ICEAA Board of Directors Meeting
March 31, 2023 | Zoom Virtual meeting

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

<u>Voting Attendees</u>

Tim Anderson (via Pullen Proxy), Rick Collins, Bob Hunt, Brent Johnstone, Jennifer Kirchhoffer, Cole Kupec, Cheryl Latimer, Alan Mayer, Arlene Minkiewicz, Cari Pullen, Christina Snyder, Madeleine Teller, Barb Wilson, Kellie Wutzke

<u>Non-voting Attendees:</u>

Kevin Cincotta, Brent Larson, Sanath Rajagopal, Jennifer Scheel, Sharon Burger, Megan Jones

<u>Welcome, quorum count, introductions:</u>   Bob Hunt

Bob thanks everyone for joining, a quorum is established and the meeting begins at 11:02 am.

<u>Secretary Report:</u>   Arlene Minkiewicz

No comments or edits were suggested for the February 2023 minutes either in advance of the meeting or during.

Vote: Motion is raised to approve the February 2023 minutes. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

<u>Treasurer Report:</u>   Madeleine Teller

Due to the proximity to the previous report and that the second quarter financials are not yet available, there is no treasurers report for this meeting.

<u>Professional Development Update</u>   Jennifer Kirchhoffer

Jennifer presents slides with certification statistics. There are some discrepancies in the report since the business office changed membership management systems, making the number of certifications seem fewer than there are. Megan and Christina had examined some

prior years' certification trends and our new certification to renewal ratio is consistent with past years.

Kevin and Sharon report that seven alpha testers have taken the SCEC with three remaining to take it. Bob got a request from a member to be an alpha tester, Sharon will provide the information.

Jennifer K. asks Kevin if he needs anything else from the board to continue with the SCEC project. Kevin says he needs a decision from the board the terms and conditions under which the SCEC will move from alpha to beta testing and then official testing.

Arlene asks what the feedback has been. Kevin says the general feedback on CEBoK-S has been that the materials are too dense, the font and spacing is such that it's not clean, the material could be presented in fewer slides, and there are references to tables or graphs that don't exist. Kevin suggests that CEBoK-S needs a managing editor.

Kellie says she had volunteered earlier in the project to transfer the content of the slides and speaker notes into the Wikimedia format used by CEBoK 2.0, and offers to help with the editing and standardizing of the content for publishing in the new format. Jennifer K. warns that there are over 1,000 slides and 2,000-3,000 pages of speaker notes; Kellie understands it's a big undertaking but someone has to get it started. Jennifer and Kevin thank Kellie for volunteering.

Jennifer suggests the new board president name a CEBoK-S Principal in addition to the CEBoK and Certification Principal positions.

ICEAA Software SIG Update and Draft Strategic Plan   Bob Hunt

Bob asks to change the topic to the ICEAA Software SIG for a moment: someone from the Software SIG will want to be the CEBoK-S Principal.

He gives some background on the ICEAA Software SIG initiative, saying it has gone back several years. He says when reading the Software SIG charter, you'll see that the SIG isn't really as SIG, and it's not really a joint agreement, the whole point is to try to expand ICEAA into the European and Asian markets to increase CEBoK-S sales. With that in mind, one of the SIG representatives would like to be the CEBoK-S Principal, but before we make that decision, he suggests the board read the charter agreement the board approved in October 2022 and the proposed Software SIG strategic plan, and anyone should join the SIG board

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

meeting in May at the Workshop. Bob believes the SIG will help expand our membership, increase CEBoK-S sales, and be a worthwhile endeavor for ICEAA. The SIG is requesting resources for their activities, so it won't be an entirely volunteer effort.

Megan clarifies that there are two documents on the SIG in the pre-read: the charter, which the board approved in October 2022, and a draft strategic plan that the SIG created with their ideas on what the SIG should do and how it should be funded. The second document is not final, it has not been approved, and the board should review it carefully as there are suggestions in it that will need work and consideration. Bob concurs, adding that the board will need to decide and agree upon the scope and funding for the SIG at the May board meeting.

Rick advises against allowing the CEBoK-S Principal to come from the SIG, based on our experience in the CEBoK-S development project, and suggests the Principal be from the US and ideally someone who worked on the development. Christina concurs, and says that many of the items the SIG has proposed in their strategic plan are not in line with the parameters defined in the board-approved charter. She suggests Arlene, as Secretary, compare the two documents to ensure ICEAA is not being committed to anything outside of the approved charter. While she supports the idea of the SIG, there are ideas in the draft strategic plan that overstep the boundaries of the approved charter. Arlene agrees with both Rick and Christina, having noticed similar concerns.

Bob also agrees with the raised concerns and encourages everyone to provide their feedback on the draft strategic plan so that forward progress can be made with the SIG.

Jennifer K. mentions how on the most recent Software SIG call, they indicated one of their primary market targets is India, which she worries may be a concern for our members employed by the US DOD., or that globalizing the material may make it less applicable to our core membership. Bob counters that we are an international organization with members in Saudi Arabia, Korea, Japan, and others, so pursuing customers in India should not be an issue. Christina points out that the draft strategic plan includes a seat on the SIG board for a representative from India, which would be less of a concern if the position were to represent all of Asia, in which there are many US-friendly/ANZUS nations with less potential for political issues. Bob stresses that the SIG's strategic plan is merely a draft, so while these are the kinds of concerns that should be raised, we should approach it with the perspective of the SIG being a boon to ICEAA.

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

Rick believes the SIG is critical for leveraging Nesma and the SIG members' contacts overseas, so without the SIG, we will fall short of reaching a truly international audience. He encourages everyone to keep an open mind when reviewing the draft strategic plan so that we don't lose any progress made to date. While Rick has been asking for years for members of the SIG board to provide a market projection for sales, they have not done so, but Rick does believe there is market potential, even if it hasn't been quantified.

Bob thanks everyone for their thoughts and asks that they prepare to discuss the draft strategic plan in detail during our May meeting. Arlene asks how much time we will spend on the draft strategic plan during the May meeting and will representatives from the SIG be present? Bob says the amount of time we spend on it will depend on the comments received on the draft plan and intends to have SIG representatives at the board meeting. Arlene would prefer the SIG not be present while we discuss their draft plan, Rick and Bob are not concerned about having them present.

Megan suggests the board schedule a short interim meeting to discuss the SIG draft strategic plan after the board has had a chance to digest the material, since the SIG board meeting will be taking place before the ICEAA board meeting, it would be valuable for them to be able to discuss our feedback during their meeting, and provide responses to our comments during the ICEAA board meeting, to make both meetings more productive. Bob and Arlene agree.

Arlene asks if the entire ICEAA board is invited to the SIG meeting; Bob says no but anyone can join (if they let Megan know they intend to). Megan also suggests designating a few representatives from the ICEAA board to sit in on the SIG meeting.

Bob adds that there will be a Space SIG meeting in San Antonio also, and asks if anyone wants to join it, to no response. He cautions against allowing past challenges with the SIG to derail the initiative. Christina agrees, having been on a few Software SIG planning calls to date, that the SIG itself is a good idea, but wants ICEAA to make sure we are protecting our own interests. She argues that the Space SIG is not an apt comparison, as the Software SIG is now requesting funding and resources that ICEAA does not even provide itself but utilizes volunteer contributions for. Bob acknowledges the concerns, believes transparency is the best approach, and hopes the board will provide thorough feedback on the draft plan. He adds that during the years the SIG has been in development, various promises and off-the-record agreements were made that are not official, have not been approved by the board, and should not be considered during this review.

Action: All board members to email their comments on the draft Software SIG strategic plan to Megan by April 17 for compilation and distribution prior to a one-hour single-topic board meeting to be held at noon on April 21.

Jennifer K. says she is unaware of the history behind the SIG, but was jarred by the draft strategic plan that seems to imply that ICEAA will cede control of CEBoK-S to the SIG. She's supportive of the idea of the SIG and encouraged that so many people want to get involved, but is hesitant to hand over the curriculum. Bob believes this is the SIG's intent but agrees ICEAA needs to retain control of CEBoK-S.

Christina says she has been pleased with the SIG members' enthusiasm for making edits and updates to CEBoK-S, and has suggested they channel their energy and get started. Rick supports the SIG being proactive and making contributions, but that ICEAA should retain oversight and control. Christina thanks Rick and Bob for the background information and suggests the board consider it when making their reviews of the draft strategic plan, as well as think specifically about what ICEAA ultimately wants from the SIG and what ICEAA wants the SIG to accomplish.

When the idea for CEBoK-S came up about 8 years ago, he said at that time he said the board needed to decide if this new curriculum would be on Software Cost Estimating or Software Pricing, and that the SIG representatives were more focused on Software Pricing, and while he believed pricing was a smart decision for ICEAA to pursue, he was voted down by the board at the time in favor of focusing on Software Cost Estimating. Nevertheless, the SIG representatives have since tried to steer CEBoK-S towards Software Pricing, and if ICEAA gives the SIG too much control over the content, it will go from being a Software Cost Estimating curriculum to a Software Pricing curriculum.

Professional Development Update: CEBoK-S   Kevin Cincotta

Kevin continues. Feedback received on the SCEC alpha exam has been that it's too easy, too quick, lots of overlap of questions, too many "gimme" questions, too many questions with silly or distracting answers, we need more quantitative questions that require actual calculations or estimates, but those are the difficult questions to write.

Kellie asks if the alpha testers will receive the SCEC certification. Kevin has no argument against granting them the certification, Megan agrees it's a nice gesture of thanks for the testers.

Kevin says the scores to date have ranged from 70%-90%, which has likely been skewed by only choosing experts to participate in the alpha test but does believe we need to make the test more difficult for the beta test. Jennifer K. says she's not a software estimating SME, but she familiarized herself with the material and passed. Arlene agrees that the SMEs probably find the exam easier than the average estimator would, but with proper study, the test is not difficult. Christina suggests having an experienced estimator take the test without studying CEBoK-S; Madeleine says she did just that, not having much time to prepare, but thinks she must have been the 70% (with the caveat that she's good at studying and test taking).

With all the feedback in mind, Rick believes the alpha testers should not receive the SCEC certification unless they provide some of the more difficult to write quantitative questions that they have indicated the exam lacks. Kellie, Kevin, and Bob like the idea. Jennifer K. adds that the alpha and beta testers at the Workshop could work together to create a case study on which we can write those quantitative questions. All support this idea too.

The alpha testers were asked in a followup survey what they think the proper passing score should be: two gave a percentage higher than their own score (and both said the exam was too easy). Most of the alpha testers finished their exam in less than an hour, so the two hours provided is more than necessary. Kevin proposes the SCEC beta exam at the Workshop be 60 questions over 90 minutes with a 70% passing score.

Several board members mention how some of the images on the exam were difficult to see and couldn't be zoomed in on. Megan and Sharon will discuss with the exam provider any options available for resizing images.

Vote: A motion is raised and seconded to set the SCEC exam at 60 questions over 90 minutes with a 70% pass rate. All are in favor, and with no objections or discussion, the motion is approved.

Jennifer K. says the CEBoK-S training for the Workshop is set and ready, and thanks all the volunteers.

Jennifer asks how the board Principals are determined, whether they're elected or appointed. Megan says historically the President has informally solicited suggestions and recommendations for the Principals, but per the bylaws they are ultimately appointed by the president. Jennifer believes we should have a CEBoK-S Principal, and Bob suggests keeping that in mind while reviewing the Software SIG draft strategic plan for our April 21 meeting.

ICEAA Board of Directors Meeting

March 31, 2023 | Zoom Virtual meeting

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

<u>Professional Development Update: Updating CEBoK Modules</u>   Jennifer Kirchhoffer

Jennifer asks Kellie if there have been any developments on CEBoK module updates. Kellie says that the Module 6 update group had some momentum going for a while but they've stalled. She has volunteered to help make the updates, and will reach out to Dave Brown on the Module 6 progress. She says there have been minor edits suggested by users that we've been making as they arise.

Kellie reminds the board that we had agreed to re-write the software module of CEBoK (Module 12) to reflect the teachings in CEBoK-S. She suggests Module 12 be the next in line to get updated, or maybe replace Module 12 of CEBoK be taken from the CEBoK-S overview lesson, featuring high-level software information that would be appropriate for the PCEA or CCEA exams. Christina suggests reviewing the PCEA/CCEA exam questions after Module 12 is revised so that the exam reflects the CEBoK materials provided. Kellie agrees.

Jennifer says she's planning for the CEBoK study group sessions at the Workshop, hoping for a few experts per day make themselves available to individuals preparing for the exam. Kevin, Sanath, and Christina volunteer, Rick has some Techomics folks to recommend. The study group will be provided a room where they can view the CEBoK training videos for free and access CEBoK 2.0.

Rick thanks Jennifer, Kevin, and everyone on the call who has been an alpha tester, written questions, or has otherwise contributed to the CEBoK-S/SCEC efforts over the past few months.

Megan reports that she contacted our attorney about securing copyrights for CEBoK-S and the SCEC. The attorney said our copyright on CEBoK will be sufficient to cover CEBoK-S, and that while SCEC is already copyrighted by the Southern California Earthquake Commission, the attorney does not believe we will be prevented from copyrighting the same acronym as the meanings are drastically different and unlikely to be confused. The total cost for copyrighting SCEC will be about $500. Unless the board has any objections, Megan will pursue the SCEC copyright. The board does not object.

<u>Professional Development Update: MOA with DAU</u>   Kevin Cincotta

Kevin reports that he sent the CEBoK-S materials to the DAU lead for their review, received an acknowledging email, and then no further response.

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

<u>2023 Workshop Update: General and Cost Challenge</u>   Jennifer Scheel

Jennifer S. presents slides. Megan says there are 4 booths left in the exhibit hall, and she has a lead for one, but is always looking for new contacts to approach about sponsorships.

Registration for 2023 is trending to exceed 400 attendees, revenue is projected to exceed $180,000, equal to Tampa 2019, better than Pittsburgh 2022.

Progress on the first ever ICEAA Cost Challenge continues apace. Jennifer's team of "Challenge Architects" are individuals who have been on the winning teams of similar government-sponsored challenges, but the group was having trouble finding a real-life dataset for the challenge that wouldn't provide an unfair advantage to any given team, so they settled upon a theoretical, more abstract idea that SCAF used for a challenge previously. The challenge will be released in early April, written presentation files will be sent to ICEAA on the Sunday before the Workshop, the teams will present live to the judges on Wednesday and then the winning team announced on Thursday.

Rick asks how the membership will be notified. Megan says she plans to make the call for teams shortly, with about a 2-week deadline for teams to volunteer. Once the challenge is released after the team entry deadline, no new teams will be admitted. All team members will need to be registered for the Workshop by May 1 (any teams who haven't registered their team members by May 1 will be disqualified).

Christina thanks and congratulates Jennifer and the team for getting this initiative off the ground and encourages all board members to consider sending a team.

Sanath and Cheryl add that the SCAF Challenge is their most popular event and is thoroughly enjoyed by all who participate. They say it's a great way for the young estimators to meet role models and for the juniors to get to know their peers in the industry.

The OEM Forum & Networking Event will be on Monday May 15 from 3-5 at the Workshop; all workshop registrants are welcome to attend.

Megan encourages the board to make their hotel room reservations for San Antonio well before the cutoff date of April 17, and implores everyone who is not a government employee to resist the temptation of booking one of the few government per diem rate rooms we have been able to secure for our government attendees. The earlybird registration rates close on April 4, everyone should register before the rates go up by $100.

ICEAA Board of Directors Meeting

March 31, 2023 | Zoom Virtual meeting

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

<u>2023 Workshop Update: Complimentary Memberships</u>   <u>Megan Jones</u>

Karen Mourikas emailed a question (she was unable to attend) regarding the complimentary memberships that are offered to those Workshop registrants who pay a non-member registration rate. The standard practice is to send coupon codes to those individuals to use to redeem their free year after the Workshop, but Karen is concerned this is too onerous of a task. Megan suggests using this year as a test: to send the coupon codes as usual, but then grant the membership after the coupon code deadline to those who did not use it and then look at the data of how many people used their code vs. didn't to see if it is in fact a barrier. There are no objections to the plan.

<u>2023 Workshop Update: Cost of Everything Podcast Collaboration</u>   <u>Christina Snyder</u>

Christina presents slides. Amritpal Agar, one of our keynote speakers from the 2021 Online Workshop and host of the Cost of Everything Podcast approached Megan, Christina, and Jennifer S. with a crossover marketing plan. The podcast does not have any sponsors to date, and it could be a great opportunity for ICEAA to capitalize on his listenership. For around $3,500 he's offering: short 30-second spots on every podcast, attend the ICEAA Workshop to conduct onsite interviews with our attendees and presenters for a special episode, and then an additional ICEAA-focused episode every year. The podcast has many subscribers in Europe and Australia, and can be a valuable way for ICEAA to gain more exposure in those areas.

Megan and Christina believe this is a very reasonable amount that will be a great value to ICEAA (Megan clarifies the $3,500 estimate is higher than the slides to account for Amritpal's hotel room in San Antonio). Christina adds that this is a non-exclusive agreement, so if we were to find another podcast to sponsor, or Amritpal were to find another sponsor, both are free to do so.

Sanath has been a guest on Amritpal's podcast, that it is very popular in the UK, that Amritpal has done a similar episode of Workshop interviews for ACostE, and that he has approached SCAF with the same, so if we don't take advantage of this opportunity, another organization will.

Christina and Megan say that these sound bytes will be useful in future marketing efforts, and we can team up Amritpal and our photographer to take film some of the interviews for new marketing videos.

Vote: A motion is raised and seconded to approve funding the Cost of Everything Podcast sponsorship agreement at $3,500. All are in favor, and with no objections or discussion, the motion is approved.

2023-2025 Board Election Committee Update   Megan Jones

The 2023-2025 Board of Directors election is underway. During the February meeting, Megan was tasked with reviewing the bylaws and constitution to see whether our idea to allow non-winning candidates from the executive election (Executive Committee and At-Large Directors) to enter the Regional Director elections in their area. Neither the bylaws nor the constitution allow for this, but Megan believes if the board wants to pursue the idea, they can make a decision to do so now on the condition that they will amend the bylaws to officially allow for it in the future.

At the previous meeting, many seemed supportive of allowing non-winning candidates from the executive election to join the regional ballots, others were concerned this was unfair to those who chose to run in the usually less-competitive regional elections that would now face a new challenger.

Megan asks the board to decide to either make a statement allowing for losing candidates in the executive election to join in the regional races later and update the bylaws to reflect this, or to run the election as dictated in the bylaws.

Kellie is concerned about the idea and asks for the pros and cons of either. Megan explains the reasoning behind allowing losing executive candidates to run in the regional elections was to give another opportunity for a volunteer to serve who has expressed the desire to do so; but the con is that it could be unfair to those who chose to run in the regional election.

Bob asks when a decision needs to be made. Megan says she has sent the executive ballots but has held off on sending the regional ballots until the board makes a decision. She could send the regional ballots as early as Monday.

Christina feels we should not change the rules of the election in the middle of the cycle, if we decide to make the change, it should be for the 2025-2027 election. Bob, Rick and Kellie agree. The board agrees to make the election process a topic of discussion for the May board meeting and Megan will distribute the regional ballots on Monday.

OFFICAL MINUTES as approved May 15, 2023

<u>New Business, Plan Next Meeting & Adjourn</u>   <u>Bob Hunt</u>

Bob thanks everyone for a productive and thought- provoking meeting. The board will meet for one hour on April 21 to discuss the ICEAA Software SIG draft strategic plan, and then on May 15 at the Professional Development & Training Workshop

With no objections to the board meeting date or other new business, a motion to adjourn is raised, seconded, and approved. The meeting adjourns at 12:47.