

**National Association of Industrial Technology  
Executive Board Meeting  
Thursday February 24 and Friday February 25, 2005  
Sheraton Westport, St. Louis, Missouri**



**Thursday February 24, 2005**

**Present:** Ahmad Zargari (University Division Past President and Board Chair), Steven Hsiung (EECT Division President), Diane Dufek (Principal, UCI, Inc.), Earl Godt (Student Division President Elect), Kim Travers (CCTI Division President Elect), Frank Trocki (CCTI Division President), Haig Vahradian (Student Division Past President), Tom Spotts (Graphics Division President), William Grisé (President Research Division), Mandara Savage (Safety Division President), Wayne Jones (Safety Division President-Elect), Steve Devlin (Industry Division President), Mahyar Izadi (University Division President), Tom Scott (EECT Division Past President), W. Tad Foster (Research Division Past President), Gary Hoppes (Manufacturing Division President), Bruce DeRuntz (Industry Division Past President), Steven Freeman (Safety Division President), Rick Coscarelli (Executive Director, Ex Officio), and Dave Monforton (Associate Director, Recorder).

- 1) **Call to Order & Opening Remarks:** Chair Ahmad Zargari called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Dr. Izadi welcomed the members of the Executive Board and made some brief remarks. Those present introduced themselves.
- 2) **Approval of Proxy Votes:** *Spotts moved, seconded by Hoppes, to allow Earl Godt, Student Division President-Elect to cast proxy votes on behalf of Shawn Strong, Student Division President who was unable to attend, and to allow Kim Travers, CCTI Division President Elect to cast proxy votes on behalf of David Devier, CCTI Division President, who was unable to attend. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*
- 3) **Review and Approval of Agenda:** *Godt moved, seconded by Trocki, to approve the agenda. The motion was approved on a voice vote.*
- 4) **Review and Approval of Minutes:** The Board members reviewed the minutes of the February 2004 NAIT Executive Board meeting. *Godt moved approval of the minutes, seconded by Trocki. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*
- 5) **Ratification of Prior Electronic Votes:** Coscarelli noted that one electronic vote of the NAIT Executive Board was held since the November 2004 meeting. A motion to approve spending of NAIT funds for initial development, publication and distribution of two issues of the new publication, *The Technologist*, and to approve budget expenditures of up to \$11,000 for that purpose was approved by electronic vote. *Hoppes moved, seconded by Godt, that the motion and vote be ratified and recorded. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*
- 6) **Reports – National Office:** Executive Director Coscarelli
  - A) **Membership:** Coscarelli noted that reduced membership continues to be an issue , particularly in the Industry Division, as former students become Industry members upon

paying dues after graduation but often don't renew the following year when they are billed at the higher Professional member rate. (At January 31, 2004, NAIT had 1880 members, while at January 31, 2005, it had 1704 members. The divisional membership comparisons for professional members are as follows: CCTI, 1/31/04 – 146, 1/31/05 – 135; Industry, 1/31/04 – 403, 1/31/05 – 361, University, 1/31/04 – 519, 1/31/05 – 565. The Student Division had 678 members as of 1/31/04 and 616 members as of 1/31/05. Special Interest division membership remained above the minimum 50 members for each division and each special division gained members in the last year: EECT, 1/31/04 – 109, 1/31/05 – 120; Graphics, 1/31/04 – 71, 1/31/05 – 86; Manufacturing, 1/31/04 – 189, 1/31/05 – 236; Research. 1/31/04 – 97, 1/31/05 – 116; Safety, 1/31/04 – 49, 1/31/05 – 55.)

- B) Certification:** Coscarelli noted the change to the exam-only eligibility policy and that an end-of-2004 campaign to certify graduating students and faculty under the old policy did result in a net gain of certified members from 390 at 1/31/04 to 437 at 1/31/05. He also noted that the NAIT office would do various informational and marketing efforts over the next year to increase the number of certification exams taken and the number of individuals certified after passing the exam.
- C) Accreditation:** Coscarelli noted that with the conclusion of the 2004 Board of Accreditation hearings, NAIT again saw increased participation in NAIT's accreditation program. A total of 78 institutions have accredited programs, 51 baccalaureate and 27 associate, with 104 programs with 122 program options accredited at the baccalaureate level and 138 programs with 138 programs with 184 program options at the associate level. He noted that the NAIT office sees a pattern that NAIT members at accredited programs who move to a non-accredited program often take action to move toward NAIT accreditation at their new institution, and that failing to retain individual members in accredited programs can put the accreditation at risk due to lack of an internal advocate for NAIT Accreditation. Coscarelli also noted that accreditation income accounts for 49% of NAIT's income stream.
- D) Investment Accounts:** Coscarelli noted that the performance of the NAIT and NAIT Foundation investment accounts in 2004 was good, each realizing gains of about 12%. He noted that NAIT staff would make transfers from operating cash (checking) accounts in the spring before the end of they fiscal year.
- E) Reminders – Publications deadlines, Awards processes, Elections:** Monforton noted upcoming deadlines for the IT Insider, and the need to begin the awards and election nominations processes. He noted that there is updated information on the elections process on the NAIT website.
- F) Existing Open Elected & Appointed Positions:** Coscarelli noted that a few positions were open due to not being filled or resignations. Trocki and Travers reported that CCTI Division filled two openings, with Loren Niemeyer accepting the appointment as Region 2 Director and John Martini accepting the appointment as Region 4 Director. The Manufacturing Division will find a volunteer to be appointed President Elect due to the resignation of Peter Klein.
- G) Keynote Speaker Process:** Monforton outlined the process, which begins with input from members and ends with interviews of a selected number of potential speakers and final selection by the Board Chair.

- H) **2006 Convention Theme:** Monforton noted the process, beginning with input from members, and the board and a final selection by the Board Chair.
- I) **2004 Convention Report:** Coscarelli reported on the income and expense from the 2004 Convention, which resulted in a net of just over \$19,000.

7) **Reports – Divisions:**

- A) **University:** Izadi noted that the division's awards and elections process is moving forward.
  - B) **Industry:** Devlin reported that the division leadership wants to proceed with publishing *The Technologist* and that three workshops are being planned for Industry Day at the NAIT Convention.
  - C) **CCTI:** Trocki filed a written report, noting that the division is on target with meeting goals and that the election process is beginning. He also reported that the CCTI Division will send representatives to share a booth with EPT at the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Conference in April, and that they will use the event to promote NAIT accreditation.
  - D) **Student:** Vahradian reported on behalf of Shawn Strong, Division President. He noted that the division has again revised the Robotics Contest rules to further upgrade the competition and that IT/IQ content has also been updated and will be presented in a new electronic format.
  - E) **EECT:** Hsiung reported that the division is conducting a membership survey to get input on plans for the division, that an EECT listserv is being set up and that a convention workshop is being planned.
  - F) **Graphics:** Spotts reported that increasing membership is an ongoing task, that an online newsletter is underway, along with a project to produce a promotional brochure, and that an industry site tour is being arranged at Unigraphics for the 2005 Convention.
  - G) **Manufacturing:** Hoppes reported that the division's membership continues to increase, and that the division has begun discussions about establishing a NAIT Certification specific to manufacturing.
  - H) **Research:** Gris  reported that he had assembled volunteer reviewers for the convention proposals and Selected Papers processes, and that the division continues to discuss setting up a research service for senior faculty to assist junior faculty and grad students in preparing research papers for peer review.
  - I) **Safety:** Savage reported that membership did increase enough to allow the division to maintain its status. He also noted that the division is partnering with the Industry Division to provide a safety-related workshop for the Industry Day program at the 2005 Convention. Wayne Jones, President Elect, is working with ASSE members to see how NAIT and ASSE might cooperate.
- 8) **UCI/NAIT Contract Review:** Coscarelli noted Diane Dufek's role as principal of UCI, NAIT's management firm, and that with the retirement of Al Rudisill, who was NAIT's Executive Director and a UCI principal, that Zargari suggested that Ms. Dufek attend the meeting. Dufek provided short review of the contract proposal noting that it is a two-year contract, providing for three direct NAIT staff positions along with the other UCI support staff who help service NAIT, such as Keith Bretzius, who handles publications design and printing, and the other staff who provide communication, computer, mail and other supports.

Devlin noted the need to establish the NAIT Executive Director as a full-time position with the revenue to support that. Freeman noted that the second year of the contract could be amended to provide for that change. Scott noted that the contract provides for services, not percentages of staff time, so that the necessary tasks happen in order to fulfill the contract. Izadi noted the extraordinary efforts of the UCI staff in providing services to NAIT.

*Izadi moved, seconded by Hoppes, that the proposed NAIT/UCI contract be approved.*

DeRuntz asked for detail on the percentage increases in the cost of the NAIT contract over the past few years. Dufek noted the range of increases. Coscarelli noted that the total revenue and expense stream for NAIT has also increased. Foster suggested that the contract be amended to require that the NAIT Executive Board approve UCI's choice of an Executive Director. Dufek agreed that the change could be incorporated.

*Foster moved the motion be amended to approve the contract with the addition of language to assure NAIT Executive Board approval of the hiring of any new Executive Director. The movers of the original motion deemed the amendment friendly. There being no further discussion, the motion as amended was approved on a voice vote.*

Savage requested that a discussion of errors & omissions insurance coverage be added to the New Business portion of the agenda.

#### **9) Proposed 2005-2006 Association Budget:**

- A) Review & Discussion / Budget Comparison 2004-2005 to 2005-2006:** Board members asked questions on specific budget items regarding membership, accreditation, ASPA and CHEA. Foster suggested communicating concern of the Executive Board on the large expenditures for CHEA and ASPA membership, and noted his concern that accreditation, operated by the independent Board of Accreditation, has a budget controlled by the NAIT Executive Board.
- B) Approval of the Budget:** *Hoppes moved, seconded by Trocki, to approve the proposed NAIT fiscal year 2005-2006 budget as presented. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*
- C) Amendments to the Budget:** Board members proposed the following amendments to the Division Projects expense budget: Manufacturing – reduce from \$1000 to \$500; Industry – no change from \$1000; University – increase from \$1000 to \$1600; CCTI – increase from \$1000 to \$1500; Student – increase from \$1000 to \$2000; Research – decrease from \$1000 to \$500; EECT – increase from \$1000 to \$1500; Graphics - no change from \$1000; Safety – reduce from \$1000 to \$500. *Hoppes moved the requested amendments to the budget as one motion, seconded by Travers. There being no further discussion, the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

Board members discussed NAIT's bank balances and the investment accounts and inquired of staff about proper reserves. Staff noted varying cash flow needs throughout the year, the need to assess how much to transfer to investment accounts after the spring accreditation visit cycle is completed, and that staff intended to make a sizable transfer before the end of the fiscal year on June 30. *Foster moved, seconded by Godt, that NAIT staff transfer up to \$25,000 from the NAIT*

*checking account to the NAIT investment account by June 30, 2005. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**10) Old Business:**

**A) Marketing, the Future of NAIT, “Who are We?”:** Zargari started the discussion regarding the value and meaning of NAIT, noting it has been an issue raised by communication from members and an undercurrent of many board issues. He expressed his feeling that NAIT needs to draw members into the discussion of the role, direction and recognition of NAIT. Coscarelli provided some background on the marketing issue, including discussion with a local marketing firm, Moore-Power Marketing, including a proposal for marketing plan development. Reviewing the proposal, he noted that the desire is for a marketing plan, not the pursuit of discrete projects that might be part of a larger marketing plan. Trocki noted that the other side of marketing is sales and that a plan should address that issue. Travers supported marketing research as a means to determine if we are spending our budget wisely. Dufek noted that UCI has existing relationships with firms that can provide that type of service. Other members questioned whether the proposal, due to its relatively low cost, would be any more than basic services and whether NAIT would first require marketing research and analysis. *Trocki moved, seconded by Izadi, to approve the Moore-Power proposal. There was further discussion. The motion was defeated on a voice vote.*

*Devlin moved, seconded by Freeman, to direct the NAIT Staff to research the cost and process of obtaining a marketing analysis by an outside firm defining and evaluating NAIT’s products and services with respect to NAIT’s customers and potential customers within 6 months. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**B) The Technologist – Timing and Funding:** Devlin discussed the motion that was approved to proceed with and fund initial development and distribution of *The Technologist*, and wondered if NAIT needs to do marketing analysis first to assist in determining how to proceed. Foster asked about the intent and marketing focus of the publication and, depending on its focus and target audience, how would it be distributed.

*Zargari noted the time and requested a motion to adjourn until Friday morning. Godt, seconded by Foster, moved to adjourn until 8 a.m. on Friday February 25. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.*

**Friday February 25, 2005**

**Present:** Ahmad Zargari (University Division Past President and Board Chair), Steven Hsiung (EECT Division President), Earl Godt (Student Division President Elect), Kim Travers (CCTI Division President Elect), Frank Trocki (CCTI Division President), Haig Vahradian (Student Division Past President), Tom Spotts (Graphics Division President), William Grisé (President Research Division), Mandara Savage (Safety Division President), Wayne Jones (Safety Division President-Elect), Steve Devlin (Industry Division President), Mahyar Izadi (University Division President), Tom Scott (EECT Division Past President), W. Tad Foster (Research Division Past President), Gary Hoppes (Manufacturing Division President), Bruce DeRuntz (Industry Division Past President), Steven Freeman (Safety Division President), Charles Patrick (Chair, JIT Steering Committee), Rick Coscarelli (Executive Director, Ex Oficio), and Dave Monforton (Associate Director, Recorder).

*The meeting was called to order by Chair Zargari at 8:03 a.m. and Zargari continued with the agenda item under discussion at the point of adjournment.*

**10) Old Business:**

**B) *The Technologist – Timing and Funding:*** *Devlin moved to produce one issue of The Technologist with content on OITs, CITs, CSITs, and other content on NAIT Accreditation and NAIT Certification. The motion was seconded by Freeman.*

Discussion resumed, with members commenting on a number of issues, as follows: Who is the target audience? Not just Industrial Advisory Boards?; a timeline of what and when; the possible alternative to test the idea with a limited run or PDF sample to gauge its reception; is this a continuing publication or a one-time marketing effort?; possible use of a survey to determine if NAIT should proceed, what content, etc.; should it focus on OITS or on NAIT members who are certified an working in industry?; do we need a marketing analysis as proposed before we proceed with this?; What is a Technologist?; Could it have more content to focus on all of NAIT? Could it have content about companies and executives that have hired Industrial Technology graduates?

*The motion was restated as follows, with the addition of amendments the movers deemed friendly: Devlin moved, seconded by Freeman, to produce one issue of The Technologist with content on OITs, CITs, CSITs, NAIT Accreditation, including a listing of all NAIT-accredited institutions, NAIT Certification and other NAIT content by September 1. The first production run should be 1500 copies. The project should include a means to obtain feedback on the first issue. The publication should include a request for information on reordering so that NAIT can gauge the need to do a reprint or further issues. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

*Hoppes moved, seconded by DeRuntz, that the chair establish a Technologist Ad Hoc Committee to bring The Technologist to publication. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote. The chair appointed Coscarelli to chair the committee and appointed DeRuntz, Devlin, Foster and Spotts to the committee.*

**C) JIT Steering Committee Report:** JIT Steering Committee Chair Dr. Charles Patrick reported. He noted the history of the committee and its charge to produce recommendations for a formal administrative structure for the operation of the JIT, including an independent policy board, guidance on the content and style of article submitted for review, operation of the review process, and training of JIT reviewers. Patrick provided an overview of the draft bylaws for the JIT produced by the committee and answered questions. *Trocki moved, seconded by Izadi, that the Executive Board endorse distribution of the draft bylaws for input from interested parties, to include feedback from the JIT reviewers and the NAIT membership as a whole, an article in the IT Insider, and posting the draft on the website and that the committee should report back to the Executive Board in November 2005. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**D) NAIT “Common Core” Update:** Coscarelli noted the charge he was given by the Executive Board to communicate concerns about NAIT’s “Common Core” to the Boards of Accreditation and Certification. He noted those boards’ independent status and that the Executive Board can only make recommendations to them on policy issues. He also noted that the NAIT membership and the executive board members do have representation on those boards through the elected representatives of NAIT’s primary divisions. He suggested that board members raise issues about accreditation and certification to the boards through those representatives, and that he had been in communication with the Boards through their chairs. The Certification Board has indicated that the common core of the program, as indicated in the certification examination, is technology management, and that the new cumulative exam score policy allows examinees a better chance to pass the exam even if the program they are graduating from has less emphasis on some topical areas than it does on others. He noted that defining a “common core” of curriculum or competencies may in some ways be in conflict with impending accreditation policy changes that would create less proscriptive standards with more reliance on assessment to determine satisfaction of accreditation standards.

*Godt moved, seconded by Gris , that the chairs of the Boards of Accreditation and Certification be invited to attend NAIT Executive Board meetings and be covered under the Executive Board expense reimbursement policy. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

*Freeman moved, seconded by Foster, that the Executive Board, through the Executive Director, communicate their support for the Boards of Accreditation and Certification in the direction they have taken in addressing the common core issue. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

## **11) New Business:**

**A) 2005 Convention Structure and Content:** Monforton directed the Board’s attention to the hotel room usage grid for the 2005 Convention and explained the tentative use of rooms. He noted that the grid is based on prior practice and any known changes for 2005. Other changes, new programs, etc., have to be communicated now so that space can be

reserved, as in order to conduct the proposal review process, the maximum number of presentations that can be presented needs to be determined. Monforton also indicated that the hotel is able to provide internet access in all meeting rooms and that the needed service for two days in the presentation rooms would be an expense of about \$1000. Monforton asked the Board members if they had any additions or changes to the convention room use schedule as proposed.

- *Board members noted that all publications and communications about the hotel should refer to the Sheraton Westport Lakeside Chalet, so as to not be confused with the Plaza building.*
- *The board reached consensus that NAIT should have the hotel provide internet access in the presentation rooms.*
- *The board reached consensus that to minimize Saturday conflicts, that the schedule should be moved forward one half hour, so that the Business Meeting runs from 7:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m., workshops and other sessions from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Division meetings from 12:30 p.m. to 1 p.m., and the Executive Board meeting from 1 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.*
- *The Safety Division requested that they have their Division open meeting at 8 a.m. on Friday.*
- *The Industry Division requested that they have their Division open meeting at 8 a.m. on Thursday.*

Monforton indicated that the necessary schedule revisions will be made.

**B) Standards & Accreditation Committee Process Discussion:** Coscarelli outlined the process involved in revising NAIT Accreditation standards. Suggested changes have been made by the Standards & Accreditation Committee and posted to the NAIT website along with others suggested changes. The Standards & Accreditation Committee will meet and make recommendations at their meeting on Wednesday evening of the convention, and the Board of Accreditation will make final decisions on any changes at their meeting on Thursday morning of the convention.

**C) Academic Colors Discussion:** Coscarelli reported his communications with a NAIT member on the proper academic colors for Industrial Technology graduates, and what his further research found. The Board briefly discussed the issue. *Godt moved, seconded by Freeman, that the Executive Director investigate the issue further and report in November. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**D) Electronic Voting Policy:** Foster suggested that the Board not use electronic voting for issues that need or lead to far-ranging and complex discussions. Devlin suggested specific time frames and time limits for e-votes. Monforton noted that the bylaws change allowed the Board to adopt a specific e-vote policy but that the policy has not yet been adopted. *Godt moved, seconded by Hoppes, that the Chair appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Electronic Voting to recommend a specific policy for use of electronic voting by the NAIT Executive Board. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote. (Recorder's note: the appointments to this committee were not made at the board meeting.)*

**E) Foundation Administration Fee:** Coscarelli discussed the issue of charging the NAIT Foundation for administrative services. Currently, the Foundation only pays direct expenses but is not charged for any services provided by staff, overhead, office space, etc. Prorating staff time devoted to the Foundation as a percentage of NAIT's management fees would indicate a fee of nearly \$1000 just to compensate NAIT for use of the NAIT staff. Coscarelli indicated he would discuss the issue with John Earshen, Chair of the NAIT Foundation Board. *Devlin moved, seconded by Godt, that the Executive Director investigate the issue and report back to the Board in November.*

**F) Liability and Officers Insurance Issues:** Savage requested information on insurance coverage that NAIT has covering officers and volunteers. Coscarelli noted that NAIT carries general liability insurance that provides some protection but that a specific analysis of activities and risks would be needed to make a recommendation about any other coverage that may be prudent. *Savage moved, seconded by Foster, that the Executive Director investigate liability issue for NAIT, its officer and volunteers with respect to potential liability associated with Executive Board activity, the convention, accreditation and accreditation visits, and the NAIT Certification program. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote.*

**G) Other:** *Godt moved, seconded by Freeman, that the Board minutes reflect the Board's appreciation of and commendation to the NAIT staff for their work and dedication on behalf of NAIT. The motion was approved on a unanimous voice vote.*

**12) Adjournment:** There being no further business on the agenda, Zargari requested a motion to adjourn. *Hoppes moved, seconded by Gris , that the meeting be adjourned. There was no discussion and the motion was approved on a voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.*