

BOARD OF DIRECTORS - MINUTES

California Association of DECA, Inc. Board of Directors Meeting
November 30, 2023 | Virtual

A. Call to Order and Welcome

The regular meeting of California DECA was called to order at 11:45 AM by Board Chair Michael Acheatel. Michael welcomed new board members Vince and Michael and shared appreciation for the continued service of all board members.

B. Roll Call

Board Secretary Vincent Wu conducted the Roll Call of Board Members and Guests.

Board Members present:

- Michael Acheatel, Chair
- Dennis Mifflin, Vice Chair
- Jeffrey Baughman, Treasurer
- Vincent Wu, Secretary
- Molly Anderson, CDE State Adviser
- Tami Raaker
- Michael Buxton

Not Present:

- N/A

Staff Present:

- Brycen Woodley, State Director
- Ryan Underwood, Executive Director
- Ed Trang, Assistant State Director

It was moved by Jeff and seconded to approve the May 2023 minutes as amended. The motion was adopted unanimously.

It was noted that past Board Member Maureen Rankin's term expired on June 30, 2023. The Board expressed their appreciation for Maureen's many years of service as a Board Member and Treasurer.

C. Reports

1. California Department of Education Report - State Advisor Update Molly Anderson

Our State Superintendent Tony Thurmond has announced his candidacy for Governor of California. This has created some neat opportunities and

exposure for education in general and specifically for CTE (e.g. CTE programs with paid internships). He has convened 10 meetings across the state and engaged County Office of Education. Key items identified by the public at the convening of the Superintendent as state priorities include:

- Teacher and Faculty Shortage (which is becoming a crisis)
- Grow Dual Enrollment
- Data Informed Decisions
- Work-Based Learning Expansion

The CDE is currently updating the CTE state plan. Over the last ten months, they need to address four things: CTE teacher shortage (and teacher shortages as a whole), the need to grow dual enrollment, the inclusion of work-based learning, and using data to improve learning. For the latter, at the CDE there's no real great metrics for obtaining data.

As discussed at the advisor conference, all CTSOs are focusing on going back to basics: to grow student leaders, try to deemphasize over competition, help students to be good people in the community, and model how advisors should conduct themselves.

Personal Finance as a requirement for graduation is looking to head to public as a ballot initiative rather than through assembly (which the bill did not pass through that mechanism in the last session). It was originally proposed to have these courses delivered through social studies/sciences. The CTE community is advocating that those courses go through business and marketing and CTE not social studies. As this initiative comes along, CA DECA and CTE community (not CDE) will need to advocate and be active in sharing public opinion.

Tim Renzata, founder of *Next Gen Personal Finance*, has a mission to get personal finance as a graduation requirement in California. Contrary to other states, there is a big struggle in California. At first, a bill was proposed that personal finance would be a course under Social Science. That bill was killed due to strong opposition from the CDE and educators, so they are looking to do a ballot in November 2024. CDE's stance is the best way for personal finance to be taught is to give it to business and marketing teachers. However, as California Education is locally controlled, if local schools don't have business or marketing teachers by default many would give it to social science teachers.

Dennis noted that they would most likely stick the personal finance with the economics teachers. Part of the reason the bill was killed was because they wanted the Personal Finance component to be a unit within Economics. It was mentioned that CA DEDCA may need to join in advocacy efforts and that it might get to the point we would need to get signatures from the public.

Vince inquired why the math teachers are not in the discussion to teach personal finance. Molly shared that the conversation will vary at the local level. She said we should start talking to local administrators and try to advocate to take over for those courses.

CDE has officially engaged CA DECA for two contracts that are now active. The first is the annual support contract for \$225,000 as previously reported

which is now set for a three-year process and renewal. The other agreement is a one-year \$250,000 contract for business and marketing professional development. This included items like the advisor conference in September as well as elements like standards revisions, futuring panels, enhanced membership in MBA Research, etc.

An important conversation for CTE competitions and particularly DECA and FBLA is the use of ChatGPT and AI for competition. It was noted that Juston Glass was recently selected from a competitive field of educators to serve on the DECA Inc Competition Committee and will be our representative and will be engaged in this discussion. It was also noted that CA FBLA has an adviser on the FBLA National Awards Program Committee and that perhaps Juston and Jacob Avilla could collaborate together to bring a wise and informed California perspective to program.

CTE Teach is also working on retention and recruitment for replacements of teachers that retire.

February 14, 2024 will be the virtual CTSO Summit with CDE and CTSO Board Chairs and State Directors. Michael, Brycen and Ryan will participate with Molly.

2. Management Team Report

A. Membership/Conference Review and Stats

Brycen reported that membership is super dynamic this time of year. We have officially surpassed 6,000 members and quite possibly may reach 6,500 by fiscal year end. As we speak it is continuing to grow and members are still unsubmitted at this time. At this moment our membership total is 6,324 members. For a frame of reference Brycen shared that last year's final membership number was 5,899.

The DECA Power Trip was held in Austin, TX in November. California DECA has 110 attendees.

The annual Advisor Conference took place in September. It was another successful event with 42 advisors in attendance.

Brycen recommended moving next year's December board meeting back so that it falls after the District Conference registration deadline. This will allow more concrete numbers as we are currently in the midst of district and membership registration. For instance, Ed and Brycen are concerned for overflow at districts, and had we waited a week later they would have a report on that for the board.

Brycen said people are waiting to submit members through DECA, Inc. in order to register for Districts.

Our next goal statewide membership goal is to reach 7,000 members. This is the next milestone to receive another allocation to ICDC. We are currently at five competitors in Series Events allowed to advance from state to ICDC, and top four for the Prepared Events.

Michael A. thanks for the membership stats. He would also request conference stats for Power Trip and Advisor Conference as well for future meetings.

B. Status of Chapter Grants

Finance team is working on the chapter grant funds, and chapters will receive grant funds checks within the next couple of weeks.

3. State Officer Team Report

State President Leo Shao has submitted the report.

For the May board meeting the state officers will join us for lunch in Anaheim.

Juston notes that our membership growth is due primarily to SoCal and NorCal. It was reported that Silicon Valley membership numbers are dropping. He is concerned that Silicon Valley is dropping due to inactive chapters and lack of active advisors. He relayed several schools have approached him to start up chapters but cannot due to inability to meet CTE criteria.

Vince inquired if there is dialogue to moving chapters around to even up distributions of districts. He notes MSJ DECA (Silicon Valley) is geographically more north than Irvington DECA (NorCal) when logistically it should be in reverse. This could remedy the dilemma Juston is facing as well as concerns of overflow in NorCal. Brycen said it would require a much more detailed discussion of district boundaries, but a lot of the division occurred the last time around due to chapters desiring to be in certain districts and he has significant concerns about the potential disturbance that would result from revisiting district alignments.

D. Action Items

1. Financial

A. Review and approval of 2022-23 year-end Financial Statements

The year-end closed financial statements for 2022-23 were presented for Board Review. The Board would like to receive three-year comparison financial statements to review at future meetings to get a better idea of growth patterns, cash on hand, reserve standing, investment options, etc.

It was moved by Juston and seconded to approve the CA DECA 2022-23 financial statements as presented. The motion was adopted unanimously.

The Management Team will develop for the May 2024 Board Meeting a provisional proposal for Reserve Limit determination (e.g. 6-12 months expenses) and long-term endowment/ investment.

B. Review and approval of 2023-24 year-to-date Financial Statements

The year-to-date Balance Sheet and Income Statement were presented for Board Review. It was noted that our traditional cash flow rhythm this time of year is primarily an expenditure season with income following from membership, conference and CDE contract later in the spring.

Michael A. notes the growth of income, surpassing where we were before COVID.

Brycen noted at the May meeting that the numbers are slightly inflated. The practice in regard to contracts and grants is to spend the money and get reimbursed later. As a result, in the spring the surplus may look higher than they really are. Additionally, last year our conference numbers were through the roof. State grew to 2,300 attendees from 1,800 the year prior. ICDC had our largest delegation. With such large delegations more money had to be deposited. In actuality, we might need more reserves.

Ryan suggested that we establish an “endowment” with an investment plan. Juston proposes to setup a reserve with inflation accounted for. Or perhaps we should have a six-month benchmark. Ryan agrees that we need to have a more formalized approach.

Michael A. asks by our next May board meeting to have a recommendation. He proposes to have a number desired in reserves by then.

Dennis inquired about NorCal Financial Activity had a cost of \$1. Brycen shared that it is interest. Each individual district does not have individual credit cards California DECA covers most upfront costs for the districts and then invoices the districts back for reimbursement.

It was moved by Juston and seconded to receive the 2023-24 financial reports as submitted. The motion was adopted unanimously.

C. 990 Group Filing Submitted

The annual 990 filing was successfully submitted to DECA Inc on time and a copy was provided to the board for review.

It was moved by Juston and seconded to acknowledge the California DECA 2022-23 990 was successfully submitted to DECA Inc on time. The motion was adopted unanimously.

The Board directs the Management Team to initiate a conversation with DECA Inc about independently filing the CA DECA 990 with the IRS directly rather than with the broader DECA Group Return process.

D. Audit Update

a. Two Fiscal Years Audited: 2020-2021 & 2021-2022

The Audit Committee received and reviewed the final auditors report for FY 2020-21 and for FY 2021-22. Both audits noted no exceptions or findings and a sound accounting management of CA DECA financials as well as grant management procedures and controls environment.

It was moved by the Audit Committee and seconded to approve the CA DECA audit for 2020-21 and 2021-21. The motion was adopted unanimously.

b. Next Audit will be 2022-2023

It was moved by Molly and seconded to appoint Dennis, Michael A., and Michael B. to the Audit Committee. The motion was adopted unanimously.

c. Renewing Auditor

The Board reviewed the services and prices of the currently selected auditor and asked for insights from Audit Committee on the firm. It was determined the current auditors are competent, appropriate, and reasonable in their approach to both nonprofit and more specifically to CA DECA needs and business model. The Board would like the Management Team to investigate a multi-year agreement to see if we can lock in pricing with our current audit firm.

It was moved by Michael and seconded to extend the agreement for auditing services with Hills, Renaut, Homen and Hughes Accountancy Corporation for 2022-23 and 2023-24 audits. The motion was adopted by unanimously.

E. District & State Conference Updates & Discussions

a. Current Year Plans

It's a goal for planning District CDCs to contract two years out. For State CDC the goal is contacting three years out. Hotel backlog for convention and meeting services in California continues to be very strong making availability and negotiation challenging for nonprofits, especially education institutions. Research was presented on current availability, pricing and negotiation options for District and State.

It was noted that NorCal Award session will match the other two Districts of mini awards and final awards.

b. Hotel Contracting for SoCal 2025/2026

SoCal SCDC location at the Delta Hotel in Garden Grove is unfortunately no longer an option. Delta will not provide a contract for two years out and wants only yearly contracts at six months out. The Management Team has been working with Visit Anaheim to survey options across all hotel brands, and the only option the works from a cost, availability, and location standpoint is the Hilton Orange County Costa Mesa. Hotels are hard to book due to the pandemic, and rates are through the roof. Brycen is hoping the pent-up demand from COVID lockdowns will eventually alleviate. Registration amounts should remain the same, but we are waiting on the sales team results.

Michael B. inquired about the max capacity for that hotel. Brycen said it's large and that we're only using 1/3 of their space. Michael B. said because of its proximity with the airport, there are standing contracts with pilots. There have been noise complaints when HOSA has stayed there in the past.

Molly thanked Brycen and Ed for their tireless efforts in booking and working for all these hotels. With costs astronomical and competition against bigger clients this is an issue for many student-based organizations.

It was moved by Dennis and seconded to contract with the Hilton Costa Mesa for SoCal CDC for 2025 and 2026. The motion was adopted unanimously.

c. Hotel Contracting for SCDC 2027/2028

Hotel contracting for future SCDC's has been very challenging. Because of a surge in convention and meeting business paired with intense inflationary pressures it has proven difficult to find safe and affordable options that accommodate California DECA's conference timetable. The Management Team completed a canvas of options across the entire State of California, looking primarily for venues that could accommodate us under one roof from a safety and security standpoint, but also considering options with multiple hotels paired with convention space as we've done in years past in Santa Clara. The board reviewed the bids received and the Management Team discussed at length the options presented, costs, and availability. Ultimately it was decided that the Anaheim Marriott was the safest and most affordable option for SCDC for 2027 and 2028.

Santa Clara is no longer an option with three hotels in the mix and complicated and expensive logistics and significant safety concerns.

It was moved by _____ and seconded to contract with the Anaheim Marriott for SCDC for 2027 and 2028. The motion was adopted unanimously.

F. Advisor Conference 2024

Discussion of Plan & Format

The current approach for 2024 Advisor Conference is Southern California location in partnership with FBLA. The second year of the joint format with DECA+FBLA was successful programmatically, logistically, and from advisor response evaluations.

Molly said in the survey results, DECA was asking for more collaboration time with the FBLA. Advisors also loved the MBA research time.

G. Board Discussion

a. District Action Teams (DAT's)

It was noted that there was a complaint filed by one member of the DAT against another. The matter ended up engaging administration and parents from both local schools as well as parents. The matter was carefully reviewed by local administration and resolved, but the process as well as outcome is still somewhat unsatisfactory to the parties.

It was requested that more guidance and training be provided to those in these roles to help support their process.

It was noted that DAT support in only one District and not others seemed like it was providing opportunities for some and not for others. It was noted that other Districts had attempted but that either interest or support was not there. A key aspect of equity conversation is where they report to in terms of District or State Level and ensuring there is not significant disparity in approaches. The Presidents Council has really served to support access to chapters beyond local level in addition to and in lieu of DAT approaches.

The DAT should be examined in terms of goals, strategy, opportunity, risk, reward, etc. for the May 2024 meeting. Board representatives will discuss with chapters in their district to get their sentiments and insights. Providing provision for plan to implement, appoint, provide compensation, consistent training, etc. for a plan will be key.

There is a discussion about DAT on what their function is in the larger California DECA as a whole. Over the years the lines between State Office and DAT have been blurred. Brycen asked all the board members to ask their respective constituents if they feel the program should continue and how it should function.

It was noted that the Management Team will bring a revised Harassment Policy for consideration in the May 2024 meeting to clarify path of escalation for complaints, concerns, and issues. We currently have a Sexual Harassment policy in place that may be fine in some situations, but, not extensive enough for others.

b. CTE Certification for Advisors

The Board discussed at length the goal and intent of CTE credential certification, and the increased rigor being continually increased and required at the local level to have a CTSO program like DECA.

While it is important for high quality programs and organizations to have standards, it was noted that the CTE Certification requirement as the only single pathway to having a CTSO program can be nearly prohibitive in some environments. It was

noted that credentialing process and requirements are different from county to county. This variance created inequity in terms of cost, time commitment, types of schools, and ultimately access to CTSO opportunities by various student populations. CA DECA agrees to the spirit of high quality CTE and that standards increase quality, consistency, and continuity. The request for Management Team and CDE is to examine and understand the goal of the CTE credential, if there are other suitable paths at all for achieving, how to ensure consistency of verification by all CTSOs, and to turn the requirements of CDE into a distinguishing factor of CTSOs different from other clubs, local organizations, and school activities.

It was noted by Juston that in today's environment there is a severe shortage of teachers let alone qualified teachers having to comply with increased local and state standards. It was stated that we need to help more qualified advisors to be certified. Three different schools have approached Juston about how to start. He wants to get more advisors certified in both public and private schools. It was noted that perhaps CA DECA provide a scholarship for advisors who complete the process successfully to reimburse at least for the expense.

Molly responded that CDE and DECA are doing research regarding this county-by-county requirements and process to be able to assist the process. Currently, the process works by auditing teachers' backgrounds and from there, create a plan how to obtain the credentials. Unfortunately, it also depends on who does the audit. It's a two-part process - first finding someone with the qualified credential, and second who wants to actually want to be an advisor. Because California is locally controlled - some districts have separate pay scales for advisors, some provide stipends while others do not.

It was noted that in addition to local control, CDE does not have jurisdiction over private schools and that they should be exempted from the requirement that the lead advisor must have a CTE credential. Frustration over the tedious and expensive process he has encountered along with the other requirements makes it discouraging to new teachers who are often overwhelmed with everything required to be a teacher let alone additional rigor for optional programs that are often uncompensated and unsupported.

Molly noted that these are valid points and different from when many advisors first started their programs. It was also noted that a CTSO is completely optional and not a requirement, but, if the option is selected all programs must comply with whatever CDE policies exist (e.g. requirements for on-school vs community programs; requirements for adult professional educators and not parents or other school staff, etc.).

Dennis noted that the CDE holds the charter and has the power to mandate to any school--private or public that they can or cannot participate in CTSOs at all. It was also noted that though private schools are not receiving grant money, they are still benefiting from the CDE because the grants pay for the state management teams and conferences which private schools participate in.

It was noted that credentials can be irrelevant, and it is wrong to force advisors receive them as a single pathway for a program. If the desired goal is to better our programs, but credential may not necessarily provide that result to successful chapters, why force the advisors to receive them?

Michael A. notes that because the state has no control over forcing private school teachers to have teaching credentials, how can they force CTSO advisors to obtain one?

Ryan noted that there is disparity on the local control vs state requirements conversation. If state funding is provided but is subject to local control, then how can the state make and enforce certain requirements but not others in a local control scenario. Meaning, how can credentials be required on one hand but there not be a requirement that in order to receive state CTE funding a CTSO is required. For example, if funding is to support HQCTE and CDE can require a credential for a CTSO is it possible to take the next step and require a CTSO and participation at certain levels as a condition of funding. He noted that there must be a distinction from a regular club or campus organization, and the credential is one distinction. It should be a source of celebration and a badge of honor and we need to reposition from a requirement to a differentiator of quality.

Juston noted that just because someone receives a credential that this does not always equate to a great advisor. DECA could put in place a separate process to honor and recognize advisors that would give an even better indication of teacher preparedness and program quality. It was also noted that while it is understandable to require CTE credentials of new teachers that there is no grandfather process for teachers who have historically participated, received DECA/CDE professional development, and have proven integrated and successful winning programs.

We do learn something from the certifications. The goal of this is to have a high quality CTE program; a credential helps insure this. It is true the CDE does not hold authorization over private schools. It is also true that at one point they did not hold this accountability to private school. But rules are constantly evolving. It is coming that ALL advisors must hold CTE credentials.

Michael A. proposes there will be a request of an audit of the current CTE processes.

It was asked if there are other pathways to get the affiliation approved.

Molly once again stated the CTSO is optional. The CDEs point is you do not have to offer DECA, but if you want to offer DECA you have to get this credential.

c. Board Elections: 2024-2026 Term

Two seats for each District will be up for election in the spring of 2024 given term limit change from 3 years to 2 years. Advisors will get to vote two times for candidates and the top two vote getters will come to the board. Tami, Jeffrey and Juston's terms expire this year. The Bylaws state eligibility for other positions as well as appointment vs election process to various positions on the board.

It was noted that there is a three consecutive terms limit for board members in our bylaws. Also, part of our application process notes a recommendation of four years of advisor experience. However, this raises a concern as it may limit potential candidates. Three terms are a limit per the bylaws, but, four years previous advisor requirement is a recommendation and the spirit of experience we are looking for in candidates, but not a firm requirement.

It was noted that we may need to amend the bylaws or interpret practice that if seats are unfilled at election, that a Board Member could be appointed for additional terms.

d. SCDC

SCDC Emergency Protocols

CA DECA has a comprehensive emergency protocol and crisis management policy and guidebook, but it was noted that it would be helpful to have a more streamlined set of protocols to distribute to advisors in advance of the conference. It was requested that two board members serve as the policy making body key point of contact for SCDC.

Michael appointed Juston Glass and Michael Buxton to serve in that capacity.

Board Members who will be recognized on Stage for their service as a board member at this year's SCDC:

1. Juston
2. Jeffrey
3. Tami

e. International Career Development Conference

ICDC Opening State Meeting/Closing State Meeting Discussion.

There is no meeting space at the Disneyland Hotel for our opening or closing meeting. It was noted that meeting space for state meetings is limited for everyone in Anaheim. CA DECA will host opening meetings at the Anaheim Convention Center. We will meet 90 minutes prior to our assigned opening session meeting time. Registration materials will be distributed from a hotel room on Saturday morning (there is no meeting space at the property). Shall we forego a closing state dinner and awards this year? It was felt that in light of these constraints we should forego this year.

Limitation on ICDC Hotel Rooms

We have 200 rooms for ICDC at the Disneyland Hotel. Any overage will mean those chapters will go to whichever properties in the overall DECA INC block of 30+ hotels can accommodate.

H. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the California DECA Board of Directors will be in person May 16-17, 2024 @ the Anaheim Marriott

I. Adjourn

It was moved by Dennis and seconded to adjourn the 2023 Regular Meeting of the California DECA at 12:14 pm. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Vincent Wu
Board Secretary