



The Association of
Technology,
Management, and
Applied Engineering

ATMAE Strategic Planning Meeting Discussion Summary

Monday, June 23, 2014

Those present: Bill Hallock, Royall Mack, John Wyatt, Jesse Kamm, Rod Flanigan, Aco Sikoski, Joyce Wilkerson, and from Apex Management: Kimberly LaBounty, Kelly Geegan and Michele Anderson

The day opened with a tour of the facility, identifying meeting room locations, and other logistical items.

We then discussed the agenda in some detail. Kimberly & Kelly noted their goal to raise the bar at the 2014 conference and begin to make it feel like an exciting relevant conference. Some changes made for 2014 include:

- An opening keynote presentation,
- Holding the robotics prep, judging and competition all on Thursday, to leave NIAC time for sessions on Friday
- Because of the tighter timeframe, part of the grade for the robotics competition will be coming from audience voting
- We are moving workshops to Saturday morning
- Division meetings will no longer conflict with conference sessions

Other items of importance regarding the conference:

- We should communicate that public viewing of the robots is available while judging is taking place
- We need new questions for the tech challenge
- The student sessions/activities often run behind schedule
- We want to announce next year's robotic competition challenge and rules on Friday afternoon
- Saturday board meeting will finish at noon
- Strong student participation in the conference is important for the NIAC group to continue their involvement

Action Items related to the conference:

- John² and Jesse and Heshiun Lawrence will work with Steve ahead of the conference to establish the challenge and rules. Steve will receive questions

following, but goal is that much is established ahead of time. Additionally, the conversations leading up to the competition challenge and rules will remain in the strictest confidence among John, John and Steve.

- ❑ Need to establish new questions for the tech challenge
- ❑ Royall needs 6 students (3 for interviewing and 3 for Pecha Kucha) to be trained on Thursday, November 20, from 10am-5pm. These hand-picked students will then provide “before” and “after” examples of how to improve interviewing and presentation skills.
- ❑ Royall will need to provide at or around September 20th a list of what positions the companies will be interviewing for while in attendance
- ❑ Division Presidents & Vice Presidents will be asked to attend an open meeting on Wednesday prior to the board meeting. During that meeting, ATMAE board will communicate its vision and goals for the future; division leaders will be expected to provide a five-minute summary/presentation/report of their activities, etc. Kimberly will create a template for them to use in creating that report.

Future Conferences:

While a strong emphasis was placed on holding the 2015 conference in Indy, there is no availability. Instead ATMAE will look to go to Pittsburgh in 2015, and then look to book Indy in 2016. The goal is to book both by the 2014 conference and then establish a strategy for future locations, knowing the conference will change locations each year.

-BREAK for LUNCH-

After lunch, Bill noted the schedule for the remaining meeting, noting the SWOT Analysis and what will be discussed. Kimberly followed up noting the analysis was done from her and Apex staff's perspective, and encouraged board discussion and feedback.

Kimberly then quickly summarized all four quadrants and asked for additional suggestions/additions to the analysis. Discussion ensued regarding threats such as other accrediting bodies – namely ABET – and other publications as well. Discussion then evolved into one of ATMAE's brand, niche (our donut & coffee), and how we differentiate ourselves. Further, we acknowledged that much of the remaining discussion is not relevant unless we agree on who we are and where we fit into academia, industry and career development. We agreed that much of who we are is focused on workforce development through technology education. When you think of engineering you think of ABET; when you think of technology, we want you to think of ATMAE. Some phrases discussed were:

Educating Tomorrow's Technology Workforce

Workforce Development – economic development

How do we do it?

Quality programs (accreditation)
Continuing ed through certification
Publications – in Journal & White Papers

Contributing to econ development through educating (preparing?)
tomorrow's technology workforce.

Workforce Development through Quality Technology Education

After further discussion, we decided our focus on technology was enough of a common thread to move on. We noted, though, that we need greater involvement with and from industry to increase our success.

In discussing weaknesses, Kimberly discussed areas of exposure they have uncovered, namely in the area of insurance and protecting assets. Proper insurance coverage is paramount in peer-reviewed situations, especially for accreditation and the journal. Currently, for example, visiting teams are not covered. Michele has discussed the E&O coverage for peer-reviewed activities. Additionally, there is car insurance, but no general liability coverage. Nancy is in the process of changing the car insurance to general liability.

Another area of exposure, especially if we are planning to market our certification programs, is the trademarking of the certification logos. The ATMAE accreditation logo also. ATMAE has now entered into an agreement with a law firm who can trademark these logos for us. Jesse noted that investing in trademarking shows a commitment to the programs and that it should be long-term, with no changes or casual adding or subtracting of those certifications.

Discussion then turned to policies and procedures. Kimberly will draft internal financial policies and procedures that describe what is reviewed on a regular basis, how bills are paid, etc. Additionally, while there are some written expectations on board nomination documents of what is reimbursed for the board, there isn't anything written in a board manual. Discussion ensued regarding board expenses incurred during the June and November meetings.

It was moved and seconded that the board will be reimbursed for 100% of travel expenses for the June planning meetings, and will receive complimentary registration and hotel accommodations during the annual conference. The exception is for the student and industry representatives of the board. Those three members will receive complete reimbursement of travel expenses. This policy should begin immediately, and Kimberly should expand on the policy where necessary. For example the cost of a coach flight would be reimbursed, but not flying first class. The motion was approved.

Regarding the establishment of a treasurer, Kimberly noted a conflict of interest that the treasurer would be a contractor. Discussion of job requirements of a treasurer

would include monthly review of the financials, leading the establishment of the annual budget and oversight of the financial standing of the organization. The board determined a treasurer is needed and that this will be an appointed position and the term is undefined. The first complete term will begin at the 2014 annual conference, but John offered to serve as the interim treasurer until that time one will be appointed.

Discussion regarding Division leaders also ensued, and what their expectations are and what is expected of them. Kimberly stressed the need for inclusion. The board agreed to ask division leaders to attend a brief meeting prior to the board meeting Wednesday night (11/19). At that meeting ATMAE board will communicate its vision and goals for the future; division leaders will be expected to provide a five-minute summary/presentation/report of their activities, etc. Kimberly will create a template for them to use in creating that report.

Additionally, discussion ensued regarding the need to include accreditation, certification and the journal in more board meetings. We concluded that we will ask them to attend & participate in the November board meeting and June strategic session. Between those board meetings, an identified the board members servicing as a liaison to that committee or boards will report back to the board in the call in between.

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Discussion Summary

Those present: Bill Hallock, Royall Mack, John Wyatt, Jesse Kamm, Rod Flanigan, Aco Sikoski, Joyce Wilkerson, and from Apex Management: Kimberly LaBounty and Michele Anderson (*Mark Miller and Jeff Cunion later joined by phone*)

The meeting began just prior to 9am with a brief review of summary notes from Wednesday. Clarifications and corrections were made. (*the resulting document is above*)

Realizing personnel development was not discussed Wednesday, the day opened with a brief discussion regarding the need for more volunteers and better management and utilization of the volunteers we have.

In Accreditation, there are approximately 9 positions that will need to be filled due to either vacancies or a renewal of terms. Michele noted there will be a significant bump in 2016 and then again in 2018 with schools up for renewal, where we will need numerous visiting team members. Additionally, she is working diligently to establish more leads for accreditation. Should she be successful, this will require more time from consultants, etc. Kimberly and Michele also noted the need for stronger training in the area of accreditation, noting a recent survey sent to recent

visiting team members to inquire about their expectations, any tools they would have liked to receive prior to their visit, etc.

With regard to the Journal, Michele noted there are some reviewers who are called on several times. It would be nice to increase their reviewer pool so it is not as taxing. Additionally, discussions of training webinars for reviewers on how to use the (hopefully) new system and the JTMAE review process would be helpful as well.

Kimberly and Michele reiterated that much of the needs also requires more convenient, easier-to-use systems so that the valuable time volunteers offer is not more than it should be. If we are looking to grow and add more schools, journal articles, etc., to the membership, we need to have the volunteers to support it and we need to make sure their jobs are as clear and as efficient as possible. Additionally, Kimberly noted the need to ensure the board is communicating their vision to the other volunteer leaders. Additionally, this communication will assist in ensuring board members understand what volunteers are working on, their needs and challenges, and can then confirm those activities compliment the mission of the organization.

Discussion then moved to Opportunities. The first agenda item was the ATMAE Brand Development. Discussion ensued regarding the need for consistency across all channels, including visiting team members at schools, conference education, certification, etc. Kimberly reiterated the need for board members to communicate with division leaders, etc. so that brand can be consistent.

The board members then discussed the need for a “pitch” for Kimberly to take on the road, which can be tweaked to fit the situation (talking to a school, industry advisory members for those schools, at trade shows promoting accreditation or certification, etc.). Knowing the focus should be around technology, workforce development and quality education, the board asked Kimberly to make that a goal for the first half of the fiscal year, and ideally by the November conference. The board members agreed ATMAE needs to be in front of more people and this pitch will be a great first step.

Better use of Technology:

Kimberly noted there are several areas ATMAE can improve technologically. Most systems have been done manually, and in an inefficient manner. With that, much of Apex’s time is being spent improving current systems. These suggested system improvements are included as part of the budget that has been presented and will be discussed on Wednesday.

With regard to the conference, Kimberly noted there are already plans for an app, which is an improvement, and slick technology members will see immediately. The other improvement Apex is recommending is a process by which presentation proposals will be submitted in the future. Currently all proposed presentations

(approximately 250) are received individually via email. Then collated by division into one word document, sent as a pdf to each division, which is then graded, manually calculated, and slotted. Notifications are then sent individually by email from the office. The same company that has the app also has a system by which the proposal process can be done, which will then feed into the app. Kimberly and Kelly have completed the demo for the system and were very impressed with how well thought-out the process is and system designed. It will be a better way to communicate with speakers, set the schedule, and then also receive papers. This system will be part of next year's conference budget. This led to a discussion regarding the process by which presentations are accepted. Acknowledging the fact that more accepted presentations means higher attendance, as well as a better opportunity for academic members to present, there is also a desire to "raise the bar" on the image of the conference and what is presented. Currently the number of presentations has been determined by the number of rooms held and slots that can be filled. Unfortunately, that doesn't necessarily mean only the best are presenting. Rod Flanigan suggested we revisit the way presentations are accepted. Discussion was held regarding this. The board agreed this would be a good request to the division leaders, asking them to propose how their division papers might be selected in the future. Discussion even went as far as considering what the presentation might look like, and what the proposal might include. Kimberly will include this in her communications to division leaders.

When it comes to the journal, JTMAE, there are two areas of needed technology. The first was mentioned already, in the use of webinars to train reviewers on the submission and review process. These can be done in house and utilized throughout the year. The other is a journal submission software program. One of the first orders of business Apex had was to identify an affordable, effective, useful system for submitting and reviewing journal articles. One was found and the JTMAE board and editors went through a demo for the system. They were very pleased with it. While there is a setup cost and labor to do so, the residual costs are only \$30 per submission. These costs are included in the annual budget.

With regard to Accreditation, Michele is already utilizing survey monkey to survey visiting team members. Michele and Dr. Anderson have also discussed developing webinar training sessions for visiting team leaders and team members. Additionally, Kimberly noted that she would like to set up the website so that someone visiting the site could search for an accredited program, by program or state. Currently there is only a pdf download. This is not convenient, and no visitor would take the time to go through a list that is alphabetized by state, but that's it. This will require some data entry work, but will mean that any student or parent or other university/school can identify ATMAE accredited programs within minutes. The longer-term vision is that ATMAE will be a resource for parents and students in their search for a school to attend.

This led to additional discussion around accreditation. Michele noted the need for one manual in one document, instead of a compilation of several that are difficult to

work through. Bill suggested getting industry people to also take a look at some of the standards, knowing they are up for review. Michele will alert industry board members of when the comment period has begun and how to provide feedback. Michele noted that Apex had inherited four leads for accreditation from AMR. Since then she has identified a list of schools that would be not only an outstanding prospect list for accreditation, but she is also using it to solicit articles for a special edition of the journal. This list has 269 leads. She suggested looking at feeder systems to accredited schools as possible leads and other state-wide systems. She also suggested editing the Accreditation 101 session. Slides seem outdated and content could be improved. Michele spoke of a vision for a “cradle to grave” process for accreditation, beginning with prospecting, to informing schools, to preparing them to the visits and approval process, to regular communications with the schools/programs, to re-accreditation, etc.

(At this time Mark Miller joined the meeting via conference phone.)

Bill asked Mark to update the board on recent activities in certification. Mark noted the CTM exam has been revised and that the older test is only used for assessment. There are others who have expressed interest or are working on additional exams, such as an EECT exam, revising the CTP exam, and creating one for nano-safety. Mark also mentioned the Six Sigma exam is nearly completed. He is having folks take it so it can be tested. There are still some things that need to be worked out regarding the type of belt received as a result of the score received but the system is nearly complete and the study guide is finished. He noted the need to post certificants on the website. He is working with staff to do so. Mark also compared the ATMAE certification programs to those of other organizations, such as SME. He also expressed interest in better understanding the income and expenses associated with certification so he can help the organization make more money.

Discussion then turned to the Journal. Kimberly referenced documents shared: the SWOT analysis and strategic document, noting their important contents, suggestions and comments. Discussion ensued regarding the credibility of the journal: impact versus acceptance rate. Scope was also discussed and any competing journals. The board noted their desire for more submissions and published articles. They also noted the cost for putting the journal together. This led to questions of whether the journal articles have to look the way they do? Are there ways to reduce the amount of staff time to assemble an article? Currently, it takes 5-7 hours per article. Chin requested the articles be a single-column format, especially with so many people using tablets to read the articles. The board asked Kimberly to make suggestions of ways to cut the amount of time spent on the journal article assembly. When asked about the format of the white papers, it was suggested that they stay the same because they are often considered more of a marketing piece than scholarly publication.

Accreditation program growth:

Michele again mentioned the list of 267 schools she is using to target for growth. After discussing other ideas of sources, such as technology centers, looking west,

and programs that are focused on technology, and not ABET accredited, the board suggested that Michele's target market would be 2- and 4-year schools with technology programs (multiple in one school because of the cost savings to them), that are not ABET accredited. Michele and Kimberly noted appreciation for selecting a target. She offered to share the list of schools with the board. Some offered to reach out to contacts at other schools if they know them, just to make the introduction for Michele and grease the wheels.

The board asked Michele about international expansion, knowing it has been mentioned in the past. Michele acknowledged past discussion and said there is currently no strategy for international expansion. She suggested in order to do this ATMAE would need local advocates in those countries; they would need to revise the scope in their documentation to CHEA, and ensure the insurance and logos are secure. She suggested expanding in North America first.

The board discussed the importance of educating industry on ATMAE programs. Again, Kimberly's pitch might help with this. Additionally, communications with the students through certification is another way to communicate. Also, communication through the accreditation programs and Michele.

Michele also noted a prior suggestion that a target for growth in the certification area might be the military. Many of those in the military have skills related to our programs and it would be a logical expansion. She also suggested out reach through the Department of Labor, as a technology association helping with workforce development. The board further discussed ATMAE's role of tying STEM, innovation and our programs with a skilled workforce, and our programs ensure consistency in quality.

Wednesday, June 25, 2014

Discussion Summary

Those present: Bill Hallock, Royall Mack, John Wyatt, Rod Flanigan, Aco Sikoski, Joyce Wilkerson, and from Apex Management: Kimberly LaBounty and Michele Anderson

The morning opened with a discussion regarding accreditation and a concern Apex has over the Accreditation board feeling it needs to bring on Rick Coscarelli to assist with their work. Kimberly noted that, while Michele has done an excellent job to establish new tasks and timelines that have not been done before, she is still given the impression the Accreditation Board feels it must have Rick's assistance. Apex has been told Rick's conflict of interest with AMR has been released. Additionally, the ATMAE bylaws can be interpreted that the Accreditation Board would be allowed the authority to bring on an employee, consultant, or contractor on their own. Kimberly noted that she had not put in language in the contract between

ATMAE and Apex stating Apex has authority to employ those who provide the scope of work described in the contract, but noted one could be easily drafted and added to the existing contract as an addendum. The board favored this action and asked Kimberly to provide Bill with that draft. Additionally, *Royall moved that the board gain legal advice regarding the ATMAE bylaws, particularly regarding the clarification of control. Rod seconded. Discussion ensued, noting that while the added term in the contract is a short-term solution but that the bylaws should be changed to reflect the real clarification of responsibilities and lines of authority. If the ATMAE board is to change bylaws, they need to ensure all changes are correct, thorough, etc. The motion was approved.*

Additionally, the board suggested a call between Bill, Kimberly, Michele and Dr. Anderson as a follow-up to this meeting, asking about any concerns, updating on discussions held Monday and Tuesday, and see if Rick's name is raised. This should be done before the next board meeting, and an update should be provided to the board at that time.

Discussion then moved to the 2014-2015 fiscal agenda. Kimberly confirmed Royall's remark that the budget is a "bill budget" that addresses the needs of the association to address technology needs and other areas of need identified by Apex. It is not visionary at all, but is extremely practical, realistic and included the requested items noted in the days prior. Bill also noted his discovering that AMR had often drastically under-budgeted on the income side and over-budgeted on the expense side. He noted his appreciation for budgeted figures that are close to actual historical numbers. Kimberly then discussed each budget area with the board. There were discussions of how to present accreditation income and expenses. Kimberly noted that there have been formulas used in establishing the "reserves to operations" figure that Nancy in the office has not completely understood. Michele suggested there may be other ways to communicate the budget. Royall suggested presenting a budget to actual for 2013-2014 with the variance, as well as a 2014-2015 budget alone. Additionally, Kimberly divided the management fees by area, such as accreditation, membership, conference, etc. based on current hours and forecasting out.

Some highlights on the budget, and items the board asked to change/clarify:

- Kimberly noted that the certification income numbers had been updated based on the May financials and actual income to date. This does not include any revenue from the Six Sigma exam.
- Conference revenue and expenses based on Kelly's established pricing, estimated conference budget.
- Membership dues are based on last year's numbers with some conservative growth. Kimberly noted again the need to focus on student chapters and the need to provide members with value.
- Regarding accreditation expenses, included is money for marketing. The Board asked for clarification in what that money might be used for.

- Webinar expenses are for three training webinars; the other expense is for the accreditation management software. This is an annual fee.
- Certification expenses are likely conservative, allowing development funds, some additional projects, and the amortization of the trademarks.
- Conference expenses reflect a higher cost for AV due to the renting of projectors. The board suggested based on paying for some student expenses, and the trainer for Royall's session, that number should increase.
- The board requested the Executive Director expenses (this is for Kimberly to travel) be increased to allow for opportunities to "pitch" as discussed. Bill suggested budgeting for traveling six times.
- The management fees identified include two areas – remaining admin time, and then Kimberly added about \$30K to allow for the hiring of a part-time marketing person. She noted that with the needed tasks to complete by current staff, she does not see it realistic that additional marketing - across all program lines, let alone the establishment of a pitch – can be done with the existing infrastructure. Marketing is important to the organization and the growth of ATMAE.
- Publications expenses include the new submission software and additional supplements. The board again reiterated their desire to decrease staff time associated with publications. Kimberly noted that these expenses would likely go down the next year because it includes time to set up the software and supplements.
- With all additional expenses, the proposed budget still includes a profit of nearly \$121K.

Bill closed the meeting by suggesting the board establish times to hold monthly board meetings. The board agreed on the following, all at noon eastern time:

- Friday, July 18
- Friday, August 22
- Friday, September 19
- Friday, October 17