

The June 9, 2000 MassCUE board meeting was called to order at 5:05 PM by President Nancy Vose. In attendance were: Arthur Jackman, Jim Modena, Beverly Reber, Sharon Eempio, Bob Hanna, Pat Trotman, Marcy Reed, Laurene Belisle, Earle Hancock, Linda Colvin, Lelia Richardson, Charlie Schiller, Priscilla Kotyk, and Steve Olivo from Chicopee. Ron Koehler arrived at 5:25.

Nancy began the meeting with updates of some statewide initiatives. She displayed the MassCUE mission statement to remind the board that we should always use the mission statement as our guide.

### **Update 1: VES**

What is our role in VES? It has been difficult to stay connected to VES without talking to the board.

- VES has reserved a seat on its board for MassCUE.
- VES is now a 501(c)(3), nonprofit organization.
- Kim Joyce owns CLASP. She believes that teachers working together is the only thing that will change education.
- The president of MassCUE was made head of the VES Forum.
- Nancy has positioned us to be a vendor for the DOE to help with the implementation of VES. We don't need to use the privilege, but we can access it if we want.

Nancy sees that their implementation process matches what we do for our SIGs. It creates a sharing community. She passed out 2 handouts: "Bylaws of VES, Inc. (formerly known as North/Networks Inc.)" and "VES implementation model."

Nancy feels that MassCUE should be getting involved with VES. The DOE won't own VES. They have spun it off into a non-profit organization with members of the public on the board.

**Pat Trotman:** MassCUE representation on the VES board? What do they expect from MassCUE?

**Nancy:** They don't expect anything from us. We just sit on a board. Maybe they feel we could help reach other organizations.

**Nancy Vose:** I have spent an enormous amount of time putting us on the vendor list in case we want to use it. VES has already received \$4M from Gates organization to build the site. Partner groups Acton, Springfield, Boston, and Worcester will work on it this summer. It will be at least 3 years before all features will be working. Washington State is a national model of

**Laurene:** At district level, it will require much time. Teachers need to put a lot of time in at first to learn Web-based environment and to log in all their students - before they can begin to participate.

**Jim Modena:** Is the MTA represented on the board?

**Charlie Schiller:** Not yet, but they will be. It's important because of the contractual issue. (Finding the time to work on it and the impact on teachers in classroom.)

**Linda Colvin:** What does it mean that we're on the DOE vendor list?

**Nancy Vose:** Once we're on the list, we can apply to do work for the DOE.

**Earle Hancock:** Would like to register complaint about Nancy's applying to be a DOE vendor without discussing it with the board.

**Nancy Vose:** She said we could discuss that later but not now. Now we're just updating information. Also, she had to make some decisions on her own because the board wouldn't meet and board members wouldn't reply to her e-mail.

### **Update 2: The Online Environments Event held May 11**

300 people attended, and we have made about \$23,000. Nancy has made up report to break down the finances by cost per participant and profit per participant.

**Pat Trotman:** Since it was so successful, should we move to that type of conference where one topic is the covered?

**Ron Koehler:** Do we have figures on how many K-12, higher ed, business, etc. attended.

**Nancy:** No, don't have that breakdown.

**Charlie:** attended several workshops where higher ed people were asking many of the questions.

### **Update 3: BEST**

This week. Was \$35 a head, matching 3/1 in the fall. House upped it to \$75/head, but that source for funding was not guaranteed. Not a good funding source. When the current bill came out of the Senate, it came as \$20M for DOE initiatives plus \$35/student in some type of trust to be spent over 5 years, not by all districts at once. BEST attempted to lobby, and invited Greg Nadeau to a BEST meeting on Tuesday. Now Greg is using the same BEST language in his lobbying. At Tuesday's meeting, they discussed digital divide and school districts that haven't moved forward.

### **Update 4: Grantwriting Workshops**

Overview: Nancy added in SIG meetings in May and June using two new pots of money available to us. We've made new friends on South Shore, Leominster, and Taunton. Experiences resulted in some new insights. At BEST pointed out serious digital divide. We should be looking for conference workshops that show some new tools, better than the Internet or CDROMs. She asked Eileen Spinney to submit a workshop about Palm Pilots.

**Laurene:** Districts are struggling with grant applications. DOE is losing site of technology use. It's what you do with it, not that you have to use cutting edge equipment

and software. We need to have workshops on how to use what we have better, not just how to have new technology.

A discussion of the ITS certification followed.

**Nancy:** ITS certification suggested that ITS should know about adaptive assistive devices. It's in there. Professional development should be in there, too. Connie says need to put only testable items in the certification. Can't test professional development.

**Jim Modena:** Doesn't approve of the DOE practice. Teachers need to speak up. He's not interested in teacher testing. At some point, teachers need to argue about certification. It bothers him that "must be testable" is a requirement. Too much a teacher does is not testable.

**Nancy:** We don't want the description of an ITS to be technical only.

**Laurene:** If you're certified in educational technology, that should be sufficient.

**Ron Koehler:** Collegiality is important. It's already under assault by making conferences not count as professional development.

**Nancy:** We were successful in putting the professional things we wanted into the certification. Now they've taken out all that and put it in the teacher's certification. What's left makes our certification look too technical.

More updates:

- We have 2 workshops accepted at the MTA conference, a panel on staffing plus a grantwriting workshop.
- TechCore Website has been accepted. It is a Web design committee with help by YTE.
- Kathy still involved in MLI. Has applied for the Umass Lowell grant.

Agenda:

### **Secretary's Report from February**

Charlie: Correction Roman numeral XI, #7 6 workshops should be changed to numerous. Minutes were accepted as corrected.

Treasurer's Report:

Arthur went over the enclosed report thoroughly.

A question arose about paying speakers at SIG meetings because the Worcester SIG has been paying the same person \$75 each month to run a training at their monthly meeting. Discussion followed that need to decide on rules and guidelines and go over them with the SIG leaders. The total spent on SIGs has been low. Last year we made a budget. Now need to analyze and revise the budget each year.

**Nancy:** last year's entire SIG budget was Mass Networks money. \$10,000 given as grant last year. Steve Lamarche made the decision to put that money into the SIG account. We did some training. The rest was to be used for SIG expenses.

In report the total amount of grants is listed, but we need to improve the accounting of grants we receive. We need to be able to record what grants are for, what they end up covering. Need to report to the grantor, if necessary. Will develop a plan.

**Priscilla Kotyk:** the \$999 that was donated for Kids & Technology in 1999 was a GTE grant. It should be included in that grants total.

Arthur: The conference money that comes in before the beginning of the fiscal year in which the conference is held throws off reports. Also Arthur reports money that has been deposited, but he needs to know and to report what has been invoiced and what is outstanding.

A discussion followed regarding the checks for \$9,800 and \$8,000 that were received from Mass Networks and the check for \$5,000 from Mass Tech Corp.

The grant money from Mass Networks was never approved by the board. Nancy felt the board wasn't meeting and wasn't responding to her requests for a decision to accept the funds. She had to make a decision, so she decided to accept the money.

On December 8, the board passed 3 motions regarding large amounts of money.

- 1) There must be board approval for any expenditure over \$1,000.
- 2) That any grant must be voted on by the board.
- 3) That there be a requirement that all proposals for grants or other funding be presented in writing at a board meeting (with a statement of specific expenses to be incurred by MassCUE). The board must vote prior to the agreement.

**Nancy:** Didn't see this money as a grant because she didn't ask for it. They approached Nancy to help keep MassCUE going for a few months. Nancy has submitted time sheets Sept-May. Steve Miller offered money to MassCUE so she could run additional SIG meetings.

**Sharon Eempio:** still doesn't understand. Have we done everything that was agreed? Have we paid the bills?

**Nancy:** Yes, we have accomplished everything. Look at my time sheets

**Ron Koehler:** point of order. We were considering the treasurer's report. Let's finish it before transacting other business.

Arthur needs to know whether to return checks. We're in a Catch 22. Mass Networks has given us a check for services to be done. If we return check, will be looked at with suspicion?

**Pat Trotman:** This isn't MassCUE's money. It's specifically to pay Nancy for running meetings for the DOE and Mass Networks.

**Ron:** Is there a motion on table?

**MOTION:** Motion is made to approve the Treasurer's Report (except for) these 3 checks.

Unanimous.

Discussion of first check: \$8,000 from Mass Networks.

**MOTION:**

Earle makes a motion that the \$8,000 check be returned with a letter indicating that since it was a contract between Nancy and Mass Networks, that payment for Nancy's services be worked out by them.

What will happen? Will we lose credibility?

**Pat Trotman:** We have to set some precedent now. Need prior board approval. Lot needs to be examined.

**Earle:** Nancy's grantwriting workshops are excellent. He takes issue with the paragraph in the agreement that says MassCUE will market VES. He doesn't think we should be an active supporter of VES.

**Laurene Belisle:** This agreement simply was not approved by the board. In her district, it's not unusual for prior approval to be required for paying or receiving funds.

**Sharon:** Are we shooting ourselves in the foot? How much have we actually spent that was to be covered by this check. I don't think we should accept it, but I also worry about how much we have already spent.

**MOTION:** Jim moves to limit discussion on each issue on each check for more than 10 minutes.

Marcy second. Discussion: should we limit each to 7 minutes?

5 opposed to limiting discussion to only 7 minutes each, so limit to 10.

Immaterial whether we have spent this money already. We need to return the check.

**Sharon:** How does it impact financially? We don't want to look stupid.

**Nancy:** printing and mailing extra calendars already cost \$800.

**Arthur:** Will it hurt the credibility of the organization if we return the money?

**Linda Colvin:** It worries her that we already voted against this in December.

**Nancy:** Didn't consider it a grant because they were paying us for a service.

**Sharon:** Right, it isn't a grant. Nancy has portrayed us as a vendor in this one. What did our motion say?

“ . . . grant or any other funding proposal over \$1,000.” The motion was not limited to grants.

**Laurene:** Also, the bylaws say that “revenues are not distributable to members or officers except as approved by the Governing Board, for either reimbursement of related expenses or compensation for approved services.”

**Bob Hanna:** We need to be careful how we word letter. The best way to deal with this one is to be sure expenses are reimbursed and paid to Nancy as a consultant. It's a technicality.

**Ron:** It's a technicality, but if we don't return the check, we aren't abiding by the bylaws. Phrase the letter so that as a technicality, it needs to be an individual contract.

**Amending the MOTION:**

In accordance with our bylaws, the MassCUE board was not able to consider and approve or disapprove the proposal of April 28 for (then list what is on the invoice).

Seconded: Laurene

**Vote:** one abstention (Sharon)

**Nancy:** Connie wanted to give us funds to keep us going because we didn't have the money to pay Nancy. She offered to pay MassCUE for her to do the workshops.

Motion: Move to amend the previous motion so it will include reference to both checks.  
Bev second

Discussion:

**Sharon:** The questions are the same. What have we spent for travel, hotels, refreshments, etc.?

All in favor of amended motion.

VOTE: 2 abstains

Mass Tech Corps check for \$5,000:

This was accepted by the board by email.

Jim explained. Basically Mass Tech Corp wants us to put a link on our page and try to get people in schools to volunteer. They need some PR and want us to help. If we would put links to their site, they would pay us \$5,000. We could use money to support our own site. Jim thinks it's a good idea.

The web committee and how it should operate is a different issue. We need to form an organized committee. At the moment there is an awkward situation around the issue of the committee members getting paid for their work. Jim didn't feel the committee would want to be paid, but he thinks others who showed an interest in being on the committee thought they would be paid. So far the organization of a committee hasn't gone anywhere. It will require some face-to-face meetings. Board needs to charge someone with the responsibility of organizing a committee.

Jackman: I know we voted to accept the money, but he would like the "contract" to be reworded. It was an initial "agreement" that isn't final. We need to communicate with Mass Tech Corp to improve the written agreement that we will link to their site and do limited promotion for them. The board needs to reply to a revised agreement.

**Jim:** We didn't accept money without understanding of what we'd do. We met with the Mass Tech Corp people and agreed that all we have to do is link to them. That original agreement was written quickly, so we shouldn't have a problem getting one that's reworded.

**MOTION:** Jim

That we will only cash the check if the letter agrees to 2 things in principle: That we will link to MassTech Corp's web site and that we will do limited promotion of Mass Tech Corps at our conference.

The revised agreement will be e-mailed and approved for vote.

**VOTE:** Ron abstain.

### **Conference Committee Report - Marcy Reed**

We are in the middle of organizing the program. Meeting with program committee.

Bob Hanna reports that MEC will provide the hands-on areas with a T-1 at no cost.

The committee would like to alter the pricing structure by increasing the cost by \$15/day. One day's attendance would be: \$100 for members/110 for nonmembers  
Two day's attendance would be \$190 for members/210 for nonmembers  
We would like to discourage onsite registration by charging \$135/day.

**MOTION:** Move to approve increased conference fees.  
Laurene second.

VOTE: Unanimous

**PDP's:** In light of the Commissioner's last letter about PDPs, we need to make it clear in our literature that MassCUE will provide PDPs as usual. It is the responsibility of the attendees to use them in accordance with their individual plans. All we can realistically do is identify the strands. We need to include information to dispel the impression that teachers can't get PDPs if they don't get 10 hours all at once.

**Sharon:** If they have to produce a product to get pdp's, they could submit to MLI or write a short article

Linda is concerned about potential problem that technology challenge grant money can not be used for conferences. The state board of education is ripping rug out from under us by saying that the \$35/student can be used for professional development but that conferences don't count. 85% of our registrations are paid by purchase orders from school departments. There will be a significant impact if they won't support conferences.

#### **State House Day - Priscilla Kotyk**

State House Day was a success. 27 schools participated.

#### **Online Environments, May 11 Event - Nancy Vose**

Revenue How to spend?

#### **Web Page Redesign Committee:**

Valerie Becker, Jim Modena, Cindy Good, Barbara Peskin, Kathy Peloquin  
Youth Tech Entrepreneurs want to help out.

A few thought they would be paid to do it. Jim encourages volunteers.

**Marcy:** Until the board voted to pay Nancy, we had a volunteer organization.

**Nancy:** The organization is not 100% volunteer. Clerical and bookkeeping services are paid.

**Marcy:** We pay for clerical and bookkeeping but not beyond that. The board can approve payments to other people, but must get board approval.

**Jim:** For the web page redesign committee, it needs to be clarified.

Sharon wants to be part of the team.

#### **Pathfinders - Bob Hanna**

4 in so far

**Nancy:** VES is having board meeting. Do we want to stay connected, on the board?  
Nancy is not comfortable about going to meetings without the board behind her. We should have a liaison who can report back.



**Colvin:**

MOTION that MassCUE board will appoint a representative to the VES board.

**Vote:** unanimous

Discuss: Someone needs to volunteer. Sharon wants to know who would do it and what the duties are.

Earle volunteers, and Jim volunteers as alternate. Nancy will submit Earle's name. They are just building the board. Bylaws are proposed.

### **Board Survey - Nancy Vose**

Nancy would like to know why the board didn't fill it out.

**Laurene:** It was overwhelming. Too many questions. Seemed as though she wouldn't be able to explain the answers.

**Bev:** Thinks we're small enough that we should discuss our goals, not fill out a questionnaire.

**Sharon:** The survey made her uncomfortable. Surveys can be misinterpreted. Face-to-face is better.

**Linda:** She filled it out, but she had to check too many maybe's.

**Nancy:** It was a way to reflect MassCUE involvement. Only intention was to help the board reflect on what Nancy has been doing. Don't think group reflects on the Mission Statement in its decisions.

**Linda:** Not a bad idea to have survey, and collecting data can be a way to evaluate where you are and how to set goals. Thought wording and choices on this one were difficult.

**Priscilla:** Not able to get into it. Timing was beginning of May. Probably should agree on a survey. To make it valid, same survey goes out year-after-year. Can't discuss every issue. Her district does survey of all staff.

**Pat:** The questions about the organization's looking for funding bothered her. Are we an organization that is looking for funding?

**Nancy:** NECC

MassCUE needs to send someone to NECC to attend the affiliate meeting on Saturday, look for new vendors, look for keynotes. Need to interact with other affiliates. As a state organization of high regard to move forward, we need to be involved in the national organization. Do we want representation or not? Nancy has tried to stay connected by submitting nominees for awards, etc. Someone needs to represent MassCUE nationally.

**Linda:** agrees need representation at the national level. Some boards pay fee and transportation. Some pay only fees.

**Laurene:** has attended 3 national conferences this year. Doesn't see MassCUE's benefit in attending.

**Nancy:** Laurene attended as her school district representative, not as an affiliate representative.

**Priscilla:** thinks we must pay transportation and fee. We need to plan for next year now, not necessarily to send someone this year.

**Sharon:** How much would it cost?

**Nancy:** \$1,000 Board needs to make a decision to pay \$1,000 each year, no matter where NECC is held.

**Priscilla:** Move to allocate \$1,000 of the May 11 profits to send someone this year.

Second: Linda

Amend motion: To earmark \$1,000 to send a representative, chosen by the board, to the NECC conference this year and to make it a line item in the budget for the future.

Vote: 6 no      6 yes

**Nancy:**

Nancy checked with the Willits-Hollowell Center. It is available in August. A plan needs to be made by an organization, not by an individual. Nancy is resigning right now if the board won't work over the summer to reorganize. She feels a distrust and dislike of Nancy Vose from this group, not from contacts throughout the state. She needs to move out of the way. She is putting entirely too much time into MassCUE work.

**Earle:** In 1998, when the board decided to pay Nancy, she agreed to make a plan by December 31, 1998. She still hasn't done it.

**Nancy:** She will leave tonight. Yes, she has done a lot of work on creating a business plan. She is not comfortable making plan for the board. They need to do that themselves. Nancy's work is much more structure. She sees enormous opportunity for funding for MassCUE, and she has developed relationships with corporations that can get us more money.

**Sharon:** We need to let go. Yes, Nancy was supposed to get a plan. We aren't paying her. If we don't pay her, we can't expect her to make a plan. Why belabor the point.

**Jim:** He has been on the board since the beginning. Now we're in a place where we can't go on. Something must happen.

**Nancy:** She knows enough to step aside. She knows she has to move on.

**Jim:** We're stuck.

**Earle:** Nancy ignores the bylaws. Even her letter of resignation doesn't follow bylaws.

**Nancy:** You are at the place where you could stand so tall. You could be huge voice for teachers. You're right on a precipice. There is funding out there. There's a law in ed reform that if the organization pays its president, the president can take 4 years off and still stay in the retirement system. Now is the time. You want to go back to being an organization that does nothing except run a conference with a president who just runs board meetings.

**Earle:** Laurene is more capable than that. She developed a conference that really is MassCUE. She would do more than run the meetings.

**Marcy Reed:** We're in a place we can't move. For the good of the organization, Nancy has to resign or the rest of the board must.

**Linda Colvin:**

**MOTION:** Move that the board will accept the resignation of Nancy Vose as President of MassCUE, effectively immediately.

Marcy: Second

Discussion:

**Sharon:** She understood that Nancy had already agreed to resign, so don't understand why we have to force the issue and lose her guidance.

**Jim:** We have already reached that point, so we have to end it.

**Linda:** We have been struggling with our identity for 5 years. We, as a volunteer organization, don't have the people power to do the state-wide work we want. MassCUE has grown. Linda believes that we will need to, at some point, have staffing.

**Jim:** There's a larger issue. Do we want to pay. Do we not? We put the cart before the horse. We need to decide our structure, where we want to be. We have done it the other way around. We need to pull back, regroup, and take stock of where we stand.

**Laurene:** It's like being given a huge amount of money to spend on equipment and running out to buy the equipment without a plan. We're the same way.

**Sharon:** We don't want to make anything Nancy has done lessened. She has gotten us out there, and we can't fault her for that. We want what is best for the organization.

**Pat Trotman:** We used to concentrate on sharing with teachers. We're succumbing to new technology. We need to be a small way to reach small enclaves where people need to get involved in this group. Look at calendar in last few months. Where are the meetings that teach small things teachers need? We're spreading ourselves too thin.

**Laurene:** Nancy has been valuable, but the bylaws are necessary.

**Jim:** The best indication that people are dissatisfied is lack of attendance at board meetings. We can't accomplish anything if no one is here, but no one wants to attend.

**Arthur:** Can find a lot of people who don't have a full time job, but not many would have worked as hard as Nancy. It's a tribute to her that she has offered us the out by resigning.

Motion to move the motion.

Vote 1 abstention

No 2

Linda Colvin:

That the board will accept the resignation of Nancy Vose as President of MassCUE, effective immediately.

Marcy second

Vote:

All yes with 1 abstention

**Nancy:** She wants to know if she is still a member of the board, even though she resigned as president.

**Jim:** We need to have Algot research the bylaws. We need to be sure we follow the letter of the law.

**Laurene:** She believes the past president position isn't even in the bylaws. It was created as a courtesy to keep Alan November on the board, but she doesn't think the bylaws make it automatic for a former president to become past president.

**Earle:** Over the past few months, he felt the board acted with integrity. It was our power and strength that we made an intelligent plan. Now he sees hypocrisy. He moves that the board accept his resignation immediately.

Motion: to table Earle's motion to resign until next meeting.

Passed

Must set date of the next board meeting. June 21<sup>st</sup> 4:30

Priscilla Motion to adjourn

Second Arthur

Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15.

