

**National Association of Industrial Technology**  
**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Friday March 7, 2003**  
**Marriott Nashville – Nashville, Tennessee**



**Opening Remarks:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Niaz Latif at 1:05 pm.

**Present:** Niaz Latif (University Division Past President and Board Chair), William Brauer (University Division President and Vice-Chair), Earl Godt (CCTI Division President), Steven Freeman (Safety Division President), Charles Patrick (Research Division Past President), Lesta Burgess (Student Division Past President), John Wright, Jr. (Student Division President) Benjamin Lee (Graphic Communications Division President), Bruce DeRuntz (Industry Division President Elect), Tad Foster (Research Division President), Russell Johnson (Manufacturing Systems Division President), Tom Scott (EECT Division President), Rick Coscarelli (Executive Director, Ex Officio), and Dave Monforton (Associate Director, Recorder).

**Review and Approval of Minutes:** Board members were asked to review the minutes of the November 6 and 9, 2002 Executive Board meeting minutes and the November 9, 2002.

*Foster moved, seconded by Godt, that the minutes of the November 6 and 9, 2002 Executive Board meeting and the minutes of the November 9, 2002 Annual NAIT Business meeting be approved. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*

*Brauer moved, seconded by Patrick, that Bruce DeRuntz, President Elect of the Industry Division, be allowed to vote as proxy for Industry Division President Ron Meier, who was unable to attend the meeting. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**Review and Approval of Agenda:** Board members reviewed the meeting agenda. Coscarelli asked that the agenda be amended to include a Board of Accreditation update and Review of Bylaws under item 8, New Business.

*Patrick moved the approval of the meeting agenda with the requested amendments, seconded by Brauer. The motion was approved on a voice vote*

**National Office Reports:** Coscarelli reviewed all of the National Office reports contained in the Board notebook.

1. **Membership:** Coscarelli noted the cyclical nature of NAIT membership as displayed by graphs, and the need to look at overall trends as opposed to specific monthly totals.
2. **Certification:** Coscarelli noted the decline in total certifications. In response to a question, Monforton indicated that he did not believe that the total at June 30, 2003 will reach the total as of June 30, 2002. Staff also noted that total numbers do follow an annual cycle, related to peak application times, renewals and non-renewals. Board members pursued discussion on several issues related to certification, including the value of the program, the eligibility criteria, the breadth of the exam and its appropriateness for exit assessment, the congruence of the exam content with NAIT accreditation standards for Industrial Technology curriculum. The staff indicated that the Executive Board can

make recommendations to the Board of Certification and that the Primary Divisions have direct representation on the Board of Certification. The Board decided to consider a motion regarding certification issues, which will be drafted by Board members and presented for consideration at Saturday's meeting.

3. **Accreditation:** Coscarelli noted that there are now 70 NAIT-accredited programs and that he is projecting 79 after the Board of Accreditation acts on new applications in November 2003. Coscarelli noted that he would discuss other issues regarding the Board of Accreditation under New Business.
4. **Convention Sites:** Coscarelli deferred to Monforton who reported that he had sent RFPs to the four cities identified as preferred convention sites for 2005 and 2006 (Cleveland, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis), that he is reviewing the proposals and anticipates making site visits in March or April. He also indicated that he had received proposals from the Marriott and another facility in Panama City Beach for 2007, which may necessitate a site visit later this year to evaluate the new facility.
5. **Publications:** Coscarelli noted the upcoming deadlines for the IT Insider.
6. **Awards Reminder:** Coscarelli noted the various awards that can be presented by the association and the individual divisions. Monforton noted that of the Association Awards, Honorary membership is nominated by the Board and then voted on by the membership, while the Charles Keith Award and Al Rudisill Exemplary Service Award are named by the Executive Board Chair, usually after nominees have been suggested by the Board.
7. **2004 Convention Theme:** Coscarelli noted the need to determine a theme for the 2004 Convention; Monforton noted that a theme should be determined prior to the 2003 Convention as materials for the 2004 Convention are first distributed at the 2003 Convention. *It was suggested that the NAIT office solicit themes as they have done in the past, via listserv contact with the membership, and report back to the Chair and the Board for selection of a final theme. The staff indicated they would do so.*
8. **Divisional Strategic Plans – NAIT Office Issues:** Coscarelli noted his difficulty in making sense of strategic plan updates as submitted by the divisions and that he had not updated the website with new data.

**Proposed 2003-2004 Association Budget and Financial Issues:** Coscarelli noted that he would like to align the budget approval process along with the UCI/NAIT contract with NAIT's fiscal year so that we are eventually approving a proposed budget and the UCI/NAIT contract in the spring, prior to the start of the fiscal year. With that in mind, the Board book contain a Projected 2003-2004 Budget for the Board's consideration. He also noted that the staff had prepared a proposal for an increase in the membership fees for the Board's consideration. Coscarelli then reviewed financial materials contained in the Board book. He specifically called the Board's attention to the overall financial report, noting that NAIT Foundation funds should be viewed as a separate item than the remainder of NAIT funds, and that with NAIT needs to continue to improve its financial condition to build a sufficient reserve without reliance on Foundation funds. The Board members discussed the financial information and asked questions of staff; there was general agreement that NAIT should continue to build reserves.

*The Board directed Coscarelli to report back to the Board in November 2003 with a proposed reserve fund goal described as a percentage of annual NAIT expenses, with target dates for achieving the goal. Coscarelli indicated he would do so.*

Coscarelli reviewed the 2003-2004 Budget proposal in brief, noting net income and expense figures and directing the Board's attention to the Budget Assumptions report contained in the Board book. Some board members indicated that they would like to be able to compare the current and projected budgets prior to taking action. Some board members indicated that they were ready to approve the proposed budget, given the consistency of past budget projections with actual end of year income and expense figures. Coscarelli apologized for his oversight in not having the prior budget included for comparison purposes, and that staff could prepare the necessary document and post it to the Executive Board Only Page (EBOP) of the NAIT website. Coscarelli noted that the NAIT Foundation had established a good system for conducting an online email discussion and vote and that he could do that for Executive Board issues also, so that this issue could be resolved prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year in July 2003.

*Foster moved, seconded by Godt, that the NAIT staff prepare and post to the NAIT Website EBOP a 2003-2004 Budget Proposal that includes the 2002-2003 Budget figures, the proposed 2003-2004 budget figures and the percentage change in each account. There was no further discussion of the motion. The motion was approved on a voice vote with one nay vote.*

*Freeman moved, seconded by Brauer, that the Executive Board approve the proposed 2003-2004 budget as presented. There was no further discussion. The motion failed, with two members voting in favor, nine members voting against, and one member not voting.*

**Reports – Divisions:** The chair indicated that most divisions had submitted written reports, or were submitting them during the meeting, and that the oral report should only highlight division activities. Coscarelli indicated that the written division reports would be appended to the minutes of the Board meeting.

- 1. CCTI Division:** Godt noted that CCTI Division is sharing a booth with EPT in order to promote NAIT membership and accreditation at the spring ATEA Conference, and that David Devier is representing the CCTI Division.
- 2. Industry Division:** DeRuntz noted that the Industry Division had conducted a survey of its members primarily regarding convention participation and is receiving responses. He also noted that they were in communication with SME, ASQ and PMI regarding those organizations' certification programs and consideration of NAIT activities for CEU credit.
- 3. Student Division:** Wright noted that the new Robotics contest has been a successful and ongoing "Step 1" in recapturing student interest in NAIT involvement and convention participation. He also noted that they are still seeking regional directors in Regions 5 and 6, and have charged their directors with developing one new chapter in their region.
- 4. University Division:** Brauer deferred to his written report but did mention the idea of "model articulation agreements" or a national articulation model as a potential useful area of NAIT programming for the future.

5. **Graphic Communications Division:** Lee noted that the Division is making progress on arranging another “cutting edge” tour for the 2003 Convention.
6. **Manufacturing Systems Division:** Johnson deferred to his written report and raised concerns about divisional leadership voting at the convention, as there were concerns that those voting at the Manufacturing Systems Division meeting may not have been members of the Division.
7. **Research Division:** Foster deferred to his written report and had no further comments.
8. **Safety Division:** Freeman noted the membership problem in that the Safety Division has barely 50 members, and that the small number of members is inhibiting leadership development.
9. **Electronics, Energy and Computer Technology Division (EECT):** Scott highlighted the divisions plans for an industry-sponsored workshop by Parallax at the 2003 Convention, and a division survey project to ascertain a “core curriculum” of EECT classes in both EECT-focused Industrial Technology degree options and in general Industrial Technology programs. Tom feels that the new division is off to a good start with some vibrant member activity.
10. **NAIT Foundation:** Coscarelli briefly reviewed the NAIT Foundation plans as included in the Board book, calling particular attention to the “Named Endowment Program” and the “Deferred Pledge Agreement.”

#### **Old Business:**

1. **Outstanding Industrial Technologist Award – Guidelines and Funding:** DeRuntz reported that while long-range plans for funding are being developed that the Industry Division will limit the award to three individuals annually. The Division also wants to organize more effective recognition of the winners at the convention and to find ways to include them in convention activities. Other Board members suggested that the convention keynote speeches on Thursday and Friday may provide an opportunity for participation and recognition.
2. **JIT Ad Hoc Committee Report:** Patrick reported in the absence of Manufacturing Division Past President Fred Walker, chair of the JIT Ad Hoc Committee, who could not attend due to weather-related transportation difficulties. Patrick related the general thrust of the committee’s charge to make recommendations to improve the Journal of Industrial Technology. Patrick noted: that a small editorial board is being considered for initial vetting of papers submitted for review to determine their fit with the JIT, but that more work is needed to determine and adequately define the types of articles that should be included in the JIT; the committee recommends training sessions at the Convention for both reviewers and potential authors and that they will be scheduled for Saturday morning at the 2003 Convention; he reported on favorable contact with one indexing service, the H.W. Wilson Company, and that early indications are that the JIT will be accepted to their “applied science and technology” index in May of 2003 as the JIT appears to meet their criteria; JIT Editor Dave Monforton will update some of the website content to make it more clear that the JIT fits H.W. Wilson’s criteria; Monforton will again survey review board members to confirm their specialties, and determine their preferences for participating in “hard copy” and/or “electronic” reviews.

The chair indicated that the agenda would be continued at Saturday's conclusion of the NAIT Executive Board meeting.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm. Until 8 a.m. Saturday March 8, 2003.

-----

**National Association of Industrial Technology  
Executive Board Meeting  
Saturday March 8, 2003  
Marriott Nashville – Nashville, Tennessee**

**Opening Remarks:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Niaz Latif at 8:05 a.m.

**Present:** Niaz Latif (University Division Past President and Board Chair), William Brauer (University Division President and Vice-Chair), Earl Godt (CCTI Division President), Steven Freeman (Safety Division President), Charles Patrick (Research Division Past President), Lesta Burgess (Student Division Past President), John Wright, Jr. (Student Division President) Benjamin Lee (Graphic Communications Division President), Bruce DeRuntz (Industry Division President Elect), Tad Foster (Research Division President), Russell Johnson (Manufacturing Systems Division President), Tom Scott (EECT Division President), Rick Coscarelli (Executive Director, Ex Oficio), and Dave Monforton (Associate Director, Recorder).

**New Business:**

- 1. Board of Accreditation Issues:** Coscarelli reported on behalf of the Board of Accreditation. Current Board of Accreditation Chair, Dr. Jerry Parish, has confirmed that he has resigned his position due to conflicts with his new duties as an Assistant Dean at Texas A&M University – Commerce. Coscarelli explained NAIT policy in this situation, which provides for the Chair of the Standards and Accreditation Committee serving until a new Chair is appointed, and that NAIT would normally have elected a Chair-Elect to begin service in November and to succeed the Chair at the Fall 2004 Accreditation meetings. Dr. John Sutton, Co-Chair of the Standards and Accreditation Committee has indicated he is willing to serve as Chair for the November 2003 Accreditation hearings. Dr. James DeLaura, a member of the Board of Accreditation who meets the criteria for service as Chair of the Board of Accreditation, has agreed to accept the appointment as Chair-Elect.

*Board Chair Niaz Latif, pursuant to NAIT Bylaws, appointed Dr. John Sutton to serve the remainder of the term of Dr. Jerry Parish as Chair of the NAIT Board of Accreditation.*

*Godt, seconded by Lee, moved to appoint Dr. James DeLaura as Chair-Elect of the Board of Accreditation, to succeed Dr. Sutton as Chair for the 2004 NAIT Board of Accreditation Hearings. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*

The Board agreed to recognize Dr. Parish for his service to NAIT and the NAIT Board of Accreditation.

Coscarelli further reported that the Standards and Accreditation Committee (SAC) will be developing a specific policy regarding appointments to the SAC and for making personnel who qualify for service on the SAC aware that they are eligible to serve. Coscarelli also noted that the term of service of the current SAC ended in November 2002 without reappointment happening at that time and that the current SAC needs to have its term extended.

*Foster moved, seconded by Brauer, that the terms of office of the Standards and Accreditation Committee be extended through the November 2003 Board of Accreditation Hearings. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*

## **2. Convention Structure and Content:**

- Monforton reviewed the proposed 2003 Convention schedule, based on the room block at the Marriott Nashville, and taking into account regular meeting functions and the number of proposals submitted for each convention track. Monforton noted that the high number of proposals, over 230 rather than the usual 180, required him to designate a minimum rejection rate for each track. In keeping with recent preferences, he did not schedule breakout sessions for Saturday. There are only a few room slots available on Thursday or Friday, so planning additional events on Thursday or Friday in session rooms (i.e., panel discussions or longer breakouts) will require scheduling on Saturday or rejecting a higher percentage of proposals.
- DeRuntz mentioned the Industry Division's desire to have an Industry track at the convention, which is not yet scheduled for 2003. He reviewed the Industry member survey results (*see Industry Division report*) which indicated that Industry members may attend the convention if specific content is presented, that they would prefer speakers or workshop presenters from industry, and that there would be a preference for a central location; Industry members also indicated a preference for Industry-focused regional conferences. Coscarelli questioned whether the indicated preference for regional events calls into question the need for an industry-specific track at the convention. DeRuntz indicated that there is a basic question as to whether NAIT is solely academic in focus, or whether it can have more of an industry focus. Freeman stated that he does not see the need for an industry track, per se, as so many presentations in the different tracks do have an industry-focus or are presented with industry co-presenters already. Coscarelli questioned whether an industry track with current presentations would meet the Industry members' need given their preference for industry-based presenters or speakers. Latif noted that just the designation of sessions or workshops as focused on industry would have a positive impact, and that specific identification of sessions as such would help bring more industry members to the convention. DeRuntz mentioned that perhaps an "industry day" or morning or afternoon session on a particular day could be identified as "industry-focused" as a start to reorienting the convention to Industry members, with presentation scheduled for that morning being selected based on their relevance to Industry members.

*The Board reached consensus that the Friday morning sessions at the 2003 NAIT Convention shall be designated as "Industry" and that presentations in that period should be selected for their relevance to Industry members. An Ad Hoc Committee, with*

*DeRuntz as Chair, with Monforton's assistance, will determine which presentations will be scheduled for Friday morning. Special Division Presidents and Focus Group Chairs will participate in the Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee will also suggest how the 2004 Call for Presentations can be customized to solicit industry-focused proposals.*

- **Speaker Selection:** Coscarelli noted the Board's directions regarding speaker selection as decided at the November 2002 Board meeting. Monforton is to solicit suggestions from the membership, cull unrealistic suggestions, forward suggestions to the chair, the chair is to gather input from the Board members, and the chair will select top candidates to contact, and then make a final choice. It was suggested that we consider prior OIT winners as possible speakers, perhaps in a panel format on Friday if more than one is willing to speak. Johnson noted that a Friday general session with OIT participation would mesh nicely with the morning's industry-focused presentations.

*The Board reached consensus that the solicitation of speakers include the names of OIT winners so that members could suggest those that they believe would be appropriate general session keynote speakers. NAIT staff will include that information with email solicitations of speakers.*

- **Requests for One-Hour breakout presentations:** Monforton indicate that some proposals had requested a longer speaking time than that allowed by the agreed format of two presentations within a 50-minute block of time. Some are regular breakout presentations and some are panel discussions.

*Motion by Godt, seconded by DeRuntz, to allow Monforton to determine on a case-by-case basis whether to allow longer than the normal session time for a presentation, if there is industry participation in the presentation and if a longer time is requested. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*

- 3. Association Bylaws:** Coscarelli noted the NAIT staff's desire to review the NAIT Bylaws and report to the Board on recommended changes and additions.

*Motion by Godt, seconded by Foster, that the Executive Director report to the Board on recommended changes to the NAIT Bylaws at the November 2003 Executive Board meeting.*

- 4. Recommendations to the Boards of Accreditation and Certification:** Wright presented two written motions with recommendations to the Boards of Accreditation and Certification, with respect to core curriculum and its relation to the certification examination.

#### **Motion #1**

The Executive Board recommends that the Accreditation Board work to clarify and solidify the common core of the Industrial Technology Baccalaureate Programs via industry and peer institutional research.

The purpose of this motion above is two-fold:

- (1) To help define the Industrial Technology baccalaureate program.
- (2) To continue to allow technical option flexibility based on regional needs.

## **Motion #2**

The Executive Board recommends that the Certification Board focus its efforts on the certification exam development toward the validation of the results (common core) reported by the Accreditation Board. The Executive Board also recommends to the Certification Board that NAIT should eliminate the current practice of automatic certification via application upon graduation or impending graduation from accredited programs after an appropriate exam focused on the common core is developed.

*Motion by John Wright, Tad Foster, Steve Freeman and Bruce DeRuntz, seconded. Both motions were voted on separately. The motions were approved on a voice vote.*

**Click on the url link below to read motion rationale.**

<http://www.nait.org/ExecBoard/MotionRationale.pdf>

### **5. Other New Business:**

- DeRuntz mentioned possible nomination of Dr. James Orr as an Honorary Member of NAIT. Dr. Orr is retired from SIU, and served as Chair of the Executive Board and was a strong promoter of the NAIT Certification Program during his career. *Monforton will send an email to the Board members with some information about Dr. Orr for their further consideration.*
- DeRuntz mentioned idea of direct representation of the Boards of Accreditation and Certification on the Executive Board. Some discussion ensued. *Coscarelli will research the issue and report to the Board at the November 2003 Executive Board meeting.*

*There being no further business before the Board, the chair requested a motion to adjourn. Patrick moved, seconded by Foster, that the NAIT Executive Board meeting be adjourned. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**Adjournment:** The chair adjourned the meeting at 10:40 am.