by its terms.

I understand that the CAOWI Listservs are intended to create a closed forum to be used solely by a community of professionals with common concerns and to provide these professionals with a confidential means to seek guidance from each other. It is further understood that, to meet this purpose, the Listservs must be governed by rules that encourage a frank and free-flowing exchange of both facts and opinions. Finally, it is understood that this purpose cannot be achieved if participants must be concerned that another Listserv participant might cause their postings to be used in another context to adversely affect either the posting participant's interests or the interests of a person or entity being investigated.

Accordingly, I understand and agree that my participation in the CAOWI Listservs are conditioned upon my willingness to agree, and continuously respect, that all CAOWI Listserv participants have an expectation of privacy in their Listserv postings and that this expectation arises from the fact that all Listserv participants have agreed to comply with the following proscriptions:

--Listserv participants shall not cause a copy of a Listserv posting to be disseminated to any other person.

--Listserv participants shall not cause a posting or the contents of a posting to be attributed to its author except in discussions with other CAOWI Listserv participants, who are subject to this Agreement.

--Listserv participants shall not cause a posting or the contents of a posting to be used to impeach the credibility or competence of its author.

--Listserv participants shall not cause another Listserv participant's receipt of a posting to be used to impeach the credibility or competence of that participant.

These proscriptions do not apply to the following permissible disclosures of Listserv communications:

1. Disclosures to a participant's own legal counsel if necessary for the participant to receive legal advice or representation. It is expected that such disclosures will be maintained by the participant and participant's counsel as an attorney-client communication to the extent permitted by law.
2. Disclosures that are compelled by a subpoena or other legal process. A participant subject to legal process seeking disclosure of Listserv communications will promptly email the writer(s) of the subject Listserv communication to advise him/her that the communication has been subpoenaed. The writer(s) may then assert whatever privacy, privilege or other rights he/she/they may have to nondisclosure. CAOWI cannot assure any Listserv participant that his/her communication will be legally protected from disclosure.
3. Disclosures where a participant advises in his/her Listserv message that he/she is conducting a survey or asking a question of CAOWI members for the express purpose of disclosing the results to others, including by way of example only, as an expert witness on investigations, or as an attorney giving advice to a client.

A participant's disclosure of Listserv communications under one of these exceptions shall not constitute a waiver of the privacy rights of other Listserv participants.

I understand that adverse interests inevitably will arise among authorized Listserv participants. For example, multiple participants could be involved in a litigated matter as a party, as legal counsel for a party, as the investigator who conducted a workplace investigation, or as an expert witness opining about the adequacy of the workplace investigation.

I understand that the Protocol for the CAOWI members' use of the CAOWI Listservs, which has been adopted by the CAOWI Board, is as follows:

1. There are two Listservs open to all CAOWI members: an On-Topic Listserv; and an Off-Topic Listserv. The On-Topic Listserv is limited to communications regarding substantive issues that are related to workplace investigations. The Off-Topic Listserv is to be used for other matters that might be of general interest to CAOWI members.
2. There are additional Listservs open to sub-groups of CAOWI members, including but not limited to a Listserv for each CAOWI Local Circle of Colleagues, a Listserv for each CAOWI committee, and a Listserv for the CAOWI Board of Directors. These additional Listservs are limited to communications regarding substantive issues that are related to workplace investigations and communications regarding CAOWI business.
3. CAOWI members have the option of *initiating* an On-Topic dialogue with an anonymous posting. This option is available to address two potential problems: (a) the inevitable disclosure of the employer that is the subject of an inquiry when it is initiated by a CAOWI member who is an in-house professional; and (b) the possibility that other CAOWI members may have, either currently or in the future, interests adverse to the interests of the posting member. All other postings will identify the author, including all Off-Topic postings, all subsequent dialogue in response to anonymous initial On-Topic postings, and all postings to the additional Listservs for sub-groups of CAOWI members.

To make an anonymous initial posting, a member should send their proposed initial posting to listservadministrator@caowi.org. The e-mail will be routed solely to the Listserv Administrator, who is the only person with the authority and the ability to effectuate an anonymous posting. Before posting the communication, the Administrator will confirm the appropriateness of the communication under the rules governing the Listserv (e.g., that it is "on-topic" or that it does not include inappropriate language or personal attacks). If the proposed initial posting is deemed inappropriate, it will be returned to the sender with an explanation. The Administrator will have no authority to alter a proposed posting.

4. While CAOWI has established the Listservs as confidential forums, CAOWI cannot guarantee that there will not be a breach of confidentiality by a Listserv participant. Accordingly, CAOWI encourages participants to consider wording their postings in a manner that will avoid unnecessary disclosures of confidential information. As mentioned above, participants may consider initiating a dialogue on the On-Topic Listserv with an anonymous posting. Participants may also consider drafting their inquiries in a generic form that omits information which would tend either to identify the individuals or entities involved in the matter giving rise to the communication or to disclose sensitive information.
5. CAOWI members should not initiate any postings regarding non-CAOWI events, except on the Off-Topic Listserv. The Off-Topic Listserv is a moderated Listserv, which means that postings to that Listserv will be finalized by the Listserv Administrator. The Administrator will post the notice regarding the non-CAOWI event so long as the sponsoring organization provides CAOWI with reciprocal rights of publicity to its members or customers.
6. Communications through the Listservs should be understood to be the opinion of the member posting the communication, not legal or professional advice offered by CAOWI or the posting member.
7. As the Listserv publisher, CAOWI encourages thoughtful and cogent postings. Postings that become personal, resort to inappropriate language, or do not support the overall purpose of the CAOWI Listservs are prohibited and should not be posted.
8. The ability to participate in the CAOWI Listservs is not an unconditional right or benefit arising from CAOWI membership. Rather, participation in the Listservs is conditioned on (a) CAOWI membership; (b) submitting an executed copy of the CAOWI Listserv agreement on the CAOWI website; and (c) continued compliance with the terms of the CAOWI Listserv Participation Agreement and the CAOWI Listserv Protocol. CAOWI reserves the right to remove a member's privilege to participate in the Listservs for conduct that constitutes, in the sole discretion of the Listserv Administrator, a violation of the Agreement and/or the Listserv Protocol.

9. After submitting this executed agreement on the CAOWI website, you automatically will be subscribed to the On-Topic Listserv, the Off-Topic Listserv, the Listserv for your chosen Local Circle of Colleagues and the Listserv(s) of any CAOWI Committee(s) of which you are a member. Listserv participants who would like to be removed from any or all of those Listservs may do so by logging in to their profile page, clicking on the My E-Lists tab and/or the My Committees tab at the top of the profile page, and then unsubscribing from the listed Listserv(s).

10. Any Listserv participant who has a complaint or inquiry regarding a CAOWI Listserv or a posting on a Listserv should contact the CAOWI Listserv Administrator at listservadministrator@caowi.org.

I understand that if I am unable to comply with the terms of the CAOWI Listserv Protocol and/or any other proscriptions or terms of this Agreement, I should refrain from signing up as a Listserv participant or should remove myself as a Listserv participant. I also understand that a Listserv participant who violates a proscription set forth in the Protocol or the other terms of this Agreement may be barred from all future participation in the Listservs.

I understand that CAOWI cannot and does not guarantee the accuracy or appropriateness of the contents of Listserv postings or that Listserv participants will comply with the CAOWI Listserv Protocol and other terms of this Agreement. While CAOWI has a procedure for Listserv participants to make complaints related to the CAOWI Listservs, it is understood that except as specifically provided herein CAOWI will not be reviewing Listserv postings before they appear on the Listservs and will not be monitoring whether postings once made are in compliance with the Protocol or other terms of this Agreement. By executing this Agreement, I agree to assume all risks associated with the CAOWI Listservs, and I agree that I will not hold CAOWI, its officers, its directors or its employees responsible for any harm caused to me as a result of the contents of a Listserv posting, the disclosure of Listserv postings, or the failure of a CAOWI member to comply with the CAOWI Listserv protocol and/or the other provisions in this Agreement.

By selecting "Yes" and submitting this form, I agree to be bound by, and to comply with, the CAOWI Listserv Protocol and the other proscriptions and terms set forth in this Agreement. By selecting "No" I decline to participate in the CAOWI Listservs at this time.

 

[Submit](#)



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

Job Announcement for Assistant to the Executive Director

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc. (CAOWI), a non-profit professional association with over 250 members, is recruiting for an Assistant to the Executive Director. This is a part-time, non-exempt position, averaging no more than 20 hours per week. The wage is \$18 to \$20 per hour depending on qualifications. No benefits are provided. CAOWI is an at-will employer. Everyday work will be performed at a location of the employee's choice provided by the employee using a Windows or Apple computer with a web browser and broadband Internet access provided by the employee. For events including meetings, conferences, and educational activities, the work will be performed wherever in California the event is located. The employee must be available to travel within California to work at such events, to stay overnight, and to perform more than 20 hours of work per week before, during, and after such events. To apply e-mail your resume and cover letter to info@caowi.org. Applications will be accepted until the position is filled.

Job Duties

- Maintain, administer, support and troubleshoot CAOWI website, Listservs, and membership database using Memberclicks web application software.
- Bookkeeping using Quick Books Online web application software.
- Prepare and distribute e-mail newsletters and surveys, and maintain e-mail database, using Constant Contact web application.
- Conduct e-mail and telephone communications with members and others.
- Provide e-mail and telephone customer service and technical support for members, potential members, and sponsors.
- Prepare and edit documents using Microsoft Office and Nitro PDF Pro.
- Perform basic photo editing and assist in preparing and editing web videos using commonly available software and web applications.
- Prepare and follow up on continuing education credit applications.
- Perform copy editing of, and with graphic designer to create and publish, quarterly professional journal, advertising, and other collateral.
- Run live webinars using webinar web application software.
- Prepare, edit, and organize conference and registration materials.
- Organize and provide staff support for meetings, conferences and events.
- Manage social networking, i.e., Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook and YouTube.
- Assume duties of Executive Director in the event he or she is unavailable.
- Perform other duties as assigned and directed by the Executive Director, or, in the event the Executive Director is unavailable, the President.

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermeyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

Qualifications

Proficiency in, or a demonstrated ability to learn, the following skills:

- Website and database administration.
- Bookkeeping using Quick Books online version.
- Customer service and technical support.
- Technical or legal writing and editing.
- Microsoft Office suite, including Word, Excel, Outlook, and PowerPoint.
- Conference and event planning, preparation and support.
- Constant Contact e-mail marketing, surveys, and contact management.
- Social networking, including Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, and YouTube.
- Photo and video production and editing.
- Working with graphic designer preparing collateral.
- Working with the leadership and volunteers of a non-profit association.



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

**Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting
December 21, 2010**

The teleconference meeting of the Executive Committee was called to order by President Amy Oppenheimer on December 21, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. The following Officers were present: President Amy Oppenheimer, Secretary Sue Ann Van Dermeyden, Assistant Secretary Barry Chersky, Treasurer Walter Cochran-Bond, and Assistant Treasurer Marilou Mirkovich. Also present was Executive Director Stephen P. Angelides. Vice President Cynthia Remmers was not present.

Treasurer Walter Cochran-Bond reported that he and Director Nancy Bornn were recommending that the 2011 annual conference be held at the Glendale Hilton Hotel, and he explained the reasoning for this recommendation. Executive Director Steve Angelides briefed the committee on the key provisions of the proposed hotel contract and the financial analysis prepared by Secretary and Education Chair Sue Ann Van Dermeyden with his assistance.

After discussion, the committee decided by unanimous consent to approve the proposed hotel contract and to authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract on behalf of the corporation. The contract and the financial analysis are attached hereto.

The committee also decided by unanimous consent that non-members would be charged \$150 more than members to register for the conference, which would also entitle them to complimentary membership.

There being no further business to consider, President Oppenheimer adjourned the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Ann Van Dermeyden
Secretary

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermeyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood • Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood • Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

CAOWI
HOTEL COST PROPOSAL FOR ANNUAL CONFERENCE
NOVEMBER 13-15, 2011
GLENDALE HILTON

LOW ATTENDANCE SCENARIO	MIDDLE ATTENDANCE SCENARIO	HIGH ATTENDANCE SCENARIO
<u>Registrations & Expenses</u> Conference 100 @ \$160 F&B = 16,000 Pre-Conference 50 @ \$12.00 F&B = 600 Pre-Conference Dinner 40 @ 58.39 = 2,335.60 Box Lunch 40 @ 27.25 = 1,090 AV 4,000 Overhead 10,000 Total Expenses \$34,025.60	<u>Registrations & Expenses</u> Conference 150 @ 160 F&B = 24,000 Pre-Conference 75 @ 12.00 F&B = 900 Pre-Conference Dinner 60 @ 58.39 = 3503.40 Box Lunch 60 @ 27.25 = 1,635 AV 4,000 Overhead 10,000 Total Expenses \$44,038.40	<u>Registrations & Expenses</u> Conference 200 @ 160 F&B = 32,000 Pre-Conference 100 @ 12.00 F&B = 1200 Pre-Conference Dinner 80 @ 58.39 = 4,671.20 Box Lunch 80 @ 27.25 = 2,180 AV 4,000 Overhead 10,000 Total Expenses \$54,051.20
<u>Registration Revenue</u> Conference Regular 85 @ 295 = 25,075 Conference Sustaining 15 @ 147.5 = 2,212.50 Pre-Conference 50 @ 150 = 7,500 Pre-Conference Dinner 40 @ 50 = 2,000 Box Lunch 40 @ 25 = 1000 Total Registration Revenue 37,787.50	<u>Registration Revenue</u> Conference Regular 135 @ 295 = 39,825 Conference Sustaining 15 @ 147.5 = 2,212.50 Pre-Conference 75 @ 150 = 11,250 Pre-Conference Dinner 60 @ 50 = 3,000 Box Lunch 60 @ 25 = 1500 Total Registration Revenue 57,787.50	<u>Registration Revenue</u> Conference Regular 185 @ 295 = 54,575 Conference Sustaining 15 @ 147.5 = 2,212.50 Pre-Conference 100 @ 150 = 15,000 Pre-Conference Dinner 80 @ 50 = 4,000 Box Lunch 80 @ 25 = 2000 Total Registration Revenue 77,787.50
Projected Net Operating Income <u>\$3761.90</u>	Projected Net Operating Income <u>\$13,749.10</u>	Projected Net Operating Income <u>\$23,736.30</u>

2010 Annual Conference Registrations

Conference 175
Pre-Conference 88
Pre-Conference Dinner 68
Box Lunch 64
Non-Members 26
Sustaining Members 20

Assumes Room Block is met, totaling 94 room nights:

11/12/11	11/13/11	11/14/11	11/15/11
5	37	47	5

Notes:

1. Credit card processing fees substantially consumed late registration fees in 2010, and the late registration deadline may be later in 2011 so there may be fewer late registrations, so credit card processing fees and late registration fees are assumed to be a wash.
2. The additional charges for non-members (presumably \$120 based on the Board's other decisions in the 2011 budget) are not included in the conference registration fees because they will be allocated to membership dues.
3. Per-person F&B 2010 and 2011 assumed to be constant: Pre-Conference Break \$12.00; Lunch \$39.50; Monday Breakfast & Breaks \$43.00; Reception \$29.79; Tuesday Breakfast & Breaks \$25.67 (+\$10.00 to allows for extra as needed)
4. Expense calculations made conservatively, assuming no no-shows.
5. Overhead for 2011 is increased by \$3,500 over 2010 (\$10,000 compared to \$6,500) due to larger mailing to LACBA L&E Section than to BASF L&E Section and additional costs for staff lodging and travel.
6. AV for 2011 is increased by \$1000 over 2010 (\$4,000 compared to \$3,000). Internet \$300 @ 3 days = \$900; Main Room each day \$600 @ 3 days = \$1800; Lunch \$300; Breakout each day \$500 @ 2 days = \$1000; Total for conference with 2 breakouts \$4000
7. Pre-Conference Dinner and Box Lunch expenses are calculated conservatively, assuming those meals will be subsidized to keep prices reasonable. However, this is the worst case scenario and depending on the arrangements, such subsidies may not be necessary. Prices for these optional meals are based on 2011 menus attached to proposed 2011 contract.
8. Based on 2010 numbers, pre-conference attendance is assumed to be 50% of conference attendance, and Sunday Dinner and Box Lunch attendance is assumed to be 40% of conference attendance.
9. Sustaining member attendance is assumed to remain constant at 15 across all three scenarios, because we currently have only 19 sustaining members and so far we appear to be losing, not gaining, sustaining members.
10. Sponsorship income, budgeted by the Board to be \$12,000 for 2011, is not included above because it is not material to operations.



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

MEMORANDUM

To: CAOWI Board Members
From: Prem Bajaj, SPHR-CA (CAOWI Membership Committee)
Date: January 25, 2011
Subject: Introduction of Website Job Board Proposal by JobTarget

The following memorandum introduces JobTarget, an online job board operator who has presented a proposal to CAOWI. This memo also provides a quick overview on how job boards work and their potential benefits to CAOWI and its members.

What is a Job Board?

A Job Board is an online location that provides an up-to-date listing of current job vacancies in various industries. In our case, it would be job areas that would be of interest to existing CAOWI members and future CAOWI members. For example, the Society of Human Resource Management, SHRM, has a job board specifically geared toward its members and the specialty areas they tend to focus on. Applicants are able to apply for employment through the job board itself. Many job boards have a variety of additional services to help job seekers manage their careers and their ongoing job search processes.

How does it work?

The Job Board operator would create a link on our existing website with a tab leading to a webpage specifically designed for job seekers and hiring managers. On this new page, they would be able to see the latest job postings and have the ability to create such things as applicant profiles or employer accounts. The operator houses the data on their server. The operator would assist CAOWI in creating job teasers for the home page and coordinate search engine optimization that would direct new hits to our home page.

Revenues are generated through employers who post jobs on our board for a fee. The following provides an example of the revenue generation and fee splitting with the operator. If we start by charging employers \$ 75.00 for a 4-week job posting, the

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

operator would keep 30%, plus 3.5% of the \$75.00, approximately \$25.00, and CAOWI would receive the remaining \$50.

Why would CAOWI be interested?

As CAOWI is in its initial stages of growth, sustainability and membership is of a primary concern. A Job Board is a very useful tool not only as a member service but also as a source of potential revenue and for marketing the organization. Each hit on our website is a benefit to all parties involved in the transaction. As a new member service, we will be adding a new benefit in solidifying a network tool linking job applicants to employers. As a marketing tool, the job board will attract visits to our website through available jobs for those looking for work in this time of increased unemployment. As a potential source of revenue, it would aid in expanding the revenue source for funding CAOWI projects and initiatives in furthering its objectives. While CAOWI is still a small organization it is hoped that the job board can be used as a revenue tool but this cannot be guaranteed.

What resources or investment will be needed?

JobTarget states there are no set-up costs. CAOWI has been advised that set-up time is 2 to 3 hours; however, a 2 to 3 month wait exists, once CAOWI is on the list for set up. There may also be a resource investment of time by those members with talent in areas such as administration, website, membership, advertising techniques and human resource talent in the initial setup of this.

Who will administer it?

If JobTarget's proposal is accepted, and it is hired as CAOWI's job board operator, JobTarget will be responsible for administration of the job board. This would include facilitating of the server to house data, administer payment transactions, customer service, technical support and to coordinate search engine optimization. It is also recommended that a CAOWI individual be assigned as a point of contact on a permanent basis for the job board operator including a clear understanding of the level and scope of his/her responsibility and level of authority.

JobTarget References?

At CAOWI's request, JobTarget provided three customer references. CAOWI's Executive Director checked those references and provided the following information.

Women in Technology International: David Leighton stated Women in Technology International has used JobTarget for 5 years, and they have had no problems with JobTarget. He said they are great, provide bulk jobs, pay on time, provide all the customer service, and were able to integrate their members' passwords so the job

board is seamlessly integrated into their website. He believes the relationship has been beneficial because they previously had their own job board, but many larger employers wanted the integration. JobTarget has a great team internally. Women in Technology has not had any out-of-pocket expenses to JobTarget. The money has all gone from JobTarget to them.

California Special Districts Association: Travis Wills of the California Special Districts Association stated the Association has used JobTarget for 2 ½ years. It has not had any problems with JobTarget. No money has ever gone from them to JobTarget. The integration process with their website was efficient and streamlined. They asked JobTarget to do two pieces of custom development work, customizing certain things on the template and adding ads, and JobTarget did not charge them for either of those jobs. JobTarget was completely flexible on contract terms. In fact, the California Special Districts Association provided JobTarget with a contract in lieu of JobTarget's proposal and JobTarget accepted it with minimal negotiation.

International Facilities Management: Jeff Tafel of the International Facilities Management Association said the integration into their website was very easy. JobTarget does provide member validation for them, because they give members a discount on postings and members' resumes rise to the top in the resume section, but they have not synchronized usernames and passwords. International Facilities Management has not needed any custom development work because JobTarget does everything they have ever wanted it to do. Integration of JobTarget did not result in any glitches to their website or otherwise. International Facilities Management has used JobTarget for 6 years. They have never had any difficulties with JobTarget. The checks arrive like clockwork, and the checks have always been correct. JobTarget has been proactive in collecting any unpaid invoices, and JobTarget has been responsive to the needs of their members. JobTarget always did what they said they were going to do. They have never paid JobTarget anything.

They waited 1 year before signing up with JobTarget because JobTarget was a new company and they wanted to make sure it was going to be around for a while, and checked references on JobTarget before they signed up because it seemed too good to be true. Tafel is the past president of the Houston Society of Association Executives and many other associations in Houston use JobTarget because of his association's success with it, and he states they all like it.

It does take constantly reminding members of this feature to make it successful. They put ads in magazines about the job board, and constantly have to promote this feature to make it this successful. They have complete control of coupons and special offers. This enables them to give members discounts and have members' resumes rise to the top.



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

To: CAOWI Members
From: Walter Cochran-Bond, Treasurer
Date: January 31, 2011
Re: CAOWI 2010 Annual Financial Report

Pursuant to Section 10.6 of the Bylaws of the California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc. (CAOWI), you are hereby notified that you have the right to receive the CAOWI 2010 Annual Financial Report.

This memorandum and the accompanying CAOWI 2010 Balance Sheet, CAOWI 2010 Income Statement, and CAOWI 2010 Statement of Changes in Financial Position constitute the CAOWI 2010 Annual Financial Report. I hereby certify that those accompanying documents were prepared without audit from the books and records of CAOWI.

The names and addresses of current members of CAOWI are located at the office of CAOWI's Executive Director, Stephen P. Angelides, 29 Corliss Drive, Moraga, CA 94556.

In 2010, CAOWI engaged in no transactions which involved more than \$50,000, or aggregating more than \$50,000, with the same person, in which any director or officer of CAOWI or any holder of more than 10% of the voting power of CAOWI had a direct or indirect financial interest.

In 2010, CAOWI paid no loans, guaranties, indemnifications, or advances aggregating more than \$10,000 to any officer or director of CAOWI.

Thank you for your membership in CAOWI and for helping make CAOWI's first full year of operations a successful one. In the event you would like more detailed information regarding CAOWI's financial affairs, please feel free to contact CAOWI's Executive Director at the address, telephone number, or e-mail above.

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermeyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

CAOWI
Balance Sheet
As of December 31, 2010

	Total
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Bank Accounts	
Wells Fargo Checking	46,792.89
Total Bank Accounts	\$ 46,792.89
Accounts Receivable	
Accounts Receivable	0.00
Total Accounts Receivable	\$ 0.00
Other Current Assets	
Undeposited Funds	-150.00
Total Other Current Assets	-\$ 150.00
Total Current Assets	\$ 46,642.89
TOTAL ASSETS	\$ 46,642.89
LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	
Liabilities	
Total Liabilities	
Equity	
Unrestricted Net Assets	25,566.69
Net Income	21,076.20
Total Equity	\$ 46,642.89
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	\$ 46,642.89

Monday, Jan 31, 2011 12:58:17 PM GMT-8 - Cash Basis

CAOWI
Budget vs. Actuals: Budget - FY10 P&L
 January - December 2010

	Total			% of Budget
	Actual	Budget	\$ Over Budget	
Income				
Annual Conference Income				
Annual Conference Fees	55,052.50	34,500.00	20,552.50	159.57%
Annual Conference Sponsorships	8,000.00		8,000.00	
Total Annual Conference Income	\$ 63,052.50	\$ 34,500.00	\$ 28,552.50	182.76%
Membership Dues				
Membership Dues New Standard	28,300.00	31,250.00	-2,950.00	90.56%
Membership Dues New Sustaining	6,000.00		6,000.00	
Membership Dues Renewal Standard	7,200.00		7,200.00	
Membership Dues Renewal Sustaining	10,000.00		10,000.00	
Total Membership Dues	\$ 51,500.00	\$ 31,250.00	\$ 20,250.00	164.80%
Program Income				
Best Practices Roundtables	2,169.92	2,000.00	169.92	108.50%
HR Conference Sponsorships	12,900.00	12,000.00	900.00	107.50%
Total Program Income	\$ 15,069.92	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 1,069.92	107.64%
Total Income	\$ 129,622.42	\$ 79,750.00	\$ 49,872.42	162.54%
Gross Profit	\$ 129,622.42	\$ 79,750.00	\$ 49,872.42	162.54%
Expenses				
Advertising	14,060.26	17,000.00	-2,939.74	82.71%
Business Expenses				
Business Registration Fees	10.00		10.00	
Insurance - Liability, D and O	2,990.50	2,500.00	490.50	119.62%
Total Business Expenses	\$ 3,000.50	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 500.50	120.02%
Contract Services				
Outside Contract Services	3,600.00	3,600.00	0.00	100.00%
Total Contract Services	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 0.00	100.00%
Operations				
Accounting Online Service	31.96		31.96	
Bank Service Charges	110.00	250.00	-140.00	44.00%
Credit Card Processing Fees	4,160.76	2,500.00	1,660.76	166.43%
Postage, Mailing Service	1,138.84	1,200.00	-61.16	94.90%
Printing and Copying	4,706.89	5,000.00	-293.11	94.14%
Supplies	2,786.27	2,000.00	786.27	139.31%
Telephone, Telecommunications	997.78	650.00	347.78	153.50%
Website	3,429.05	2,750.00	679.05	124.69%
Total Operations	\$ 17,361.55	\$ 14,350.00	\$ 3,011.55	120.99%
Payroll Expenses				
Gross Payroll	29,000.00	24,000.00	5,000.00	120.83%
Payroll Service	674.10	1,500.00	-825.90	44.94%
Payroll Taxes	2,519.50	4,000.00	-1,480.50	62.99%
Workers' Compensation Insurance	603.00	1,300.00	-697.00	46.38%
Total Payroll Expenses	\$ 32,796.60	\$ 30,800.00	\$ 1,996.60	106.48%
Travel and Meetings				
Annual Conference	33,199.65	24,000.00	9,199.65	138.33%
Best Practices Roundtables	1,988.02	2,000.00	-11.98	99.40%
Travel	2,539.64	4,000.00	-1,460.36	63.49%
Total Travel and Meetings	\$ 37,727.31	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 7,727.31	125.76%
Total Expenses	\$ 108,546.22	\$ 98,250.00	\$ 10,296.22	110.48%
Net Operating Income	\$ 21,076.20	-\$ 18,500.00	\$ 39,576.20	-113.93%
Net Income	\$ 21,076.20	-\$ 18,500.00	\$ 39,576.20	-113.93%

CAOWI
Statement of Cash Flows
January - December 2010

	<u>Total</u>
OPERATING ACTIVITIES	
Net Income	21,511.20
Adjustments to reconcile Net Income to Net Cash provided by operations:	
Accounts Receivable	<u>-435.00</u>
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 21,076.20
Net cash increase for period	\$ 21,076.20
Cash at beginning of period	<u>25,566.69</u>
Cash at end of period	\$ 46,642.89

Monday, Jan 31, 2011 12:56:13 PM GMT-8



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

To: CAOWI Board of Directors
From: Steve Angelides, Executive Director
Date: January 31, 2011
Re: January 2011 Financial Report and Proposed Budget Adjustments

Attached are the preliminary balance sheet and profit and loss statement for January 2011. These documents are subject to change because they have not yet been reconciled with the January 2011 bank statement, which has not yet arrived.

I recommend that the Board make two sets of budget adjustments for 2011. The first set of budget adjustments is already reflected in the budget column included in the attached profit and loss statement:

- 1. Membership Dues Income Broken Down.** The Membership Dues Income is broken down between anticipated new members and anticipated renewals.
- 2. Full Day Seminar Income Combined.** The income from the two different full day seminars has been combined into one line item consistent with the combined budgeting for the expenses for those seminars.
- 3. Postage, Mailing Service Expense Included.** The Postage, Mailing Service Expense line item has been inserted into the budget, with a budgeted amount of \$1200, the same as budgeted in 2010. This line item was inadvertently omitted from the 2011 budget approved by the Board.

The second set of proposed budget adjustments is set forth in the Proposed Adjusted Budget column in the attached profit and loss statement:

- 4. Reduce Program Income.** The full day seminar income is reduced by \$2,400, the half day seminar income is reduced by \$1,200, and the webinar income is reduced by \$600, to eliminate double counting of membership dues income which is embedded in those program fees.
- 5. Increase Credit Card Processing Expense.** The credit card processing expense item is increased by \$1,500 based on more accurate year-end 2010 information.
- 6. Increase Website Expense.** The website expense is increased by \$600 because we will soon be in a higher pricing tier because we will have more than 300 profiles.

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermeyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

CAOWI
Balance Sheet
As of January 31, 2011

	<u>Total</u>
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Bank Accounts	
Wells Fargo Checking	48,340.45
Total Bank Accounts	<u>\$ 48,340.45</u>
Accounts Receivable	
Accounts Receivable	0.00
Total Accounts Receivable	<u>\$ 0.00</u>
Other Current Assets	
Undeposited Funds	0.00
Total Other Current Assets	<u>\$ 0.00</u>
Total Current Assets	<u>\$ 48,340.45</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	\$ 48,340.45
LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	
Liabilities	
Total Liabilities	
Equity	
Unrestricted Net Assets	46,642.89
Net Income	1,697.56
Total Equity	<u>\$ 48,340.45</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	\$ 48,340.45

Monday, Jan 31, 2011 06:56:37 PM GMT-8 - Cash Basis

CAOWI
Budget vs. Actuals: 2011 - FY11 P&L
 January 1, 2011 - January 31, 2011

	Total				% of Budget
	Actual	Budget	Proposed Adjusted Budget	\$ Over Budget	
Income					
Annual Conference Income					
Annual Conference Fees	385.00	53,288.00		-52,903.00	0.72%
Annual Conference Sponsorships		12,000.00		-12,000.00	0.00%
Total Annual Conference Income	\$ 385.00	\$ 65,288.00		-\$ 64,903.00	0.59%
Membership Dues					
Membership Dues New Standard	1,950.00	10,000.00		-8,050.00	19.50%
Membership Dues New Sustaining		5,000.00		-5,000.00	0.00%
Membership Dues Renewal Standard	2,250.00	20,000.00		-17,750.00	11.25%
Membership Dues Renewal Sustaining	1,000.00	10,000.00		-9,000.00	10.00%
Total Membership Dues	\$ 5,200.00	\$ 45,000.00		-\$ 39,800.00	11.56%
Program Income					
Full Day Seminars		21,000.00	18,600.00	-21,000.00	0.00%
Half Day Seminars		6,800.00	5,600.00	-6,800.00	0.00%
Webinars		18,200.00	17,600.00	-18,200.00	0.00%
Total Program Income	\$ 0.00	\$ 46,000.00		-\$ 46,000.00	0.00%
Total Income	\$ 5,585.00	\$ 156,288.00		-\$ 150,703.00	3.57%
Gross Profit	\$ 5,585.00	\$ 156,288.00		-\$ 150,703.00	3.57%
Expenses					
Advertising					
Advertising	80.00	5,000.00		-4,920.00	1.60%
Business Expenses					
Business Registration Fees		10.00		-10.00	0.00%
Insurance - Liability, D and O		3,500.00		-3,500.00	0.00%
Total Business Expenses	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,510.00		-\$ 3,510.00	0.00%
Operations					
Accounting Online Service	31.96	480.00		-448.04	6.66%
Bank Service Charges		250.00		-250.00	0.00%
Credit Card Processing Fees	198.96	3,500.00	5,000.00	-3,301.04	5.68%
Dues, Publications		500.00		-500.00	0.00%
Postage, Mailing Service	91.76	1,200.00		-1,108.24	7.65%
Printing and Copying	500.00	5,000.00		-4,500.00	10.00%
Supplies	270.93	2,000.00		-1,729.07	13.55%
Telephone, Telecommunications	40.03	650.00		-609.97	6.16%
Website	220.59	3,750.00	4,350.00	-3,529.41	5.88%
Total Operations	\$ 1,354.23	\$ 17,330.00		-\$ 15,975.77	7.81%
Payroll Expenses					
Payroll Service	31.20	780.00		-748.80	4.00%
Taxes	355.50	5,720.00		-5,364.50	6.22%
Wages	3,000.00	57,200.00		-54,200.00	5.24%
Workers' Compensation Insurance	250.00	2,600.00		-2,350.00	9.62%
Total Payroll Expenses	\$ 3,636.70	\$ 66,300.00		-\$ 62,663.30	5.49%
Travel and Meetings					
Annual Conference		40,000.00		-40,000.00	0.00%
Full Day Seminars	550.00	9,000.00		-8,450.00	6.11%
Half Day Seminars		3,900.00		-3,900.00	0.00%
Travel	0.60	2,000.00		-1,999.40	0.03%
Webinars	1,621.41	2,400.00		-778.59	67.56%
Total Travel and Meetings	\$ 2,172.01	\$ 57,300.00		-\$ 55,127.99	3.79%
Total Expenses	\$ 7,242.94	\$ 149,440.00		-\$ 142,197.06	4.85%
Net Operating Income	-\$ 1,657.94	\$ 6,848.00		-\$ 8,505.94	-24.21%
Net Income	-\$ 1,657.94	\$ 6,848.00		-\$ 8,505.94	-24.21%



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.

770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

To: Board of Directors
From: Steve Angelides, Executive Director
Date: January 27, 2011
Re: Membership Statistics

Current Voting Members

Active Standard Members	234
Active Annual Sustaining Members	15
<u>Active Lifetime Sustaining Members</u>	<u>5</u>
Sub-Total Active Members	254
<u>Inactive (expired but within 60 day grace period)</u>	<u>17</u>
Total Voting Members	271

Renewals

Deleted (60 day grace period ended)	17
<u>Inactive (expired but within 60 day grace period)</u>	<u>17</u>
Sub-Total Expired Members	34
<u>Renewed Members</u>	<u>75</u>
Total Expired & Renewed Members	109
Renewal Ratio 75 Renewed/109 Expired	69%

Replacements

New Members Since Conference	18
Replacement Ratio 18 New/34 Deleted & Expired	53%

Attrition

Renewals	.69
<u>Replacements .53 x .31</u>	<u>.16</u>
Total Renewals + Replacements	.85

Projections

234 Active Standard Members x .85 (Attrition)	199 (200 Budgeted)
15 Annual Sustaining Members x .85 (Attrition)	13 (15 Budgeted)
<u>5 Lifetime Sustaining Members (No Attrition)</u>	<u>5 (5 Budgeted)</u>
Total Projected Members	217 (220 Budgeted)

Categories of Current Active Members

Attorney	60%	Attorney & PI	3%	In-House	14%
PI	11%			Associate	12%

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

To: Board of Directors
From: Steve Angelides, Executive Director
Re: 2011 Nominations, Elections, and Annual Meetings
Date: January 31, 2011

The President has asked me to prepare this memorandum recommending the Board decisions for this year's nominations, elections, and annual meetings. Last year the Board decided to elect Directors by written ballot and not to solicit nominations for Director from all members. The President has asked that my memorandum recommend the election of Directors by written ballot, but that this year the solicitation of nominations for Director from all members be recommended.

The CAOWI Bylaws require the President to appoint a nominating committee to nominate qualified candidates for election as Directors, and a nominating committee to nominate qualified candidates for election as Officers. The President intends to appoint a nominating committee for Directors and Officers of three Directors with two year terms.

For your information, the current CAOWI Directors and the years in which their terms expire are as follows:

James S. Cawood	2011
Barry Chersky	2011
Pamela L. Hemminger	2011
Marilou Mirkovich	2011
Debra L. Reilly	2011
Cynthia Remmers	2011
Jody Shipper	2011
Martha Wood	2011
Nancy Bornn	2012
Walter Cochran-Bond	2012
Mary Egan	2012
John A. Lohse	2012
Amy Oppenheimer	2012
Vida L. Thomas	2012
Sue Ann Van Dermyden	2012

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

Accordingly , the following actions are recommended:

1. The President, at the February Board meeting, shall appoint a nominating committee for Directors and Officers consisting of three Directors whose terms expire in 2012, and that the President designate the Chair of the nominating committee.
2. The annual meeting of members shall take place on Tuesday afternoon, November 15, 2011, at the Hilton Hotel in Glendale, with the annual meeting of Directors taking place immediately thereafter.
3. Directors shall be elected by written ballot rather than at the annual meeting of members.
4. That the nominating committee shall:
 - a. Promptly communicate with the Directors whose terms expire in 2011 and ascertain whether they wish to stand for reelection.
 - b. Publish notices in the CAOWI Quarterly and in the CAOWInews requesting interested members to notify the Chair of the nominating committee of their potential interest in serving as Directors.
 - c. Select nominees for Director and Officer from among the Directors who wish to stand for reelection, the members who express interest, and/or other interested members.
 - d. Report the nominees for Director no later than the May Board meeting.
 - e. Report the nominees for Officers no later than the annual meeting of Directors.
5. The Executive Director, within a reasonable time after the May Board meeting, shall provide the nominees for Director a reasonable opportunity to submit a photograph and a statement of their qualifications and the reasons for their candidacy.
6. The record date for voting for Directors by written ballot pursuant to Section 3.9.A.3 of the Bylaws be the cutoff date established for early registration for the annual conference.
7. The Executive Director shall solicit electronic written ballots for Director from the members of record as of that date, as soon as reasonably practicable after that record date, in accordance with the process specified in the Bylaws.
8. The Executive Director shall make available to the members, at or before the time the electronic written ballots are solicited, any photographs and statements submitted by the candidates for Director.
9. Electronic written ballots must be electronically submitted to CAOWI by November 10, 2011 to be counted.
10. The Executive Director shall count the electronic written ballots and report the results of the election by written ballot no later than the annual meeting of members.

11. The record date for sending notice of the annual meeting of members pursuant to Section 3.9.A.1 of the Bylaws shall be the cutoff date for early registration for the annual conference.
12. The Executive Director shall send notice of the annual meeting of members to the members of record as of that record date as soon as reasonably practicable after that record date, in accordance with the process specified in the Bylaws.
13. The record date for voting at the annual meeting of members pursuant to Section 3.9.A.2 of the Bylaws shall be the day on which the meeting is held.
14. At the May Board meeting, the Board shall determine the agenda for the annual meeting of members.
15. At the May Board meeting, the Board shall determine whether any other matters in addition to the election of Directors shall be decided by written ballot preceding the annual meeting rather than at the annual meeting. In the event the Board determines that such other matters shall be decided by written ballot:
 - a. The Executive Director shall solicit position statements regarding any such matters at the time specified in numbered paragraph 5 above.
 - b. The record date for voting shall be the date specified in numbered paragraph 6 above.
 - c. The time and manner of solicitation of written ballots shall be as specified in numbered paragraph 7 above.
 - d. The position statements shall be made available at the time specified in numbered paragraph 8 above.
 - e. The time and manner of submission of written ballots shall be as specified in numbered paragraph 9 above,
 - f. The counting of ballots and reporting the results shall be as specified in numbered paragraph 10 above.



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
WORKPLACE INVESTIGATORS**

California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc.
770 L Street, Suite 950 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • Tel/Fax 916.760.2442 • info@caowi.org • www.caowi.org

To: Board of Directors
From: Steve Angelides, Executive Director
Date: January 28, 2011
Re: Local Circles

North

Contra Costa (Lynn Morgenroth)	10
Marin (Bobbi Lambert)	7
Oakland (Amy Oppenheimer)	35
Sacramento (Sue Ann Van Dermyden)	40
San Francisco (Allison West)	36
<u>Silicon Valley (Convener Vacant)</u>	<u>22</u>
Sub-Total North	150

Central

Central Coast (Kathryn Eppright)	8
<u>San Joaquin Valley (Brett Sutton)</u>	<u>8</u>
Sub-Total Central	16

South

Downtown LA (Jody Shipper)	21
Orange County (Kathie Allen)	14
San Diego (Debra L. Reilly)	8
San Fernando Valley (John Weiss)	12
San Gabriel Valley (Marilou Mirkovich)	16*
<u>West LA (Stefan Miller)</u>	<u>11</u>
Sub-Total South	82

Outside California 5

Total 253

*San Gabriel Valley currently includes 5 members located in the Inland Empire

Board of Directors

Amy Oppenheimer, *President* • Cynthia L. Remmers, *Vice President* • Sue Ann Van Dermyden, *Secretary* • Walter Cochran-Bond, *Treasurer* • Barry Chersky, *Assistant Secretary* • Marilou F. Mirkovich, *Assistant Treasurer* • Nancy Bornn • James S. Cawood
Mary Egan • Pamela L. Hemminger • John A. Lohse • Debra L. Reilly • Jody Shipper • Vida L. Thomas • Martha Wood
Stephen P. Angelides, *Executive Director*

To: CAOWI Board Members

From: Pamela L. Hemminger and Jody Shipper

Date: February 2, 2011

**CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE --
REPORT AND QUESTIONS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION**

The Certification Committee has looked into the issue whether CAOWI should offer a credentialing/certification program for workplace investigators. The Committee has examined the models of various organizations with certification programs. These programs include those offering licensure/certification in legal fields, private investigation, human resources and others. A chart describing the elements of selected sample certification programs is attached as Exhibit A.

It is readily apparent that many of these programs include experience and/or education and/or testing components, frequently all three (e.g. human resources certifications, private investigator license, legal specialization certification). Often the experience component varies in accordance with the amount and type of education. In some cases, the education component includes both generalized degree requirements as well as training in the area of specialization. Some organizations include additional components such as background checks and peer evaluations. There are a number of programs that are simply an educational course that results in a participant receiving a "certification" that the individual has completed the course, but carry no implication that the individual is otherwise qualified. These latter types of programs are not the type that are accredited by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (see next paragraph). For clarity's sake, in this report, the term "certification program" refers to the former type of program that can be accredited. The latter is referred to simply as a "course completion certification" program.

The Board Chair and others have emphasized that any CAOWI certification program should be accredited by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA), which was created in 1987 by the Institute for Credentialing Excellence (ICE) (formerly National Organization for Competency Assurance (NOCA)), a non-profit, 501(c)(3) organization dedicated to providing educational, networking and advocacy resources for the credentialing community. ICE "seeks to help ensure the health, welfare, and safety of the public through the accreditation of a variety of certification programs/organizations that assess professional competence. Certification programs that receive NCCA accreditation demonstrate compliance with the NCCA's *Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs*, which were the first standards for professional certification programs developed by the industry." The web page is <http://www.credentialingexcellence.org/Home/tabid/36/Default.aspx>.

A new certification program (one that has not previously received NCCA accreditation) may apply for accreditation either after one year of administration of the assessment instrument or when at least 500 candidates have been assessed with that instrument, whichever comes first. The application fee for non-member with no currently accredited program is \$2,025, and the yearly fee for organizations with up to two accredited programs is \$3,690/yr.

The vast majority of accredited programs are in the health care field. However, accreditation is not restricted to that field. For example, the certified financial planner and crane institute certifications have been accredited by NCCA. The SHRM certifications administered through the Human Resources Certification Institute have also been accredited by NCCA.

The accreditation process is rigorous, and a program must comply with “Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs” found at:

<http://www.credentialingexcellence.org/portals/0/STANDARDS%20-%20Updated%20January%202010.pdf>

. A copy of the Standards is attached as Exhibit B, since it is critical that the Board understand the very significant expenditure of time and money that is involved in complying with the Standards both in developing a program with acceptable assessment tools and complying with ongoing requirements. The requirements for assessment tools set forth in the Standards, however, while rigorous, do seem to be appropriately designed to ensure that the assessment tools actually measure the competencies that they purport to measure.

There are consultants that can be retained to assist with designing a program and applying for accreditation by the NCCA. For example, AMP (Applied Measurement Professionals, Inc.) (website: <http://www.goamp.com/testingServices.aspx?ToDiv=1>) advertises as follows:

“Complete Testing Solutions

AMP provides certification and licensure organizations with a full array of program management, test development and test delivery services.

AMP was created to provide high quality, secure testing services and we remain committed to that mission more than 25 years later. We combine vast industry knowledge, effective technology and high quality customer service to provide unique program management solutions. We can help with every aspect of your testing program, including feasibility study, job analysis, program design, candidate application, test development, test delivery and scoring and analysis. Psychometric staff are also available for consulting on projects ranging from NCCA accreditation to program review. Test delivery options include standardized paper/pencil administration, secure computer-based testing, mobile proctored delivery and anytime/anywhere web-based availability.”

Unless there are CAOWI members who possess the necessary skill sets and are willing to donate the substantial time involved, it is probable that CAOWI would need to retain an outside service if it wishes to pursue NCCA accreditation.

Questions / Considerations

- Do the benefits of a certification program outweigh the negatives? (Benefits and negatives will vary depending on the nature of the program and whether NCCA accreditation is sought.)

Benefits as articulated by some CAOWI members:

- Enhance credibility of profession since only qualified individuals will have certification,
- Enhance stature of certification holders which is important, e.g. when testifying,
- Enhance marketability of holders v. non-holders

Negatives as articulated by some CAOWI members:

- Difficult to identify what the competencies and requirements for certification should be, given the diverse group of investigators in CAOWI.
 - Significant expense and time commitment to develop and administer certification program, especially if NCCA accreditation is sought
 - May discourage membership in CAOWI by those who choose not to or are unable to qualify for certification (they may feel they have become “second-class” citizens).
 - Is it really necessary?
-
- Before identifying components of a certification program, the core competencies needed to be a workplace investigator need to be identified. This would likely be done in connection with Best Practices Committee. Until this is done, is it premature to discuss how to measure/achieve those competencies?
 - Who is qualified for Certification: Would we offer certificates to those not (currently) permitted under the law to conduct investigations? Is it our place to determine how certificates might be used?
 - Components to Consider:
 - **Testing:**
 - Are we deeming that certified individuals are TRAINED, or COMPETENT? If certification only refers to training, then testing is not necessary.
 - Would any individuals be able to waive testing requirement (i.e., based on some combination of membership in other organizations, education, years in the field, etc.)

- **Experience:**
 - Minimum number of investigations?
 1. How to verify?
 - Minimum amount of time working in the field?
 1. How to verify?
 - Should holders of private investigator license and/or attorneys and/or SHRM-certified human resource professionals be exempt from additional experience requirements? (If so, who is left for certification other than in-house human resource professionals without SHRM certifications, given the CA B&P Code requirements for investigators?)
 - QUESTION: Would verification be required?

- **Education:**
 - General education (e.g. private investigator license and/or attorneys and/or SHRM-certified human resource professionals)
 - Specialized education in the field?
 - If special educational requirements, how many hours, in what areas?

Decision Options

1. Testing or other assessment intended to determine individual is qualified?
2. If we are not (currently) going to pursue testing or other assessment, move ahead to consider development of a program that will lead to a “course completion certification”
3. Table certification program issue for the next year or two until finances etc. stabilize
4. Move ahead with certification program that can be NCCA accredited including (1) retaining expert consultant to assist with development and (2) identifying CAOWI members willing to devote the substantial time that will be needed
5. Move ahead with certification program without regard to NCCA accreditation and without retaining expert consultant (subject to strong criticism, even potential liability, if not developed in accordance with accepted standards for assessment development)

EXHIBIT A
CERTIFICATION MODELS

CERTIFICATION MODELS

	EXPERIENCE	EDUCATION	TESTING	OTHER
Private Investigator License	<p>3 years (2,000 hrs/yr) of compensated experience in investigative work; <i>or</i></p> <p>law or police science degree plus 2 years (4,000 hrs) of experience; <i>or</i></p> <p>AA degree in police science, criminal law, or justice and 2 ½ years (5,000 hrs) of experience</p> <p>Experience must be certified by employer and received while employed as sworn law enforcement officer, military police officer, insurance adjuster, employee of licensed PI or reposessor, or arson investigator for public fire suppression agency. (Work as process server, public records researcher, custodial attendant for a law enforcement agency, bailiff, agent who collects debts in writing or by telephone after the debtor has been located, or person who repossesses property after it has been located is not considered qualifying experience.)</p>	See experience column – specified education reduces experience requirement	Two-hour multiple-choice examination covering laws and regulations, terminology, civil and criminal liability, evidence handling, undercover investigations and surveillance.	Criminal background check No CLE
Human Resources Certifications (sponsored by SHRM and offered by The HR Certification Institute, an affiliate of SHRM)	<p><u>Professional in Human Resources (PHR)</u> – four years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience with less than a Bachelor’s degree; two years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience with a Bachelor’s degree; or one year of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience</p>	See experience column – specified education reduces experience requirement	A test for each certification. There is a California Certification exam which requires a PHR or SPHR certification as a prerequisite.	Recertification required every three years – through 60 CLE hours or retaking exam

	<p>with a Master’s degree or higher.</p> <p><u>Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR)</u> – seven years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience with less than a Bachelor’s degree; five years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience with a Bachelor’s degree; or four years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience with a Master’s degree or higher.</p> <p><u>Global Professional in Human Resources (GPHR)</u> – four years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience (with two of the four being global HR experience) with less than a Bachelor’s degree; three years of demonstrated exempt-level HR experience (with 2 of the 3 being global HR experience) with a Bachelor’s degree; or two years of demonstrated global exempt-level HR experience with a Master’s degree or higher.</p>			
<p>California State Bar Specialization</p> <p>(Offered in Admiralty and Maritime, Appellate (Civil or Criminal), Bankruptcy, Criminal, Estate Planning / Trusts/Probate, Family, Franchise and Distribution, Immigration, Legal Malpractice, Taxation, Workers’ Compensation.</p> <p>In order to be identified as a</p>	<p>Have been engaged in the practice of law in the area in which certification is sought for a minimum of 25 percent of the time the attorney has spent in occupational endeavors during each of the previous five years and Demonstrate a high level of experience in the specialty field by meeting specific task and experience requirements as listed in the Standards</p>	<p>45 hours CLE in specialty field</p>	<p>Written examination in specialty field</p>	<p>Be favorably evaluated by other attorneys and judges familiar with their work</p> <p>Recertification required every 5 years</p>

<p>"certified" specialist in California, an attorney must be certified either by State Bar of California Board of Legal Specialization or organization whose certification program has been accredited by State Bar . (Must have requirements for certification that are at least equal to those of State Bar of California's program.)</p>				
<p>EEOC Investigators</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>All new EEO investigators, including contract and collateral duty investigators, must have completed at least (32) hours of investigator training <u>before</u> conducting investigations. Part of the training covers the administrative processes of the EEOC, such as time frames for investigations and case management issues.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>8 hrs/yr CLE</p>
<p>Investigation Compliance and Enforcement Training Systems (ICETS Training - New Zealand) (For those involved in statutory compliance monitoring or investigation of statutory non-compliance.)</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Two week course with assessments, combining face to face and on-line learning. The website states that the course is accredited.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>HR Training Center: Internal Investigations Certificate Program.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Three day course. (receive 18 PHR/SPHR re-certification credit) Those who complete the course receive a "Certificate in</p>	<p>None</p>	

		Internal Investigations.”		
Certified Financial Planner	At least three years of qualifying full-time work experience are required for certification.	Degrees / professional credentials required. E.g. Certified Public Accountant (CPA), licensed attorney, Chartered Financial Analyst, Doctor of Business Administration, Chartered Financial Consultant, Ph.D. in business or economics, or Chartered Life Underwriter BA required	CFP® Certification Examination	Pass fitness standards
AFCE, Certified Fraud Investigators		BA required	Certification examinations	3 letters of recommendation from members in good standing
Society of Corporate Compliance and Ethics Officers (SCCE)	At least one year as full-time compliance officer or 1500 hours over two years.		Certification examination	

EXHIBIT B
STANDARDS FOR NCAA ACCREDITATION

National Commission for Certifying Agencies

Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs



Copyright © 2004. Institute for Credentialing Excellence. All Rights Reserved.

Approved February 2002.

Revised September 2004

Revised November 2006 (editorial only)

Revised December 2007 (editorial only)

Table of Contents

Preamble.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Structure and Development of the Standards.....	2
Standards.....	4
Purpose, Governance and Resources.....	4
Responsibilities to Stakeholders.....	7
Assessment Instruments	10
Recertification.....	18
Maintaining Accreditation	19
Glossary	20
Project Donors	25
2002 NCCA Commission	26
2002 ICE Board of Directors	27
Steering Committee.....	28
Task Force on Purpose, Governance and Resources	28
Task Force on Responsibilities to Stakeholders	29
Task Force on Assessment Instruments.....	29
Task Force on Recertification	29

Preamble

INTRODUCTION

The National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA) accredits certification programs complying with its Standards. The mission of NCCA is to help ensure the health, welfare, and safety of the public through the accreditation of certification programs that assess professional competence. The NCCA uses a peer review process to establish accreditation standards, to evaluate compliance with these standards, to recognize programs which demonstrate compliance, and to serve as a resource on quality certification. The purpose of NCCA accreditation is to provide the public and other stakeholders the means by which to identify certification programs that serve their competency assurance needs. NCCA Standards address the structure and governance of the certifying agency, the characteristics of the certification program, the information required to be available to applicants, certificants, and the public, and the recertification initiatives of the certifying agency. NCCA is a separately governed accreditation arm of the Institute for Credentialing Excellence (ICE – formerly the National Organization for Competency Assurance), a membership association of certification organizations providing technical and educational information concerning certification practices.

Since the Standards were first issued in the late 1970s, NCCA has observed fundamental changes in the nature, scope, and importance of certification. First, the certification community has expanded dramatically to include a broader variety of occupational and professional credentials offered by non-profit organizations, for-profit entities, governmental agencies, and industries. Second, it is increasingly common for a certification organization to offer multiple certification programs. Third, the certification community has expanded internationally. Fourth, the certification and testing communities have introduced the computer as a means of both developing items and new assessment formats, as well as administering assessments. This change has also led to the implementation of modern testing methodologies to capitalize on the power of the computer to score and scale the assessment instruments. Fifth, an increasing number of certification programs are recognized by state and provincial regulatory authorities, a practice that expands the traditional definition of certification.

In keeping with its service to the public and to various other stakeholders of professional certification, and in order to address fundamental changes in certification, NCCA undertook the review and revision of its accreditation standards. In 1997, NCCA established two Task Forces to address the feasibility of revising the accreditation Standards to address the changes described above and to ensure the currency of the Standards for the foreseeable future. The Task Forces were eventually combined at the end of 1997 to form a Steering Committee.

In August 1998, NCCA obtained approval from the ICE Board of Directors to conduct fundraising activities in support of the continued work of the Steering Committee. As an outcome of this effort, NCCA hired an independent project manager.

During 1999 and early 2000 the Steering Committee conducted activities through the formation of four Task Forces, each focusing on a different set of accreditation standards: (1) Purpose, Governance, and Resources (2) Responsibilities to Stakeholders (3) Assessment Mechanisms, and (4) Recertification. The Task Forces represented a cross section of currently accredited groups, testing services, and other professionals with expertise in certification.

Members of the Steering Committee and the Task Forces reported to NCCA in November, 1999, and to the ICE Board and Membership in December, 1999. A complete report of the Standards Revision Project was prepared and submitted to NCCA by the Steering Committee in March, 2000. After NCCA review and revision of the Steering Committee's report a draft of these documents was made available for public comment. Following numerous revisions and review periods throughout 2001 the draft Standards were presented to the organizations accredited by the NCCA for ratification in January, 2002. The Standards were approved in February, 2002.

In November of 2006, the Commission approved a revised definition of "Public Member." This was considered an editorial revision.

STRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE STANDARDS

The Standards focus on certification programs and are organized into five sections: (1) Purpose, Governance, and Resources, containing five Standards (2) Responsibilities to Stakeholders, containing four Standards (3) Assessment Instruments, containing nine Standards (4) Recertification, containing two Standards, and (5) Maintaining Accreditation, containing one Standard.

To earn or maintain accreditation by NCCA, the certification program must meet *all* Standards and provide evidence of compliance through the submission of required documentation.

The statements describing the Standards are numbered consecutively. Accompanying each Standard are ***Essential Elements***, which are directly related to the Standard and specify what a certification program must do to fulfill requirements of the Standard.

A second subsection under each Standard is called ***Commentary***. The Commentary section clarifies terms, provides examples of practice that help explain a Standard, or offers suggestions regarding evidence that must be documented to demonstrate compliance. NCCA reserves the right to revise the Essential Elements and the Commentary sections in response to changes in certification practice.

The development of the Standards was guided by the following assumptions:

1. A number of previous NCCA Standards, such as the requirement that the certifying agency be non-governmental, nonprofit, and national in scope, are restrictive. Further, by opening the accreditation process to include certification programs in for-profit organizations, NCCA more effectively achieves its public service mission.
2. The appropriate unit of accreditation is the certification program rather than the certifying organization. In fact, NCCA accreditation previously required that all certification programs offered by an agency meet all standards in order for the agency to achieve accreditation.
3. NCCA accreditation should be awarded for a period of five years for the initial program certification. If organizations or agencies apply for NCCA accreditation of additional programs following accreditation of the original program(s), any new programs will be accredited until the date the organization's initial accreditation expires. All of an organization's accredited programs will be eligible for renewal on the same the five-year renewal cycle.
4. Autonomy in the management and administration of certification protects certification programs from undue influence. Autonomy is required in order for certification programs to serve stakeholder interests, primarily those of consumers of professional services. However, since certification programs take different forms for different professions and occupations, a variety of structures may be effectively employed to prevent undue influence from competing interests.

5. The term stakeholder has been used to refer to candidates and the public, as well as to members of a profession, occupation, or regulatory body. The term denotes the primary interest of the public and other consumers of the certification program. The term also encompasses certificants and the entities offering certification, as well as educators, and employers. It is appropriate to acknowledge the legitimate influence of all stakeholder bodies.
6. The NCCA Standards pertaining to assessment instruments should be consistent with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999), as well as other standards and guidelines related to certification accreditation developed by specific professions, occupations, governmental agencies, and international organizations, or certification activity criteria more generally, such as (but not limited to) Principles of Fairness: An Examining Guide for Credentialing Boards (Council on Licensure Enforcement and Regulation and the National Organization for Competency Assurance, 1993) and the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, U.S. Department of Labor, and U.S. Department of Justice, 1978).
7. Recertification is valuable for all certification programs. Demonstrating continuing competence through a variety of recertification mechanisms is in the best interests of both the public and the discipline certified.

Standards

PURPOSE, GOVERNANCE, and RESOURCES

Standard 1

The purpose of the certification program is to conduct certification activities in a manner that upholds standards for competent practice in a profession, occupation, role, or skill.

Essential Element:

- A. It is the responsibility of the certification program applying for NCCA accreditation to identify the population being certified and to provide justification for the appropriateness of its certification activities. Typically, a certification program issues a credential or title to those certified. If the applying program does not, an explanation should be provided explaining why the issuance of a credential or title is not appropriate to the profession, occupation, role, or skill.

Commentary:

- A. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a mission statement, bylaws, articles of incorporation, a policy and procedures document, a governing committee charter, or candidate brochures.

Standard 2

The certification program must be structured and governed in ways that are appropriate for the profession, occupation, role, or skill, and that ensure autonomy in decision making over essential certification activities.

Essential Elements:

- A. The certifying program must show that the governance structure, policies, and procedures that have been established protect against undue influence that could compromise the integrity of the certification process.
- B. The governance structure, policies, and procedures must provide for autonomy in decision making regarding important aspects of the certification program such as eligibility standards; the development, administration, and scoring of the assessment instruments; selection of personnel; and operational processes.
- C. The development, administration, and scoring of assessment instruments must promote the purpose of the certification program.
- D. To avoid conflicts of interest between certification and education functions, the certification agency must not also be responsible for accreditation of educational or training programs or courses of study leading to the certification.

Commentary:

- A. The appropriate structure and governance of a certification program will reflect the interests of the general public in the credential. In traditional forms of professional or occupational certification, public interest requires direct protection of essential certification decisions from undue influence. Such protection is especially important when a certification program is sponsored by a professional membership association or proprietary entity. In these cases it is appropriate that the certification program's structure and governance protect the integrity of essential certification decisions.

When the certification program involves a proprietary product or service, the issue of undue influence is different. In these cases it is assumed that the proprietor has a clear and reasonable self-interest in preventing external or competing influences from diminishing the quality of the certification. It is recognized that the public is often not a direct consumer of the activities of the certified population. The public interest will be adequately protected when the needs of the proprietor, employers, or purchasers who rely on the credential provide significant direction over certification policy and decision making.

- B. Pressure to adjust certification standards either to limit the number of certificants or to reduce or elevate the established standard by changing requirements could interfere with the maintenance of standards established for a given certification.
- C. Certification programs may satisfy the requirement for autonomy of the governing body or governing committee in a number of ways. Incorporation of the certifying agency as an independent unit usually ensures autonomy. The bylaws of a parent organization may be constructed so that certification program governance and decision-making are defined as the responsibility of a specific unit of the organization with complete authority over all essential certification decisions. A governing committee may be given such authority in the policies and procedures and organizational chart of a corporation.
- D. In addition to not *accrediting* programs leading to the initial certification, the certification organization must not require that candidates complete that organization's program for certification eligibility. If a certification organization *provides* an educational program (including but not limited to primary education, exam preparation courses, study guides), the organization must not state or imply that: 1) this program is the only available route to certification; or 2) that purchase or completion of this program is required for initial certification.
- E. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a mission statement, bylaws, articles of incorporation, business plans, a policy and procedures document, a governing committee charter, or organizational charts.

Standard 3

The certification board or governing committee of the certification program must include individuals from the certified population, as well as voting representation from at least one consumer or public member. For entities offering more than one certification program, a system must be in place through which all certified populations are represented, with voting rights, on the certification board or governing committee.

Essential Elements:

- A. A system or structure must be established for ensuring appropriate stakeholder involvement by designating certain representative positions on the governing body. To ensure a balance of

program input, the governing body may implement a rotating system of representation over a set period of time.

- B. The certification program must establish bylaws and/or policies and procedures for the selection of individuals who serve on the board or governing committee. This information must show that the selection of these individuals prevents inappropriate influence from a parent or outside body.

Commentary:

- A. It is important that stakeholders (e.g., the public and other consumers, employers, regulators, and certificants) are represented on the body(ies) that sets policies regarding the certification program, including activities related to eligibility and the development, administration, and scoring of the assessment instrument.
- B. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a mission statement, bylaws, articles of incorporation, business plans, a policy and procedures document, a governing committee charter, or organizational charts.
- C. The public member is considered by NCCA to be a person who represents the direct and indirect users of certificants' skills/services. Because this may be defined very broadly, a rotating system for representation of various publics may be implemented over time. The public member may be a professional, but should not have similar credentials to the certificants. The public member should not be a member of a related profession or a profession that provides services that are complementary to certificants' services. The NCCA recommends, but does not require, that the public member has been or is a potential a consumer of the certificants' skills or services. It is also recommended that public members have experience with public advocacy.

The public member should not be:

- A current or previous member of the profession encompassed by the certification programs of the certification organization.
- A member of a related profession or a profession that provides complementary services to the certificants' services.
- An employer or an employee of individuals in the profession encompassed by the certification programs of the certification organization.
- An employee of an individual certified by the certification organization or of an employer of individuals in the profession encompassed by the certification programs of the certification organization.
- An employee of any certification organization.
- Currently deriving more than 5% of their total income from the profession encompassed by the certification programs of the certification organization.

The public member should not have:

- Derived in any of the five years preceding my appointment as a public member on the governing body more than 5% of their total income from the profession encompassed by the certification programs of the certification organization.
- Worked for or provided contract services to the certification organization at any time during the five years preceding my appointment as a public member on the governing body.

Standard 4

The certification program must have sufficient financial resources to conduct effective and thorough certification and recertification activities.

Essential Element:

- A. Financial reports of the certification program must demonstrate adequate resources available to support ongoing certification and recertification processes.

Commentary:

- A. The certification program should be able to document that monies used for the certification program are readily available.
- B. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met includes financial statements for the certification program.

Standard 5

The certification program must have sufficient staff, consultants, and other human resources to conduct effective certification and recertification activities.

Essential Elements:

- A. Key staff and non-staff consultants and professionals must possess adequate knowledge and skill to conduct certification program activities.
- B. The certification program must have adequate resources to conduct the activities (e.g., processing of applications, administering the assessment instrument, storage of records) of the certification program.

Commentary:

- A. Documentation of resource availability and activity occurrence does not mean that every certification program must have its own office or building; in some cases, all activities could be adequately handled with services from a testing company, consultants, or management service.
- B. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include resumes or curriculum vitae of key staff, non-staff consultants, and professionals, and associated organizational charts describing the inter-relationships among the individuals providing services to the certification program.

RESPONSIBILITIES to STAKEHOLDERS

Standard 6

A certification program must establish, publish, apply, and periodically review key certification policies and procedures concerning existing and prospective certificants such as those for determining eligibility criteria; applying for certification; administering assessment instruments; establishing performance domains, appeals, confidentiality, certification statistics, and discipline; and complying with applicable laws.

Essential Elements:

- A. Published documents that clearly define the certification responsibilities of the organization must include the following:

- The purpose of the certification program
 - Eligibility criteria and application policies and procedures
 - Materials outlining all examination processes and procedures
 - A detailed listing and/or outline of the performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills
 - A summary of certification activities (number of candidates examined, pass/fail statistics, and number of individuals currently certified) for each program
 - Discipline, nondiscrimination, and confidentiality policies and procedures
 - Appeals policies and procedures
- B. Confidentiality policies must (a) ensure that candidate application status and examination results are held confidential, and (b) delineate the circumstances under which this information may be disclosed or made public.
- C. Policies and procedures must be published and must include guidelines by which candidates may question eligibility determination, assessment instrument results, and certification status.
- D. Disciplinary policies must include procedures to address complaints that may concern conduct that is harmful to the public or inappropriate to the discipline (e.g., incompetence, unethical behavior, or physical/mental impairment affecting performance). These policies must ensure appropriate treatment of sensitive information and fair decision making.

Commentary:

- A. Publications concerning eligibility criteria, applications, assessment instruments, appeals, discipline, confidentiality, etc., are required to inform candidates and other stakeholders about program policies.
- B. Applicable laws and regulations include nondiscrimination, disabilities, and other issues which may affect fairness to candidates or protection for consumers.
- C. Procedures for requesting accommodations for disabled candidates should be stated clearly and published in an appropriate agency document. The process should include mechanisms that will ensure that proper evidence is submitted to the agency to assist the agency in making a determination regarding the requested accommodation.
- D. Any accommodation provided should be reasonable and not compromise the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments.
- E. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a policy and procedures manual, a candidate handbook, and any written documents or forms regarding procedures for obtaining approval for an accommodation.

Standard 7

The certification program must publish a description of the assessment instruments used to make certification decisions as well as the research methods used to ensure that the assessment instruments are valid.

Essential Element:

- A. Procedures related to assessment instruments must address development and validation, eligibility requirements, and administration (e.g., availability and location, fees, reporting of results).

Commentary:

- A. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a candidate handbook, brochures about the certification program, and other public documents.

Standard 8

The certification program must award certification only after the knowledge and/or skill of individual applicants has been evaluated and determined to be acceptable.

Essential Elements:

- A. If any current certificants (at the time the application for accreditation is made) were granted certification without having to meet the examination requirements established for certification, a rationale must be provided to explain how the competence of those individuals was evaluated and found to be sufficient. The period during which such test exemptions were granted must have been terminated before the certification program is eligible for accreditation.
- B. Once a program is accredited, “grandfathering,” or any other procedure for granting a credential in the absence of evaluating the knowledge and/or skill of an individual, is not acceptable.

Commentary:

- A. Grandfathering is generally seen as a conflict with stakeholder interests. It is used from time to time in licensure as a means of protecting the rights of individuals who entered a profession prior to its regulation and should not be excluded from the right to practice. Professional certification does not normally carry such potential to restrict the right to practice.
- B. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a policy and procedures document, a candidate handbook, brochures about the certification program, and other public documents.

Standard 9

The certification program must maintain a list of and provide verification of certified individuals.

Essential Element:

- A. The certification program must maintain a list of current and previous certificants.

Commentary:

- A. The certification program should provide and verify that a certificant possesses currently valid certification upon request from any member of the public. Policies governing verification should allow disclosure of whether or not the certificant is currently in good standing, without communicating other information which may violate the confidentiality rights of certificants or applicants.
- B. The certification program may discard information about previous certificants after a reasonable time period when such information is no longer valuable to the certification program’s stakeholders.
- C. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include a policy and procedures document, a candidate handbook, brochures about the certification program, directories in which certificant names are published, and other public documents.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Standard 10

The certification program must analyze, define, and publish performance domains and tasks related to the purpose of the credential, and the knowledge and/or skill associated with the performance domains and tasks, and use them to develop specifications for the assessment instruments.

Essential Elements:

- A. A job/practice analysis must be conducted leading to clearly delineated performance domains and tasks, associated knowledge and/or skills, and sets of content/item specifications to be used as the basis for developing each type of assessment instrument (e.g., multiple-choice, essay, oral examination).
- B. A report must be published that links the job/practice analysis to specifications for the assessment instruments.

Commentary:

- A. No single method exists to define performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills. Appropriate strategies include (a) committees of representative experts to define performance domains and tasks and associated knowledge and/or skills, including a review of related practice- or job-based information, or a review of the information from a previous study (b) rating scales (e.g., frequency and importance) to identify and select critical performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills (c) collection of job/practice information using logs, observations of practice, and/or interviews, or (d) review of proposed performance domains, tasks, associated knowledge and/or skills, and rating scales by an independent panel of experts.
- B. Validation of performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills is typically accomplished by conducting a survey of current certificants and/or individuals providing services or performing a job consistent with the purpose of the credential. It is important to sample widely within the profession, occupation, or role, or among those who use or support a product, to ensure representation in terms of major practice areas, job titles, work settings, geography, ethnic diversity, gender, and work experience. Stakeholders such as educators, supervisors, and employers may be included, as appropriate. An adequate sample size should be used to ensure that the estimated level of measurement error is defensible.
- C. Analysis of ratings information collected in the survey should determine how and to what degree the performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills relate to the purpose of the credential. Linkages to the content of the assessment instruments should be based on the use of ratings data. Empirical algorithms or other psychometric methods used to analyze or combine ratings from different scales should be specified. Analyses of demographic information collected from survey participants should also be examined to evaluate representativeness of the findings.
- D. A table of specifications should be prepared for each assessment instrument specifying the weighting of performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills to be included. The weighting system should be based primarily on data collected from survey participants, with informed review and interpretation provided by a panel of subject-matter experts. Decision rules used to eliminate performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills from the specification table should be explained. The specifications may also include instructions to the item writers to be used in developing assessment instruments.

- E. Because rapid changes may occur in knowledge and/or skills and in technology, it is important that certification programs periodically review performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills in the specifications to ensure that they are current. Since it is impossible to specify with precision how often the review should be conducted, each certification agency should develop its own timeframe and rationale. For existing certification programs, any changes between new specifications and previous specifications should be noted and explained.
- F. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met requires a complete report summarizing the results of the job/practice analysis, which may include:
- A description of the background and experience of subject-matter experts and professionals who participated in various phases of the job/practice analysis
 - Identification of the psychometric consultants or organization used to conduct the job/practice analysis or important phases of it
 - A description of methods used to delineate performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skills
 - A copy of the job analysis survey, including all instructions, rating scales, open-ended questions, and background demographic information collected from participants
 - A description of the survey's sampling plan and its rationale
 - Documentation of survey results, including return rate, analysis of ratings data, algorithms or other psychometric methods used to analyze or combine ratings data, and a rationale supporting representativeness of survey findings
 - A table of specifications for each assessment instrument specifying weighting of the performance domains, tasks, and associated knowledge and/or skill, along with any decision rules used to eliminate any of these elements from the table of specifications
 - Date of the study and description of a plan to update periodically the job/practice analysis
- G. The formal report of the job/practice analysis study to be provided to demonstrate compliance with this standard may be considered by the organization to be a confidential document, and therefore, the organization may decide to not make it widely available. However, in these cases, the organization must publish and make available a summary of the study or statement(s) describing the exam specifications development process for dissemination to prospective candidates and other interested members of the public.

Standard 11

The certification program must employ assessment instruments that are derived from the job/practice analysis and that are consistent with generally accepted psychometric principles.

Essential Elements:

- A. Assessment instruments, including assessment items, exhibits, instructions to examinees, scoring procedures, and training procedures for administration of assessments, must be products of an appropriately designed and documented development process.
- B. The content sampling plan for test items or other assessment components must correspond to content as delineated and specified in the job/practice analysis.
- C. An ongoing process must exist to ensure that linkage between the assessment instruments and the job/practice analysis is maintained, as assessment components are revised and replaced over time.

This linkage between assessment content and job/practice analysis must be documented and available for review by stakeholders.

- D. Certification programs must follow a valid development process that is appropriate for assessment instruments.
- E. A systematic plan must be created and implemented to minimize the impact of content error and bias on the assessment development process. Assessment content must be reviewed by qualified subject matter experts.

Commentary:

- A. Documentation for assessments should include a detailed description of the delivery format for each portion of the assessment and the type of response required of candidates. Developers should take reasonable steps to ensure that modes of presentation and response are justified by job relatedness. If the form of the assessment instrument is to be delivered on computer, the documentation of item selection rules or display features should be described. Certification programs should document how background and experience factors of the candidate population were considered in selecting item types or other assessment formats.
- B. Qualifications of subject matter experts, assessment development professionals, content reviewers, and others involved in assessment development should be appropriate to the content area tested and assessment procedures used and documented.
- C. Training provided to item writers, item reviewers, and others who produce assessment content should be structured, delivered, and documented in a professional and consistent manner.
- D. The development and assembly process for assessment instruments should be documented.
- E. The development process should include pilot testing of new items with a representative sample of the target population, with revision based on statistical analysis of results, where appropriate.
- F. Certification programs should document procedures used to examine the performance of items or other assessment components and describe the criteria used to identify components for revision or removal from the assessment.
- G. The size of the item pool must be sufficient to sample specifications for the assessment and to provide adequate item exposure control to safeguard the security and integrity of the item bank and test forms, particularly in relation to computer-based administration.
- H. Provision should be made for monitoring continued validity of each assessment item and assessment form during the period in which they are active.
- I. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include: specifications for the assessment instruments; training materials, agendas, and reports on item development; procedures for the development of assessment instruments; and technical reports.

Standard 12

The certification program must set the cut score consistent with the purpose of the credential and the established standard of competence for the profession, occupation, role, or skill.

Essential Elements:

- A. Cut scores must be set using information concerning the relationship between assessment performance and relevant criteria based on the standard of competence.

- B. A report must be published documenting the methods and procedures used to establish the standard of competence and set the cut score, along with the results of these procedures.

Commentary:

- A. No single method exists to set cut scores. Appropriate strategies include the use of judges or panelists who focus their attention on assessment content by rating each item or task, or who consider the candidates or their completed assessments.
- B. The raters in a cut score study must understand the purpose of the assessment, the standard of competence, and how to apply the cut score process that is to be used. Raters should have a sound basis for making required judgments. If data are available, estimates of the effects of setting the cut score at various points should be provided.
- C. The cut score study should be documented in sufficient detail to allow for replication, including full descriptions of the procedures followed, results, and how they should be interpreted.
- D. Suggested evidence to document that the standard has been met includes a report of the cut score study that addresses the following:
- Overview of the cut score process
 - Qualifications of those designing and implementing the process
 - Number of panelists, manner of selecting the panelists, and their qualifications
 - Material used
 - Data collection procedures
 - Descriptions or conceptualizations developed by the panelists
 - Data collection activities
 - Meeting agendas
 - Any adjustments made to the cut score by a governing body or policy group
- E. This formal cut score report may be considered confidential by the organization; however NCCA accreditation review requires that a formal report of the cut score be submitted with the application. In these cases, the organization must make available a summary of the study or statement regarding the study to prospective candidates and other interested stakeholders. The summary can be in journal articles, candidate bulletin, or other information accessible to candidates and stakeholders.

Standard 13

The certification program must document the psychometric procedures used to score, interpret, and report assessment results.

Essential Elements:

- A. The certification program must describe procedures for scoring, interpreting, and reporting assessment results.
- B. For responses scored by judgment, developers must document training materials and standards for training judges to an acceptable level of valid and reliable performance. Any prerequisite background or experience for selection of judges must also be specified.

- C. Candidates must be provided meaningful information on their performance on assessment instruments. Such information must enable failing candidates to benefit from the information and, if psychometrically defensible, understand their strengths and weaknesses as measured by the assessment instruments.
- D. Reports of aggregate assessment data in summarized form must be made available to stakeholders without violating confidentiality obligations.

Commentary:

- A. Certification programs are responsible for establishing quality control procedures that regularly monitor the precision of calculations used to compute assessment scores and their conversion to standardized, equated, or scaled scores, if performed.
- B. The certification program should publish an explanation of the appropriate uses and misuses of reported score information.
- C. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include descriptions of scoring procedures, training documents, quality control procedures, and sample score reports for passing and failing candidates.
- D. Evidence in support of essential element D should include documentation of aggregate assessment data to the various stakeholder groups on interest. For example, details of the aggregate assessment data might be appropriately reported to representatives of the program sponsor (e.g. a board or committee) and documented in the NCCA Accreditation application. In addition, however, some aggregate data must be available to the public and the certificant population, at a minimum addressing the number of candidates and the number of individuals attaining the certification credential during a specified period of time.

Standard 14

The certification program must ensure that reported scores are sufficiently reliable for the intended purposes of the assessment instruments.

Essential Element:

- A. Certification programs must provide information to indicate whether scores (including any subscores) are sufficiently reliable for their intended uses, including estimates of errors of measurement for the reported scores. Information must be provided about reliability or consistency of pass/fail decisions. When appropriate, information should be provided about the standard error of measurement or similar coefficients around the cut score.

Commentary:

- A. The level of reliability required for an assessment instrument depends on the type of assessment device and the purpose for which scores will be used.
- B. Different types of assessment instruments require different methods of estimating reliability. Reliability should be estimated using methods that are appropriate for characteristics of the assessment instruments and the intended uses of the scores.
- C. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include:
 - Methods used to assess reliability of scores (including subscores), and the rationale for using them
 - Characteristics of the population involved (e.g., demographic information, employment status)

- A reliability coefficient, an overall standard error of measurement, an index of classification consistency, an information function, or other methods for estimating the consistency of scores
- Standard errors of measurement or other measures of score consistency around the cut score
- Information about the speededness of performance on the assessment instruments
- Any procedures used for judgmental or automated scoring
- The level of agreement among judges

Standard 15

The certification program must demonstrate that different forms of an assessment instrument assess equivalent content and that candidates are not disadvantaged for taking a form of an assessment instrument that varies in difficulty from another form.

Essential Elements:

- A. Equating or other procedures used to ensure equivalence and fairness must be documented, including a rationale for the procedure used.
- B. When assessment instruments are translated or adapted across cultures, certification programs must describe the methods used in determining the adequacy of the translation or adaptation and demonstrate that information attained from adapted and source versions of the assessment instruments produce comparable test scores and inferences.

Commentary:

- A. Different ways exist to link assessment scores, ranging in rigor from strict equating models to judgmental methods.
- B. When certification programs use more than one mode of administration (e.g., paper/pencil and computer-based testing), it is important to document equivalence of score information and any score adjustment method used to achieve equivalence.
- C. A rationale should be provided for the reporting scales selected and methods used to determine score scales.
- D. The scales on which scores are reported should not encourage finer distinctions among candidates than can be supported by the precision of the assessment instruments. The scale values should be chosen in a manner that avoids confusion with other scales that are widely used by the same population of candidates.
- E. Raw scores should not be reported except under one or more of the following circumstances:
 - Only one form of the assessment instrument is to be offered
 - Scores on one form will not be compared with scores on another form
 - Raw or percentage scores on all forms are comparable, or
 - Raw or percentage scores are reported in a context that supports intended interpretations.
- F. When scaling scores, the stability of the score scale should be checked periodically. When indicated, steps should be taken to minimize score misinterpretations. If a change to the assessment instrument or to the composition of the candidate population alters the meaning of

scores, it may be appropriate to rescale the scores to minimize confusion between the old and new scores, or in the absence of rescaling, to ensure that the differences between the old and new scores are clearly communicated to candidates and to other stakeholders.

- G. Certification programs should, whenever possible, conduct pilot studies prior to implementation of the adapted version of the assessment instruments. Field study research should be part of a program of ongoing maintenance and improvement. Tryout and field studies should be part of a larger research program to ensure comparability and quality of cross-cultural information on the assessment instruments.
- H. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include:
- A description of the methods used to determine that different forms of an assessment instrument measure equivalent content and ensure that candidates are not disadvantaged for taking a form of the assessment instrument that varies in difficulty from another form
 - An equating and scaling report

Standard 16

The certification program must develop and adhere to appropriate, standardized, and secure procedures for the development and administration of the assessment instruments. The fact that such procedures are in force should be published.

Essential Element:

- A. Assessment instruments must be administered securely, using standardized procedures that have been specified by the certification program sponsor.

Commentary:

- A. Non-standardized administration procedures may adversely influence scores as well as the inferences drawn from these scores. When administration procedures deviate from the expected, such irregularities must be thoroughly documented.
- B. Chief examiners and proctors should be thoroughly trained in proper administration of the assessment instruments in an effort to minimize the influence of test administration on scores. Similarly, all candidates should have equal access to preparatory materials and instructions available from the sponsor.
- C. Certification programs are responsible for protecting the integrity of assessment information. This responsibility requires a security program that restricts access to assessment information to authorized personnel.
- D. Administration sites should offer similar conditions, such as adequate lighting, comfortable seating, and an environment free from noise and other distraction.
- E. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met may include:
- Candidate handbook or similar document
 - Chief examiner and/or proctor manual
 - Quality control policy and procedures documents
 - Security procedures manual

Standard 17

The certification program must establish and document policies and procedures for retaining all information and data required to provide evidence of validity and reliability of the assessment instruments.

Essential Element:

- A. Policies and procedures must ensure that items and forms of the assessment instruments are stored in a medium and method that emphasizes security, while being accessible to authorized personnel. Such policies must not only describe procedures for a secure system but also address actions required of personnel.

Commentary:

- A. Policies should establish a time period for retention of physical or electronic copies of forms of the assessment instruments and of reports and analyses related to the development process. The documents may be used in matters relating to challenges concerning scores, validity, or other essential issues. Documentation of the secure retention of assessment instruments and development information (e.g. cut score studies, technical reports) must be provided as part of the NCCA Application Accreditation. Note here how this information is securely maintained.
- B. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met should include policy and procedures documents.

Standard 18

The certification program must establish and apply policies and procedures for secure retention of assessment results and scores of all candidates.

Essential Element:

- A. Organizational policy must determine the length of time that assessment results will be retained.

Commentary:

- A. Organizational policy concerning the length of time that assessment results will be retained and score reports provided should be stated clearly in information provided to candidates.
- B. Certification program policy should prevent assessment results and other personal information from the candidate's file being provided to a third party without the candidate's documented permission. The policy should be stated in information provided to candidates.
- C. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met should include policy and procedures documents.

RECERTIFICATION

Standard 19

The certification program must require periodic recertification and establish, publish, apply, and periodically review policies and procedures for recertification.

Essential Elements:

- A. The published policy must contain a statement of the basis and purpose for recertification and all recertification requirements.
- B. The rationale for the recertification time interval must be included in the policy.
- C. Recertification policies and procedures in handbooks, guides, and/or electronic media must be published and made available to certificants and the public.

Commentary:

- A.. The goals of recertification can differ for different organizations. Examples might include: to assess core knowledge and skills; to assess knowledge and skills in specific areas of practice; to encourage continued professional development; to ensure maintenance of competence; to promote lifelong learning; etc. An organization's recertification policy should clearly state the purpose of recertification.
- B. An explanation of consequences for the certificant when recertification requirements are not met should be provided.
- C. In the case of a certification program involving a proprietary product or service, the proprietor may describe recertification on the basis of a systemic process of upgrading the product or service in connection with steps taken to withdraw technical support provided by the proprietor for the previous version of the product.
- D. Suggested evidence to document the Standard has been met should include renewal policy and procedure documents and a candidate handbook.

Standard 20

The certification program must demonstrate that its recertification requirements measure or enhance the continued competence of certificants.

Essential Element:

- A. If the purpose of recertification is to *measure* continued competence of certificants, then the certification program must substantiate the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments used to measure continued competence.
- B. If the purpose is to *enhance* continued competence of certificants, then the certification program must demonstrate how the policy contributes to professional development of the individual certificant.

Commentary:

- A. If an assessment method is used (e.g. self-assessment, third-party assessment, peer review, up to date version of the initial certification exam, portfolio), then the application and documentation must include an explanation of the validity and reliability of the assessment or process.
- B. If the enhancement method is used (e.g. continuing education, mentoring, clinical skills or practice improvement modules, institutional or web-based learning), then the application and

documentation must include the applicant's rationale for how the method(s) supports the professional development and enhances the competence of the certificant (e.g. how an enhancement method is related to an individual certificant's needs assessment; how the applicant evaluates the quality and relevance of the competency enhancement methods; whether the enhancement method includes a mechanism, such as a post-test, to assess whether certificant knowledge and/or practical skills have been enhanced.)

- C. Suggested evidence to document that the Standard has been met should include certification renewal policy and procedure documents and a candidate handbook.

MAINTAINING ACCREDITATION

Standard 21

The certification program must demonstrate continued compliance to maintain accreditation.

Essential Elements:

- A. The certification program must annually complete and submit information requested on the current status of the certification agency and its programs.
- B. The certification program must report any change in purpose, structure, or activities of the certification program.
- C. The certification program must report any substantive change in examination administration procedures.
- D. The certification program must report any major change in examination techniques or in the scope or objectives of the examination.
- E. The certification program must submit any information NCCA may require to investigate allegations of lack of compliance with NCCA Standards.

Glossary

Accommodation—

A reasonable modification in an assessment instrument or its administration made to compensate for the effects of a qualified disability without altering the purpose of the assessment instrument.

Accountability—

Responsibility of a certification board, governing committee, or other sponsor of a certification program to its stakeholders to demonstrate the efficacy and fairness of certification policies, procedures, and assessment instruments.

Accreditation—

1. **General use:** Approval of an educational program according to defined standards.
2. **As related to NCCA:** Status awarded to a certification program that has demonstrated compliance with the *Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs* set forth by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies.

Administrative Independence—

An organizational structure for the governance of a certification program that ensures control over all essential certification and recertification decisions without being subject to approval by or undue influence from any other body. See Autonomy.

Applicant—

An individual who declares interest in earning a credential offered by a certification program, usually through a request for information and the submission of materials. See Candidate.

Assessment Instruments—

Any one of several standardized methods for determining if candidates possess the necessary knowledge and/or skill related to the purpose of the certification.

Autonomy—

Control over all essential certification and recertification decisions without being subject to approval by or undue influence from any other body. Autonomy in the management and administration of certification enhances the ability of certification programs to serve stakeholder interests, primarily those of consumers of professional services. See Administrative Independence.

Bias—

IN THE CONTEXT OF SCORING: a systematic error in a score on an assessment instrument.

IN THE CONTEXT OF EXAMINATION FAIRNESS: may refer to the inappropriateness of content in the assessment instrument, either in terms of its irrelevance, overemphasis, or exclusion.

IN THE CONTEXT OF ELIGIBILITY AND RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS: may refer to the inappropriateness or irrelevance of requirements for certification or recertification if they are not reasonable prerequisites for competence in a profession, occupation, role, or skill. See Fairness.

Candidate—

An individual who has met the eligibility qualifications for, but has not yet earned, a credential awarded through a certification program. See Applicant.

Certificant—

An individual who has earned a credential awarded through a certification program.

Certification—

A process, often voluntary, by which individuals who have demonstrated the level of knowledge and skill required in the profession, occupation, role, or skill are identified to the public and other stakeholders.

Certification Agency—

The organizational or administrative unit that offers and/or operates a certification program.

Certification Board—

A group of individuals appointed or elected to govern one or more certification programs as well as the certification agency, and responsible for all certification decision making, including governance.

Certification Committee—

A group of individuals appointed or elected to recommend and implement policy related to certification program operation. (See governing committee)

Certification Program—

The standards, policies, procedures, assessment instruments, and related products and activities through which individuals are publicly identified as qualified in a profession, occupation, role, or skill.

Commentary—

Comments, remarks, and observations that clarify terms, provide examples of practice that help explain a standard, or offer suggestions regarding evidence that must be documented to demonstrate compliance.

Content Domains—

The set of organized categories characterizing subject matter under which knowledge and skills may be represented in specifications for assessment instruments.

Consumer—

See also “Public Member”

Continuing Competence—

The ability to provide service at specified levels of knowledge and skill, not only at the time of initial certification but throughout an individual’s professional career. See Recertification and Continuing Education.

Continuing Education—

Activities, often short courses, that certified professionals engage in to receive credit for the purpose of maintaining continuing competence and renewing certification. See Recertification and Continuing Competence.

Cut Score—

A specific score on an assessment instrument or instruments at or above which passing decisions are made and below which failing decisions are made.

Discipline—

A formal, published process for the enforcement of standards governing the professional behavior (i.e., ethics) of certificants.

Eligibility Requirements—

Published criteria, often benchmarks for education, training, and experience, with which applicants must demonstrate compliance in order to qualify for certification.

Equating—

A statistical process used to convert scores on two or more alternate forms of an assessment instrument to a common score for purposes of comparability and equivalence.

Essential Element—

A statement that is directly related to a Standard and specifies what a certification program must do to fulfill the requirement of the Standard.

Fairness—

The principle that all applicants and candidates will be treated in an equitable manner throughout the entire certification process. See Bias.

Grandfathering—

The process by which individuals are granted certification without being required to meet a formal examination requirement. This process is frequently invoked when a certification program is initiated, as a way of recognizing the experience and expertise of long-term experts, and/or to allow grandfathered individuals to develop the initial form(s) of the certification examination. Individuals initially certified through grandfathering may, in the future, be required to pass a form of the certification examination they did not participate in developing in order to maintain certification.

Governing Committee—

A group of individuals appointed or elected to formulate and implement policy related to certification program operation. The NCCA uses this term to denote those committees that are given complete authority over all essential certification decisions.

Incorporation Status—

Legal recognition granted by states to organizations; determines IRS classification as for-profit or nonprofit.

Item—

A general term referring to problems and/or questions that appear in assessment instruments and to which candidates must respond.

Item Bank—

The system by which test items are maintained, stored, and classified to facilitate item review, item development, and examination assembly.

Item Type or Format—

The structure of a problem or question in an assessment instrument (i.e., multiple choice, open-ended).

Job/Practice Analysis/Role Delineation Study—

Any of several methods used singly or in combination to identify the performance domains and associated tasks, knowledge, and/or skills relating to the purpose of the credential and providing the basis for validation.

Parent Organization—

The legal entity under which a certification program is established when the certification program is governed as part of a larger organization.

Performance Domains—

The set of organized categories characterizing a role or job under which tasks and associated knowledge and/or skills may be represented in the job/practice analysis.

Public Member—

A representative of the consumers of services provided by a defined certificant population, serving as a voting member on the governing body of a certification program, with all rights and privileges, including holding office and serving on committees. The public member should bring a perspective to the decision and policy making of the organization that is different from that of the certificants, and helps to balance the organization's role in protecting the public while advancing the interests of the profession.

(remove "consumer" from the glossary, as it has no definition)

Publish—

Make available in hardcopy, electronic, or web-based formats and easily accessible and available on request. The degree of accessibility may be a function of the level of confidentiality of the information.

Recertification—

Requirements and procedures established as part of a certification program that certificants must meet in order to ensure continuing competence and renew their certification. See Continuing Competence and Continuing Education.

Reliability—

The degree to which the scores on an assessment instrument are free of measurement error.

Role—

A more specific or narrower set of knowledge and skills than may be encompassed by the term *profession* or *occupation*, and may also be the focus of certification for a particular product or service to the public.

Self-Assessment—

A process by which an assessment instrument is self-administered for the specific purpose of providing performance feedback rather than a pass/fail decision.

Stakeholders—

The various groups with an interest in the quality, governance, and operation of a certification program, such as the public, certificants, candidates, employers, customers, clients, and third party payers.

Standard—

An accreditation requirement that must be met by a certification program submitting an application to the National Commission for Certifying Agencies.

Standardization—

IN THE CONTEXT OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS: ensuring that the process is conducted according to a specified plan in order to provide the same conditions for all candidates.

IN THE CONTEXT OF SCORING: ensuring that candidate responses are judged using predefined criteria in order to provide a consistent basis for evaluating all candidates.

Technical Report—

A summary of psychometric procedures and their results as implemented in the assessment instruments used in a certification program, often addressing such issues as content validity, item writing, test assembly, reliability analysis, cut score development, scoring, and equating.

Undue influence—

Control of decision making over essential certification policy and procedures by stakeholders or other groups outside the autonomous governance structure of a certification program.

Validity—

The degree to which accumulated evidence supports specific interpretations of all components of a certification program (e.g., education, experience, and assessment instruments).

Donors to the Standards Revision Project

ACT

American Association for Medical Transcription

American Association of Critical-Care Nurses
Certification Corporation

American Board for Certification in Orthotics
and Prosthetics, Inc.

American Chiropractic Board of Sports
Physicians

American Nurses Credentialing Center

American Podiatric Medical Specialties Board

American Registry of Diagnostic Medical
Sonographers

Applied Measurement Professionals, Inc.

Betty Burns, CAE

Board for Certification in Pedorthics

Board for Orthotist/Prosthetist Certification

Board of Certified Safety Professionals

CASTLE Worldwide (Columbia Assessment
Services)

Certification Board for Music Therapists, Inc.

Certification Board Perioperative Nursing

Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards

Certified Fund Raising Executive Professional
Certification Board

Certifying Board of Gastroenterology Nurses
and Associates, Inc.

The Chauncey Group International, Ltd.

Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor
Certification

Computer Adaptive Technologies, Inc.

Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists

Council on Professional Standards for
Kinesiotherapy

Dental Assisting National Board, Inc.

Hand Therapy Certification Commission, Inc.

Healthcare Quality Certification Board

Human Resources Research Organization

Institute of Certified Management Accountants,
Inc.

Joint Commission on Accreditation of
Healthcare Organizations

Joint Commission on Allied Health Personnel in
Ophthalmology

Knapp & Associates International, Inc.

Liaison Council on Certification for the Surgical
Technologist

National Association of Purchasing
Management

National Association of Forensic Counselors,
Inc.

National Athletic Trainer's Association Board of
Certification, Inc.

National Board for Certification in Occupational
Therapy, Inc.

National Board for Certified Counselors, Inc.

The National Board for Respiratory Care, Inc.

National Certification Board for Therapeutic
Massage and Bodywork

National Certification Commission for
Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine

National Council for Interior Design
Qualification

National Organization for Competency
Assurance

National Council on Qualifications for the
Lighting Professions

National Skill Standards Board

National Strength and Conditioning Association
Certification Commission

Oncology Nursing Certification Corporation

Pharmacy Technician Certification Board

Professional Examination Service

Prometric

Scott Sturzl, CPM

Shaw Pittman LLP

Water Quality Association

NCCA Commission at Completion of Standards Project

Chair

Karen Zaglaniczny, Ph.D., CRNA, Assistant Director, Education Program
Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists

Co-Chair

Cynthia Durley, M.Ed., MBA, Executive Director
Dental Assisting National Board

ICE Board Appointee

Linda Byrne, CMT, Senior Director of Certification
American Association for Medical Transcription

NCCA Appointee

Chuck Friedman, Ph.D., Assistant Vice President
ACT

NCCA Appointee

Lawrence J. Fabrey, Ph.D., Vice President, Measurement Research
Applied Measurement Professionals, Inc.

Non-Voting Appointee

James Hogan, Ph.D., Director, Professional and Occupational Programs
ACT, Inc.

Non-Voting Appointee

Vicki L. Flaherty, Ph.D., Measurement Consultant
IBM Learning Services, Measurement Consulting Services

Elected Commissioner

JoAnne Scott, MA, IBCLC, Executive Director
International Board of Lactation Consultant Examiners

Elected Commissioner

Jan Towers, Ph.D., NP-C, CRNP, Director Government Affairs Practice and Research
American Academy of Nurse Practitioners Certification Program

Public Member

Maralyn Turner, Ph.D.
Maralyn Turner and Associates

General Counsel

Philip O'Neill
Jacobsen Holman, PLLC

ICE Board of Directors at Completion of Standards Project

President

Lynn Beaton, RRT
Executive Director and Chair, Examination Committee
Canadian Board for Respiratory Care, Inc.

President-Elect

Gary Smith, Executive Director
National Board for Respiratory Care

Immediate-Past President

Dede Pahl, Chief Operating Officer
Certified Financial Planners Board of Standards, Inc.

Secretary/Treasurer

Cynthia Miller Murphy, RN, MSN, CAE, Executive Director
Oncology Nursing Certification Corporation

NCCA Chair

Karen Zaglaniczny, Ph.D., CRNA, Assistant Director, Education Program
Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists

Sustaining Member

Terry Kowalski, National Director for Certification Programs
Assessment Systems, Inc.

Elected Board Member

Susan Eubanks, NCC, NCSC, LPC, Associate Executive Director
National Board for Certified Counselors

Elected Board Member

Carolyn Lewis, Ph.D., RN, CNAA, Executive Director
UK Continuing Education Office

Elected Board Member

William Kersten, Senior Vice President, Operations
National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence

Ex Officio Member

Wade Delk, Executive Director
National Organization for Competency Assurance

Steering Committee

Project Co-chair, James P. Henderson, Ph.D., Columbia Assessment Services Testing and Learning Enterprises

Project Co-chair, I. Leon Smith, Ph.D., Professional Examination Service

William Anderson, PE, DEE, Council of Engineering and Scientific Specialty Boards

Susan Caulk, CRNA, MA, Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists

Katherine Church, Dietary Managers Association

Richard T. Cotton, MA, American Council on Exercise

Nadine Davis, MA, Liaison Council on Certification for the Surgical Technologist

Valarie French, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Steven Halsey, Halsey, Rains and Associates

James Hogan, Ph.D., ACT

Michael Martin, Commission for Certification in Geriatric Pharmacy

Dede Pahl, Certified Financial Planners Board of Standards, Inc.

Stephen Permison, MD, Division of Quality Assurance, Bureau of Health Professions, US Department of Health and Human Services

Gary Smith, National Board for Respiratory Care

Roy Swift, Ph.D., OTR, FAOTA, Swift Consulting

Jan Towers, Ph.D., NPC, CRNP, American Academy of Nurse Practitioners

Ted Twardowski, Safety and Occupational Health, OSHA - US Department of Labor

Richard Young, REM, PE, National Registry of Environmental Professionals

Project Manager, Larue D. Coats, Ph.D., Coats Knudsen & Associates

Task Force on Purpose, Governance, Resources

Chair, Nadine Davis, MA, Liaison Council on Certification for the Surgical Technologist

Linda Althouse, Ph.D., Education Division, SAS Institute

Susan Caulk, CRNA, MA, Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists

Katherine Church, Dietary Managers Association

Denise M. Fandel, MS, ATC, National Athletic Trainers Association Board of Certification

Kathleen Guerra, Education Division, SAS Institute

Michael Martin, Commission for Certification in Geriatric Pharmacy

Maria Potenza, Ph.D., Psychometrics and Test Technology, Certification and Skills Assessment, Microsoft Corporation

Jan Towers, Ph.D., NPC, CRNP, American Academy of Nurse Practitioners

Task Force on Responsibilities to Stakeholders

Chair, Valarie French, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Richard Cotton, MA, American Council on Exercise

Gary Smith, National Board for Respiratory Care

Ted Twardowski, Safety and Occupational Health Administration, US Department of Labor

Dennis Whitney, CMA, CFM, Institute of Certified Management Accountants

Task Force on Assessment Instruments

Chair, Roy Swift, PhD. OTR, FAOTA, Swift Consulting

Rose Mary Ammons, Ed.D., Professional Development Technologies Incorporated

William C. Anderson, PE, DEE, Council of Engineering and Scientific Specialty Boards

John Ford, Ph.D., Personnel Resources and Development Center, US Office of Personnel Management

Steven Halsey, Halsey, Rains, and Associates

William G. Harris, Ph.D., Association of Test Publishers

Stephen Koffler, Ed.D., The Chauncey Group International

I. Leon Smith, Ph.D., Professional Examination Service

Task Force on Recertification

Chair, Steve Permison, MD, Division of Quality Assurance, Bureau of Health Professions, US Department of Health and Human Services

James Hogan, Ph.D., Carl Vinson Institute of Government, The University of Georgia

Dede Pahl, Certified Financial Planners Board of Standards, Inc.

Richard Young, REM, PE, National Registry of Environmental Professionals

Karen Zaglaniczny, Ph.D., CRNA, Department of Anesthetists, William Beaumont Hospital

END OF DOCUMENT