ICEAA Board of Director's Meeting

11:00 – 1:00 | Friday, 10 July 2026

Zoom Virtual Meeting

OFFICIAL MINUTES approved 21 August 2026

Voting Attendees:

Christina Snyder, Arlene Minkiewicz, Javier Provencio, Carol Dekkers, Brian Glauser, Steve Glogoza, Rich Hartley (via Glogoza proxy), Tom Bosmans, Madeleine Teller, Courtney Gray, Cari Pullen, Kimberly Roye (via Teller proxy), Kellie Benefiel, Patrick Casey, Sanath Rajagopal

Non-voting Attendees:

Sharon Burger, Megan Jones, Kevin Cincotta

Summary:

The Board reviewed a proposed transfer of CPM member benefits, financials, governance changes, IT support, and revenue proposals. The Board will form a small team to analyze CPM benefit transfer. The Board voted on a change to the petition for ballot access bylaws but retained the 25 signature petition threshold. Additionally, hiring an IT vendor for 10 hours per month at $175 an hour was approved. The Norfolk Professional Development and Training Workshop projected a $114k net ($44k in 2025 and $70K in 2026), and the registration fee for 2027 was recommended to be increased by $50. The Board is exploring adding a 501(c)(3) charitable arm, with a recommendation to form an exploratory committee.

Welcome, quorum count, introductions: Christina Snyder

Christina welcomes the group, a quorum is established, and the meeting begins at 11:04 am.

Secretary Report: Madeleine Teller

No comments or edits were suggested for April 2026 minutes, either in advance of the meeting or during.

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

Madeleine presents slides outlining the CPM absorption details and summarized CPM's request that ICEAA take over programs and member benefits as CPM faces bankruptcy, noted the initial proposal shown in May, and described follow-up calls that produced additional detail but left outstanding concerns about the workload implied by CPM's messaging. She introduced the proposed LinkedIn announcement and asked members to review its contents. The board reviewed CPM's listed benefits—conferences, webinars, the

monthly Global Conversation Club, ISO standards access, and an Earned Value track—and confirmed CPM's membership is about 80 with a LinkedIn group of roughly 700 people. Members debated whether the memo's wording implied ICEAA would inherit operational responsibilities.

One of the proposed benefits, the Global Conversation Club, was described as a low-attendance monthly live event that could carry ICEAA branding, and the CPM material library would need hosting on SharePoint or the ICEAA website and someone to curate videos or maintain YouTube access. Members emphasized that words in CPM's memo make these tasks sound more difficult than they are and that existing YouTube content could simply be linked or co-branded.

Participants described the Global Conversation Club as an external program where ICEA could appear as a sponsor without ownership or control, noted possible monthly meeting participation, and discussed limited engagement with other EVM-related groups unless volunteers champion them.

Members discussed whether CPM's offerings align with ICEAA's strategic plan and many felt CPM could help reach cost-estimating-adjacent professionals and support training and the body of knowledge, though some items offer limited incremental value. The group agreed that more detailed investigation is required and proposed convening a small team to assess technical requirements, costs, and exact commitments before deciding.

The discussion began with questions about CPM sponsorship counts and lack of financial transparency, noting CPM would not provide financial records and claimed recent losses, which prevents ICEAA from seeing prior financials or obligations. Participants expressed concern about the unclear monetary value of sponsorships and the inability to contact CPM members without permission.

The team reviewed ISO access rules, including that only named working-group members and mirror committees can view draft documents and that drafts can't be publicly released, and Carol clarified that ISO mirror committees are organized by country and restrict distribution of copyrighted material.

The Board discussed the logistics of a new EVM working group, along with a desire to avoid overburdening existing staff, interest in having CPM experts review ICEAA modules, and uncertainty about member overlap between CPM and ICEAA affecting perceived value of the acquisition.

Team members debated the strategic upside of acquiring CPM members and IP versus the risk of overpromising benefits; some advocated treating CPM as a semi-independent unit to capture membership and talent, while others urged a methodical review of what ICEA would get and the costs involved.

Carol asked whether CPM would be merged into ICEAA or leave ICEAA responsible for financial obligations, and Christina clarified CPM is closing with no financial liability and would transfer IP and members to ICEAA; Carol requested specifics on CPM's ISO standards work for further assessment.

Carol outlined that ISO participation can demand organization-level membership and committee work, potentially incurring costs (for example, ~ $1,500/year for some IEEE/INITS participation) and significant ongoing effort, and offered to guide ICEAA through ISO involvement. Madeleine acknowledged needing help understanding ISO implications.

The group agreed that an MOU and a revised LinkedIn announcement should be drafted and reviewed by the board with an email vote; Madeleine volunteered to draft those documents and give Rebecca an update, Christina offered assistance and to set up a Teams link, and Megan took responsibility for presenting the bylaws edits in Word with track changes visible.

Action: Madeleine will edit the LinkedIn announcement and draft an MOU, in addition to setting up a meeting to discuss the ISO with Carol.

Megan presents the amended bylaws on the Petition language. The bylaw language allows candidates not accepted by the nominating committee to petition onto the ballot. The group debated increasing the required petition signatures from 25 to 100; which was rejected, and the threshold remained at 25 signatures. Participants raised wording concerns and preferred softer language to "override" or "rejected", and minor changes were made to the proposed bylaw language. Participants questioned whether petitions for regional director positions must be signed by members from that region, discussed feasibility in small regions, noted petitions have been rare historically, and concluded any member should be able to sign.

Vote: Motion is raised to approve the new bylaws language for petitioning to be on the ballot for the Board of Directors. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

ICEAA Board of Director's Meeting

11:00 – 1:00 | Friday, 10 July 2026

Zoom Virtual Meeting

OFFICIAL MINUTES approved 21 August 2026

Treasurer's Report — Arlene Minkiewicz

Arlene presents slides. She showed balances and trends showing seasonal July declines and a ~$50k year-over-year drop. Arlene points out that of the $114,000 profit for Norfolk, $44,000 was collected in 2025, which will be $70,000 profit in 2026. Arlene also described stalled reimbursement discussions with SCAF treasurer David Hedley. Sanath will facilitate contact with David Hedley, and Arlene will continue to pursue repayment for the joint SCAF/ICEAA workshop in 2024.

Professional Development Update: — Kim Roye

With Kimberly absent, the board noted certification activity is going well. Megan received another request for a CCEA "retired". Megan and Sharon to present a recommendation to use the "emeritus" designation rather than "retired" for CCEA at the next meeting because the issue has recurred and prior votes were incomplete.

Workshop feedback indicated CEBoK presentation slides appear dated relative to member presentations and the wiki; members proposed updating slide templates more efficiently using AI tools, interns, or internal templates, and Madeleine offered to share a cleaner slide set (with no changes to content) that she uses to help accelerate modernization, which also may be facilitated by using junior cost estimators and AI for clean up purposes.

Action: Madeleine to provide Kim with her cleaned up version of the slides.

Sean Wells was not present, so the Module 14 (Contract Pricing) updates were deferred to the next meeting.

2026 Workshop Update: — Megan Jones

Megan reviewed sponsorship outcomes and attendee composition, noting three gold sponsors and an unsold platinum tier and breaking down government and private-sector representation including international delegations. She presented expense line items (other expenses, AV, food/beverage), historical attendance comparisons, per-attendee expense trends, and proposed modest ticket-rate increases and an FY26 early-purchase special to encourage early registration and capture government budgets. The FY26 early-purchase special will be the opportunity to buy registration at the 2026 cost prior to October 1.

The group discussed registration mechanics, confirming names can be transferred for prepaid spots to accommodate early buys by organizations, and emphasized targeted early outreach to government attendees for St. Louis given Norfolk's driving accessibility contributed to late sign-ups.

Action: Megan to open registration next week.

ICEAA External Support — Megan Jones

Megan reached out to an IT vendor she used in the past. She summarized the vendor's offer of a 10-hour/month retainer at $1,750 with rollover hours and scalable work for website/database tasks (reports, archives behind paywall, chatbot). Board members asked about contract terms and payment cadence; the group agreed the service is valuable and voted to hire the vendor on the proposed retainer pending clarification of commitment details.

Vote: Motion is raised to hire the vendor for $175 hours at 10/hours a month. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

501(c)6 versus 501(c)3 — Megan Jones

Megan recounted speaking with a lawyer who said switching from a 501(c)(6) to a 501(c)(3) primarily requires administrative work like bylaw changes and form filings, with manageable legal fees if the board performs the admin tasks. She clarified she researched the differences to ensure full understanding.

Megan defined the 501(c)(6) role as professional associations providing member benefits and advocacy, and the 501(c)(3) role as charitable/educational with public-benefit constraints and revenue tied to charitable programs. She noted lobbying limitations are practically minimal for them but emphasized the distinct purposes of each status.

Megan confirmed that an organization can have both a 501(c)(6) and a 501(c)(3), but the 501(c)(3) must only perform charitable work and cannot transfer funds to the 501(c)(6). She described a common model where the main organization handles industry activities while a separate scholarship arm handles charitable donations and awards.

Megan reviewed IRS rules showing that sponsorship benefits are limited for deductible gifts, advertising or linking is restricted, and payments tied to conventions/trade shows are not

deductible; thus, tax-deductible donations would need to fund defined charitable programs such as scholarships.

Brian asked whether a 501(c)(3) could fund research and Megan confirmed grants and research are possible but require hiring a grant writer and producing specific proposals, which would be a productive exercise for clarifying public-facing language. The lawyer had noted adding a 501(c)(3) would require separate annual filings and potentially bylaw rewrites if changing status. The group agreed that more investigation is needed to determine value and feasibility.

Christina proposed using a 501(c)(3) to fund outreach and education for students to grow the profession, and Brian and Christina discussed potential uses such as scholarships or grants for CEBoK updates. Christina asked whether scholarship funds could pay workshop attendance for students; Megan said she would investigate and cautioned that past practice required strict separation between entities. The group emphasized legal compliance and avoiding misuse of funds, and Christina asked Brian to continue leading thinking on a charity committee, which he accepted.

Action: Brian to spearhead brainstorming efforts on potential for establishing a 501(c)3.

Incentivizing Growth — Javier Provencio

Javier introduced multiple revenue and expense-allocation ideas framed like corporate IRAD investments, including a marketing retainer, trade-show funding, automated membership renewals, partial travel funding, behind-paywall content, bonuses tied to brand growth, a sponsor raffle, and a monthly membership pilot. He emphasized these ideas aim to generate measurable ROI and stabilize cash flow versus episodic membership variability.

Javier argued for disciplined ROI tracking for shows (example $4,000 → 20 members) and linked these initiatives to the treasurer's cost analysis and the need for financial sustainability into 2027 and beyond. He stressed incentives for directors and chapter engagement to drive membership growth and retention.

The group discussed piloting monthly memberships and pricing elasticity around $10–$12; Megan said the system can support monthly billing, but she lacks the know-how to enable it and that IT support could activate automatic renewals and improve reminder emails. Participants flagged operational consequences for accounting and coding work if monthly billing is adopted.

Brian proposed a magazine-issue sponsorship product distinct from ads to raise revenue for the magazine; discussion clarified ads remain separate from issue sponsorships. The team debated researching 501(c)(3) status but concluded the organization must first define the intended use cases before pursuing it.

The group revisited incentive ideas for member recruitment, including meaningful rewards rather than nominal prizes; Kevin described leveraging corporate purchasing rewards to obtain Amazon gift cards at no incremental cost for bonuses. Christina emphasized designing incentives that genuinely motivate a membership drive.

Javier asked whether the team wants to evaluate, implement, or discard the ideas and emphasized speed to market to avoid losing months before the next workshop; the conversation closed on the need for a team evaluation and prioritization approach.

The chapter reviewed historical certification counts and opened the ROI discussion on revenue-generating initiatives for certifications. Javier framed CEBoK growth as a priority and suggested marketing allocations rather than external lead purchases to increase certification uptake.

Participants debated terminology and scope between a marketing retainer and trade-show funding, confirmed that exhibiting requires a booth and staff, and discussed paying travel for strong member speakers to amplify outreach while being cautious about paying members for traditionally volunteer activities.

Megan proposed building a detailed plan and buying targeted lists, Javier clarified the purpose of an IRAD-like earmark for revenue generation, and Javier agreed to pick a first date and lead the planning while inviting volunteers to join; attendees asked to be included in the effort.

Action: Javier to select a date to meet to plan marketing efforts, and lead planning

Action Item Review: Madeleine Teller

Madeleine reviews the action items and gets updates on all the action items from the group.

Plan Next Meeting & Adjourn Christina Snyder

The board agrees to hold their next meeting in person on Friday, August 21 from 11:00AM-1:00 PM with lunch preceding. A motion to adjourn is raised, seconded, and approved. The meeting adjourns at 3:59 pm EST.