

**Midwest IEC
Board Meeting Minutes
July 2019**

Present: Don Hulse, Gary Dykstra, JB Boender, Jeff Wiers,
Absent: John Evorik, Mark Campbell
Others: Pam Evorik, Kevin McNulty, Ryan Ferry

Approval of Mark Campbell to Board

<u>Motion</u> to approve	Gary Dykstra
<u>Second</u>	John Evorik

Minutes

The minutes from May were read.

<u>Motion</u> to approve Minutes	John Boender
<u>Second</u>	Mark Campbell
MOTION - Passed	

ED Billing

Kevin presented his billing of May

<u>Motion</u> to approve billing	Gary Dykstra
<u>Second</u>	John Boender
MOTION - Passed	

Old Business

Next General Meeting
Our next General Meeting will be EXPO

New Business

Next Board Meeting

Chapter Awards

Graduation Dinner

Treasurer's Report

Checkbook balance \$16,819.97

Investment portfolio \$81,367.99

Motion to approve treasurer's report

John Evorik

Second

John Boender

MOTION - Passed

Dues

Voltage Systems is due

Apprentice Program

Online Apprentice Program

The board dedicated all business of the meeting to a discussion regarding our proposed Online Apprentice Program. Under consideration were two existing programs currently operated by the Utah Chapter and the Maryland Chapter (Chesapeake). The phone call with Utah began at 5:00 pm and the call with Maryland began at 6:00.

Many topics were discussed with both parties. Some of the prominent topics discussed with both proposals included:

1. Impact of Online on current "Brick and Mortar" program

Neither Utah nor Maryland have experienced a negative enrollment on their On-site classes as a result of their Online classes. Both Chapters have higher enrollments than Midwest IEC. **[The board tended to favor more controlled start dates]**

2. What parameters are set (distance or time) to permit Online enrollees

Maryland set parameters of distance and travel-time, along with special exemptions (approved by their committee) for certain situations (i.e. single-parent dads). Utah places no restrictions on who can enroll for the Online Class versus the On-Site Class. **[The board generally felt that our chapter to protect any possible negative enrollment impacts from the Online program but did not conclude the exact method. A "watch and see" approach seemed to be the board's consensus]**

3. Year-round versus scheduled starts

Maryland allows for individual start-ups at any time year-round. Utah follows a standard school year and offers and "2nd start" for First-Year Students that runs from January to August. **[The board was more in favor of a scheduled start like Utah.]**

4. How instruction is delivered

Maryland and Utah chapters were similar in approach. Maryland tended to monitor attendance through weekly assignments. With “online face-to-face” help sessions schedule at the student’s request. Utah required weekly “attendance” at live online sessions where instructors take roll and students are free to ask their individual questions at that time or request a scheduled time. Both Maryland and Utah utilized weekly-submission of work by students in order to maintain a schedule. There was some question as to the management of the Maryland program in lieu of their “year-round start” policy. **[The board felt the Utah approached match the needs of IEC better]**

5. Labs

Maryland leaves labs mostly up to the employer. Some minor labs (like not tying etc.) are done using video. Utah has scheduled lab days where contractor come to their site on two Saturdays during the semester to execute labs. **[The board discussed the importance of maintaining the quality of our labs. Conducting labs on Saturdays at our current site and offering labs as needed at a remote site was discuss. Not final plan was established. It was felt that whatever plan was established would hinge on the location of the students who sign up for online training. Mark Campbell offered his shop as a possible more northerly location. There was a consensus that Onsite labs should be established at regular intervals – location and regularity to be decided once we receive Online applicants.]**

6. Other information gained

Brad Stephens stated that his tracking of On-Site versus Online instruction demonstrates that Online Students score higher on national testing than do Onsite.

Kevin demonstrated the nature of instruction he uses in his online teaching at his local junior college.

The board clarified the different between a “correspondence course” and an “online course.” Online courses are prepared in advance and available at any time within a schedule timeline period. Correspondence courses are live “remote learning.”

7. Board Consensus

The Board asked both Utah and Maryland to send sample Labs.

Pending review of the sample labs, the board made the decision to partner with the Utah Chapter. Their approach, format and philosophy tended to be more aligned with that of Midwest IEC.

Kevin will send out lab information to the board once it is received. Board will take official action regarding Utah versus Maryland via email following final review of the labs.

Round Table

No Round Table was conducted

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn

John Boender

Second

Gary Dykstra

MOTION – Passed

Respectfully submitted by Kevin McNulty on behalf of Jeff Wiers, Secretary