

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the**  
**STATE BOARD OF CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION**  
**HELD AT THE OLIVER HODGE EDUCATION BUILDING,**  
**2500 NORTH LINCOLN BOULEVARD, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA**

**May 15, 2025**

The State Board of Career and Technology Education began its regular meeting at 9:00 a.m. Thursday, May 15, 2025, at the Oliver Hodge Education Building, Room 1-20, Oklahoma City, OK, and the meeting was also streamed on YouTube. Notice was properly given, and the final agenda was posted at 2:52 p.m. on May 13, 2025, in accordance with 25 O.S. 2011, § 311(9).

Members of the State Board of Career and Technology Education present and all appeared in person:

- Mr. Brent Haken, state director, ex-officio nonvoting member
- Mr. Ryan Walters, state superintendent of public instruction and chair of the board
- Mr. Michael Brown, Lawton
- Mr. Randy Gilbert, Tecumseh
- Ms. Shaelynn Haning, Tulsa
- Mr. Leonard McCullough, Tulsa
- Mr. Rob Seeman, Morris

Members of the State Board of Career and Technology Education who were absent:

- Mr. Zachary Archer, Hammon
- Mr. Peter Dillingham, Enid

Attendees from the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education and other guests:

See Attachment A.

**1.01 CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Superintendent Ryan Walters called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and Ms. Ashley Rink called the roll and ascertained there was a quorum.

**1.02 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, SALUTE TO THE OKLAHOMA STATE FLAG AND  
A MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Led by Superintendent Ryan Walters.

**1.03 OPENING COMMENTS**

**Superintendent Ryan Walters** said, "The director and I were discussing moving a few items around on the agenda. If there's any issue that would require a vote, please let us know. We'd like to move both of our comments to the end —. Correct, director?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** responded, "Yes, if you all don't mind, we'd like to move items 1.03 and 1.04 to the end so we can address the action items before a few of you need to leave for [Senate] confirmation hearings. That means we'll go ahead and skip down to item 1.05. Is any action needed to do that, or are we good to just state it and move forward, Maria [Ms. Maria Maule, senior assistant attorney general]? We don't need a vote to move those, correct?"

**Ms. Maria Maule** said, "That is correct."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Thank you, Maria."

#### **1.04 DIRECTOR COMMENTS**

Per the discussion above, director's comments were moved to the end of the meeting.

#### **1.05 MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2025, REGULAR MEETING**

A vote was taken on the motion to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2025, regular meeting. The results were as follows:

Motioned by **Mr. Michael Brown**

Seconded by **Mr. Randy Gilbert**

Mr. Seeman, yes

Mr. McCullough, yes

Ms. Haning, yes

Mr. Gilbert, yes

Mr. Brown, yes

Superintendent Walters, yes

Motion carried. A copy of the minutes is on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

### **2. MANAGEMENT ACTION ITEMS**

#### **2.01 Discussion and Possible Action Concerning the Employment of Mr. Carson Dean, Digital Bindery Journey Worker – Mr. Brent Haken, State Director of Career and Technology Education.**

**Proposed Executive Session for discussing the employment of an individual salaried public employee (Authority: 25 O.S. 2011, § 307 (B)(1)).**

**Should the Board enter Executive Session to discuss the employment of Mr. Carson Dean, Digital Bindery Journey Worker, the following actions may be taken:**

- a. **Vote to Convene in Executive Session.**
- b. **Discuss the Employment of Mr. Carson Dean, Digital Bindery Journey Worker.**
- c. **Vote to Acknowledge Return to Open Session.**
- d. **Possible Vote on Any Action Regarding Subjects of the Proposed Executive Session.**

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Board members, we have an individual employed by CareerTech who serves as a digital bindery journey worker. I am recommending termination. You have the option to move into an executive session, if that is the board's preference. We also have Raquelle Parli, manager of HR, available should you have any questions or need additional information. All questions and concerns have been addressed through the department."

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** moved to accept the recommendation for the termination of Mr. Carson Dean. **Mr. Michael Brown** seconded the motion. The motion had the following votes:

Mr. Brown, yes  
Mr. Gilbert, yes  
Ms. Haning, yes  
Mr. McCullough, yes  
Mr. Seeman, yes  
Superintendent Walters, yes

Motion carried. A copy of the accreditation report and minutes are on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

**2.02 Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Gordon Cooper Technology Center Aviation Campus as an Official Campus of Gordon Cooper Technology Center School District No. 5 – Mr. Brent Haken, State Director of Career and Technology Education and Ms. Julie McCormick, Superintendent.**

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "We've had to do this once before since I've been director — approve a campus. Our rules state that a campus can be considered for approval when it has five full-time instructors. There are also additional stipulations we consider, such as location, transportation access, and regional needs. We have the superintendent of Gordon Cooper here. Julie [Ms. Julie McCormick], would you like to come forward and share information about your campus and what you're doing, so the board has context before taking a vote?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "Good morning. Thank you for your time. This morning, we have an aviation campus in Shawnee, across from the hospital. It's on the airport property. We have three adult instructors: a general, airframe and power plant. We have one high school instructor. We are adding another high school instructor in August. We have an enrollment of 46 students already in the high school program, hoping to fill a little bit further. The last two years, we've turned away some eligible applicants because of meeting capacity with only a single high school



Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

instructor. So we feel the need to expand and grow, and that's brought about the five instructors for August."

**Mr. Brent Haken** asked, "What questions would board members have for Julie?"

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** asked, "How many students can an instructor teach at a time?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "They generally teach 16 to 18 in the morning and in the afternoon."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** asked, "Are they different?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "And they are different, yes. And so, what would happen with this instructor is the enrollment would be a smaller number for the first year because in the second year he would receive another set of students — juniors the first year, seniors the second year. So we'll even have a more massive enrollment when he has finished his first year of teaching for us."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** asked, "How long is the program?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "For the high school students, it's two years, and in two years they complete their general and then take their general maintenance test before the opportunity to enroll in power plant and airframe as an adult student."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "If you're not aware of the need in aerospace maintenance right now — some of you may be — American Airlines has made a large commitment to grow. Tinker has made a large commitment to grow and expand their campus. We have many other businesses in the state that are continuing to come to the area. Aerospace is one of the areas we have to continue to grow to serve. We had an estimate a couple months ago that we were going to be, by next year, 400 maintenance technicians short across the state."

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "It's a huge demand. Often, when students come out of the general program, they can go immediately to work at SkyWest, AAR and Tinker. Sometimes the appeal of that wage doesn't retain them into the adult side for power plant and for airframe. We want to make sure that we have robust attendance on the adult side. This will allow us to push more students through, as we lose some immediately after the high school program because they go straight to work — straight out of high school. Straight out of high school making sometimes \$25-\$27 an hour."

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** asked, "Ms. McCormick, thanks for being here today and thanks for what you do at Gordon Cooper. I know with your location close to — I mean, I would say — Tinker Air Force Base or some aviation needs, I bet your placement rate's pretty amazing coming out of the current aviation facility."

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "Yes, 100%. So these are high school students going into well-paying jobs. Some of the high school students recently have chosen to go on to college. I don't know if you know that OBU has just added an engineering pathway, and they're doing mechanical, electrical and aerospace. So some of them now have that opportunity locally that they didn't have before."

**Mr. Rob Seeman** asked, "I may have gotten a little lost, but when a student graduates high school, they can graduate with their A&P?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "They can graduate with their general. Their general. They have already tested out of the general. We require that at the end of the program. We didn't originally do that until two years ago. So two cohorts have had that requirement."

**Mr. Rob Seeman** asked, "Is there testing at Gordon Cooper?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "Yes."

Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** asked, "Maybe you'll share a little bit —. The current aviation facility is, I would say, 20-plus years old, but it might be closer to 30?"

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "It was. We originally did aviation on the main campus in what is now our Innovation Center. We started the first wing of the aviation campus in 1989. So, yes, it has been around a very long time. We've added on to it three times. It has three hangars, airplanes in each hangar, and we recently, through the federal surplus grant system, purchased a helicopter. It's pretty cool."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Board members, if you're not aware or don't remember — we approve campuses because that's part of the funding mechanism to technology centers. As our discussions have been going for the last several months, that funding mechanism has been outdated. Today, I'm going to give you an update later in our board meeting about where we are on revamping that, so it will play a part again in the funding mechanism to tech centers like it's supposed to statutorily. That's why we take these to approval — because without your approval, they can have sites. We have many sites across the state for different school districts that are nonfunded because they don't meet the criteria. But you have before you one that does meet criteria, and that's why we're recommending that it be approved."

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** moved to approve the Gordon Cooper Technology Center Aviation Campus.  
**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** seconded the motion.

[After the motion and the second, additional comments were made.]

**Superintendent Ryan Walters** asked, "Before a vote, just a quick question. So just from a technical standpoint, in approving this campus, what we are doing is allowing the funding to be available for the aviation program?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Absolutely. This would move us to 63 approved campuses, so the funding mechanism would now apply to 63 instead of 62. So they would be eligible for that portion of funding."

**Superintendent Ryan Walters** asked, "So they've met every required criterion to qualify for funding?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "They have, yes."

**Ms. Julie McCormick** said, "The one thing, if I can add, that makes this an advantage for us — not the funding in mind — is that we follow the FAA calendar. And so it's really beneficial to that campus to not be affected by what happens at the main campus. We had a waterline break one time; we had to cancel class for the afternoon. Aviation had to cancel as well, but it didn't affect them because they are on the other side of town. So this allows them to function a little bit independently with their calendar — away from the calendar of the main campus."

The motion had the following votes:

Mr. Seeman, yes

Mr. McCullough, yes

Ms. Haning, yes

Mr. Gilbert, yes

Mr. Brown, yes

Superintendent Walters, yes



Motion carried. A copy of the accreditation report and minutes are on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

**2.03 Discussion and Possible Action on FY25 Lottery Scholarships – Ms. Cori Gray, Director of Student Success.**

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, “Good morning, Superintendent Walters, Director Haken and board members. I have the pleasure of presenting the FY2025 Lottery Education Trust Fund CareerTech Scholarship Summary Report. For those of you who are new to the board, each year we provide a summary of what CareerTech distributes in scholarships and grants to our constituents and community stakeholders. These include scholarships for education, technology center innovative grants and K-12 innovative grants.

“This program is unique in that we disburse funds as we receive them —. It’s reimbursed funding, meaning we only allocate money that is already in the bank and available to spend. I’ve tried to make this report as clear as possible so you can see exactly what’s going out to your communities and what your local schools have requested.

“We’re excited to share the report with you. It should be in your board packet. Please note that the data spans multiple fiscal periods —, covering payments made in summer 2024, fall 2024, spring 2025 and estimated payments for the first part of summer 2025. For FY2025, we have allocated 400 scholarships, totaling \$375,512.42. Are there any questions?

“Each of these topics is listed as a separate discussion item with potential board action. And to clarify, all of these scholarships — 25 lottery scholarships in total — are funded entirely through Oklahoma’s Lottery Education Trust Fund and are designated for Oklahoma schools, colleges and technology centers.”

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** moved to approve the FY26 Lottery Grant Awards for K-12. **Mr. Michael Brown** seconded the motion. The motion had the following votes:

Mr. Brown, yes  
Mr. Gilbert, yes  
Ms. Haning, yes  
Mr. McCullough, yes  
Mr. Seeman, yes  
Superintendent Walters, yes

Motion carried. A copy of the accreditation report and minutes are on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

**2.04 Discussion and Possible Action on FY26 Lottery Grant Awards (K-12) – Ms. Cori Gray, Director of Student Success.**

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, “Right, so in your packet, you’ll find a two-page stapled sheet listing all the program areas — from ag at the beginning to T&I at the end. You’ll also see the individual awards and schools from each division. Each grant is for \$15,000 and is designated for K-12 sites to purchase innovative equipment for use in the next school year. The funds must be used for equipment that supports instruction and enhances learning experiences for students for the next school year.”

Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "I want to remind the board that one of the benefits of being an approved program by our agency is eligibility for these lottery-funded grants. Even as we have programs that come on board through K-12 programs are new and don't yet receive the 412 or 411 legislative funding, they are still eligible for these grants. It's a great way for us to help schools by providing equipment."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** said, "What kind of equipment are we talking about — anything fun?"

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, "Well, it actually depends on the division, because what may be considered high technology and innovative in one area is not the same in another area. In STEM, you may purchase robots, high technology equipment, 3D printers. In ag, they're looking at various items — I've seen everything from hydroponic planting systems to new and innovative ways to present welding because we know a lot of welders come through ag. So they may ask for equipment for that area. In business, they may ask for new software or new computers because technology changes so quickly. So it really depends on the division. In family and consumer science, you might even ask for a new gas oven, because that would be innovative for their classroom, or new sewing equipment. So there are some things — it depends on the instructor and what their needs are."

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** said, "The new guy on the board, so these might have already been covered, but I know what STEM and ag is. Could you give a summary of the other categories?"

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, "Of course. In our division, we have BMITE, business, marketing and information technology education; FCS, family and consumer sciences; STEM, science, technology, engineering and math; T&I, trade and industrial education, which includes traditional skilled trades. You'll see these listed across the two-page document in your packet."

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** asked, "What's the criteria? I noticed, for instance, Jenks might have more than one award in one category. What determines how they get the awards and whether there's more than one?"

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, "A few years ago — I'd say probably about seven — we made the decision to have schools apply according to their program identification number. You can apply for a grant and receive a grant every other year because we want to make sure that we're spreading the funds across the state and it's not the same school and not the same teacher receiving the grant every year. So a school — and it's actually by the instructor, by the instructor's identification number."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "We consider a program to be at the instructor level. Where I taught in an ag program, my teaching partner was a separate program. Those are two programs, even though we do similar things. You would have the same in a lot of these divisions. You'll notice that there's more in some divisions than others — STEM and ag for sure, FCS is small, and health and T&I are small — because those are primarily in tech centers, not in K-12 classrooms. That's why there's a little bit of a difference. You'll see the tech center awards here in a moment."

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** asked, "Would you say there are some schools that let opportunities go by?"

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, "I would say this year we actually saw an increase in requests. We know that school budgets are tight, and so we want to make sure we provide ample opportunities for all schools — all career tech programs — regardless of funding, to apply and receive these grants. We actually do have some training videos out there for instructors to write a quality grant, because we know some districts — larger districts — may have a grant writer. If you have a grant writer and then an instructor who's focused on teaching in the classroom, their level and



Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

capacity to put into the grant is not the same. So we want to make sure everyone has the same opportunity."

**Superintendent Ryan Walters** asked, "Can you talk to me about — some districts in here applied multiple times. I see Edmond received it — I counted three just glancing over this — for ag and then FCS and multiple others. Why is it that some schools apply in multiple areas? Is that just an individual decision? Is there any reason why some districts say, 'Hey, we're going to apply in each of these areas?' Could you give a little context?"

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, "Right. The RFP — the request for proposals — goes out to all of our districts. We send it out to the superintendent, we send it to the instructional leaders, and we also send it to all of the instructors. The grant request comes through the individual instructor, and we also require a letter of support from the superintendent in that school district. If a person does not follow all the steps, they wouldn't qualify. We hope to have both a vertical and horizontal push to make sure everyone is aware of the opportunities. For example, this year we had over 250 applications. We did not have that much money to disperse. If you apply this year and don't get the grant, you can apply again next year. The only disqualifier is if you received the grant the previous year. If you have a two-teacher program, both you and your partner can apply because they are considered different programs."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "To add to that, Cory did a great job there. Edmond has four ag teachers, so there are four teacher programs. They have many teachers across the district in FCS as well, so the larger districts have more teachers in their programs. They may have multiple grants in a year. Stillwater, where I taught, also had three teachers. We may all apply at the same time."

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** asked, "Would it — or could it — also be that they have three or four teachers, and the reason they have two or three grant awards is that each of those teachers has different assignments? One may be in mechanics and need welding, another in agriscience, and so on? So each has different responsibilities within the program?"

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, "It's very unlikely that teachers would duplicate what they are providing instruction in. Most commonly, everything I can think of would be totally different curriculum sets within one school."

**Mr. Brent Haken** added, "To give you the example of Edmond, one teacher does all the shop, and one does all the greenhouse work. So they're totally split on what they do."

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** motioned to approve the FY26 lottery grant applications K-12. The motion was

Seconded by **Ms. Shaelynn Haning**

Mr. Seeman, yes

Mr. McCullough, yes

Ms. Haning, yes

Mr. Gilbert, yes

Mr. Brown, yes

Superintendent Walters, yes

Motion carried. A copy of the minutes is on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.



**2.05 Discussion and Possible Action on FY26 Lottery Grant Awards (Technology Centers) – Ms. Cori Gray, Director of Student Success.**

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, “In your packet, you will see the Technology Center FY26 Lottery Grant sheet. This year we have the opportunity to look at funding \$100,000 noncompetitive grants that tech centers may apply for. They still have to apply, they still have to submit the RFP, and then there's an opportunity to apply for competitive grants, which has a \$50,000 limit.

“Some, like I said, that is a competitive process. Some of our schools will apply for both grants. One thing I did want to mention on both sides — for the technology center as well as the K-12 sites — is that the grants are scored by the divisions initially because they are the experts in their area. So to address Mr. Gilbert's question: if it's an ag grant, it's looked at by the ag division first and scored by the ag division because they know their schools, they know their instructors, and they understand the needs of the field.

“The same thing happens with the technology center. With the \$100,000 grants, they're awarded on an every-other-year basis. So outside of completing the application, submitting your budget, giving a narrative for the equipment purpose and support, that grant is pretty much allocated. I mean, you would really have to just decide not to apply and turn down the money to not receive the noncompetitive grant.

“On the competitive side, this grant — initially — we only had four to disperse. We managed to look at some additional funds. Like I said, this money is spent in arrears. So if a tech center didn't spend all of their money, there was an additional pool of money. The way these lottery funds are dispersed is 45% for technology center grants, 45% for K-12 grants, and then 10% for scholarships through the Oklahoma Lottery. So that's the disbursement of the money. Because we had a little extra money left over, we were able to give additional \$50,000 grants, and so we're really excited to put this money back out into the field.

“With some of these grants, you'll see we had everything from firefighter training equipment requests, health skill sim lab updates. One of the popular items right now is called an anatomage table — it looks like a cadaver, and you can dissect it, but it's all VR. It's really exciting, really new.

“We're putting a lot into aerospace and providing opportunities for students — as we addressed with Gordon Cooper. So there are a variety of applications, and we're really excited to share those with you today.”

**Mr. Michael Brown** asked, “WED — is WED an acronym?”

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, “Workforce Economic Development. That's our short-term training.”

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, “You can see here on the program division area, you'll see, for example, there are combined areas. So within health, T&I and WED, they're purchasing a piece of equipment that is health-related but can cross over to, say, trade and industrial or short-term training. They can bring in people from the community and do short-term classes with this same equipment.”

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, “To give you an example — if they wanted to run a CNA class short-term, they could run that through WED. In T&I, very commonly, we may have short-term welding where we're only getting a minimum certification —. We're not going to a full-blown G6 structural certification. So you may run that through WED to get evening courses or weekend courses, so you can get somebody trained quickly and get them into a job or a promotion. We offer a variety of classes that way.”

**Ms. Cori Gray** said, “I did pull up, for example, with Southwest Technology Center. They asked for three different areas, and it is a patient care adult simulator. It can simulate blood pressure,

multipurpose IV training, heart and lung sounds, update kits, mannequin simulator, and then it also has the learning platform that goes with it. So the students learn medication administration with all the software and hardware. You can see that can be used to train their LPNs, their CNAs, as well as do additional training for the field as nurses may need additional support or continuing education.”

**Mr. Michael Brown** moved to approve the FY26 Lottery Grant Awards for Technology Centers. **Ms. Shaelynn Haning** seconded the motion. The motion had the following votes:

Mr. Brown, yes

Mr. Gilbert, yes

Ms. Haning, yes

Mr. McCullough, yes

Mr. Seeman, yes

Superintendent Walters, yes

Motion carried. A copy of the accreditation report and minutes are on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

### 3. MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

#### 3.01 Review and Possible Discussion of the Proposed Technology Center Funding Formula – Mr. Brent Haken, State Director of Career and Technology Education.

Mr. Brent Haken said, “All right, so we are actually done with action items — unless there was new business to come about. So board members that need confirmation, if you need to leave, we could lose quorum at this point. But we’re doing really good on time.

So, I’m going to walk you through — Braeden (Mr. Braeden Cook), if you don’t mind pulling that up — we’re going to discuss briefly, or in depth if you would like to. It’s really your call; you’re the board. We’re going to talk about CareerTech center funding. This has been something that’s been a priority for me this year. I’ve put a lot of superintendents to work to review this and put a lot of our staff to work to see how we can do a better job.

To kind of start you off — and some of you have heard this before — this is the operational funding formula that’s under review. Not WED, not related to the flex benefit allowance and not related to the legislative one-time raises that have come through. So, it’s only their operational funding that we have typically thought of as ‘full-time funding.’

“There are other mechanisms that bring dollars into tech centers that we’re not talking about today. The WED funding formula is totally separate at this time. Flex benefit allowance is defined by statute, and then there have been three different laws that I’m aware of over the last 20 years or so that have brought raises to instructors or support staff that are required statutorily. What we started reviewing was the old formula that really wasn’t in practice or use. But there were a lot of good pieces to that. The reason it was not in use is because it was built off of an arbitrary number of what it should cost for a program, not off of how much money we really have available and then dispersing that equitably.

“We reviewed that — yeah, it’s been a problem since 1968 since we started. Then we reviewed statute as well — what must we consider. So I’ll walk you through that here in just a moment.

The purpose is to make sure that we have equity across the system. Some schools have more ad valorem than others, so that's the real purpose.

"The criteria that we should be looking at and then set parameters by the committee — this is what it breaks down into: four real categories that we have this funding formula broken out to.

1. **Operational Funding Local Needs** – that's all about how much money do they have locally. That drives the whole thing.
2. **Secondary Service Incentive** – is how many students do they currently serve of those eligible juniors and seniors. You guys have heard about the waitlist stuff. We all want rid of that. We want students that need to be in the tech center at the tech center, so it incentivizes schools to serve more students.
3. **Approved Campus Funding** – we just talked about that with the new campus on aviation at Gordon Cooper. That is by statute something we must include.
4. **Student Services Formula** – is the other component that statute says we must consider as a board. It doesn't set parameters around what we must fund, but we must consider.

"So the local formula part — the local needs — that's going to be 70% of this funding formula as it gets built out as we presented today. We're taking 65% of their local dollars — general fund, not building fund. Building fund is not considered in this. This is general fund.

"So the local collection times .65 — that generates the amount of money that should be available to provide programming to students in their district. So I take that LD, and we match it with state allocation and divide it by the total number of eligible programs and technology centers, and that comes up with a state average amount per program. That is the number that drives this formula. So each tech center then has their local dollars compared to their number of programs, and then compared to the average — are they above or below the average? I'm walking through this really fast, so if you need me to stop, feel free to.

"This would be an example of how that works. So in this tech center here (referring to the presented data), it has \$9 million in local revenue times .65. \$6 million should be available for local programming, considering that the other percentage — the 35% not included — would be everything from WED to local needs that they provide for facilities. It might be administration that's in that as well. But 65% should be available for programming.

"This tech center has 31.4 programs. The programs, like as we discussed earlier, are the teachers themselves — how many teachers are available to be an approved program to be that blue number, that 31.4. They must meet our capacity — so 60% full classrooms. Classrooms must be 60% full.

"So if the state capacity for health is 12, which is a 12-to-1 ratio in health care nursing programs, it may be a 20-to-1 in a T&I program. It may be a 25-to-1 in a STEM program. They all vary. As long as they are 60% full, they are eligible for programming. If they don't fill that classroom, they're not eligible for funding.

"So then you go to the per program local available — this school has \$194,000 available per program. Well, that is a difference in the average. The average is \$266,000 that you see above that in that box. So they would need per program \$72,000 to be at the average.

"This is how I've built out the equity. Not saying that they're going to get \$72,000 per program, but that is what they would need to meet the average. So their total need would be \$2 million to come to the average.

"What they have available in this funding is 70% of a total. So if we had \$75 million in state aid, then this formula has \$52.5 million available. They would be able to get \$1.6 million in funding,



because that's what we have. It has to be prorated off the total amount in all tech centers as we go through.

"That is kind of confusing. It is a hundred times more simple than the old formula. I won't waste your days going through the old formula. Lisa (Ms. Lisa Batchelder) could do that — she's good at it — . It is a nightmare. It is page after page after page of spreadsheets. Does that make sense to everyone? Trying to provide equity. That's one portion."

**Mr. Randy Gilber** asked, "If — whenever you talk about the local funding and the ad valorem funding — there are certain statutorily required areas where that funding can only be used. And then CareerTech requested a change in that four or five years ago to open that up a little bit, but there are requirements where that money can only be used in certain areas."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Yeah, so we don't want to think that's an open number. That's right. And the building fund itself — which can be up to five miles, is not included at all. The other two categories that you have in your general — it's actually two different categories that were combined; that's what Randy's talking about. So the operational funding and the incentive funding were combined to be a total of 10 mills, and they have stipulations around how that can be spent as well. So it gets a little confusing."

**Mr. Michael Brown** asked, "That .4 instructor has a hard time doing their job, right?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Yeah, they really, really struggle. So what that means is that you will have — that's categorized as an FTE (full-time employee) on a 10-month contract. But there are certain instructors that are on 11s or 12s, so you may have an instructor that's a 1.1 or a 1.2 if they're on an 11- or 12-month contract. Great question. Because we have programs that have to run longer. Cosmetology is a long program — that's set by the Cosmo Board — so they are typically on 11- or 12-month contracts. Others are as well."

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** said, "So I only made it through calculus in college, so you have to bear with me, but — is the formula impacted as you add centers and programs? Do I understand that correctly?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Yes. And theoretically, it only changes in one direction because we're not reducing programs and centers. It could reduce a tech center if they're doing a poor job and not having enough programs or their programs aren't full, and they would lose funding. So that would be a way that they could lose. So it incentivizes them. That's one of the problems that I've had. Our current formula is stagnant. So I could do a great job or a terrible job, and you're giving me the same amount of money. This one would not do that. It would say: Do a good job, you'll continue to get as much money or more. So that's the goal of the formula. We've really been at a locked place. So that's what we're hoping."

"Also though, the bigger consideration — and the more likely thing — is ad valorem is going to change. So if you're in a metro area, your ad valorem is growing substantially, so you're going to need less state dollars. If you're in a rural area, your ad valorem could be going down or it could be stagnant, so you're going to need more state dollars."

"So that way — that's how I wanted to provide equity to the system. If I'm at Wes Watkins or Western or even High Plains, my ad valorem doesn't change very fast, so I need help as inflation goes. If I'm at Francis Tuttle, Tulsa Tech, Canadian Valley — even right now — my ad valorem is going up, so I don't need as much state help. Does that make sense?"

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** asked, "And this doesn't impact hard assets or buildings?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "No. There are things they could do with the dollars, but it does not impact their hard assets. We'll get to the campus funding here in just a moment. All right, we're going to jump into another portion of it. So the Secondary Service Incentive Formula breakdown

Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

is 10% of the total allocation. Again, I'm running this off of \$75 million currently. Just to make you aware, we put \$50 million into their state formula. That's what's in now. So of the \$163 million that the CareerTech agency gets, \$50 million goes into this formula currently.

"My \$75 million number is a starting point because what we really need in the system is about \$85 million. But \$75 million is where I'd hope to get quickly so that we can make the best changes possible. So this again is to drive or create an incentive to serve more students. It is built around what our averages are currently. So 67% of that money available would go to those who have a service rate of 29% or higher.

"OK, so most of the money would go to those that are serving 29% of their eligible juniors and seniors or higher. We don't have a whole lot of tech centers that do that — it breaks down there in a minute. 33% of the total allotment goes to those who have a rate of 22% to 28% of juniors and seniors served. If you're below 22%, you do not get any of this money. That way, we can incentivize serving more students. I am hoping that all schools can soon move to where they're serving at least 22% of their juniors and seniors. Currently, we have nine schools that are in the first bracket, and we have nine schools — sorry, we have nine schools in the first bracket and 13 in the second.

"Campus funding is 10% of the allocation as well. So, considering that we're estimating \$75 million in total allocation — We had 61 approved previously, we had 62 when Coweta came on, if I'm not mistaken, and we have 63 now as of today. So that 10% will be broken up and divided out equally. Campuses are one thing that must be considered by this board, by statute, for funding of technology centers. It doesn't say how — This is just the new way that we've looked at doing it. So we've taken 10% of the allocation. It does take extra cost to run extra campuses."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** asked, "Does everyone always receive the same amount? Because different campuses need different things, and some years they won't. Does everybody get that?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Currently, nobody gets it —. This is new. So, um, it is part of the old funding formula, but the old funding formula was not really being used. They were locked at a place in time from 15–20 years ago. I don't know what it was. So they'd receive funding for the campus whether they needed it or not — or wouldn't receive it."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** asked, "So they would receive this in this allocation whether they had a lot of local dollars or not?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "That is correct. That's the only problem really with this formula. But what it does help with is, if a school like Gordon Cooper is needing to add a campus, and they can use this allocation for some of the extra cost. If you have a campus, you have to have a campus director — somebody that's there as an administrator on site. You can't just have teachers on their own out there. You have to have somebody that's there. It helps with that. It's not a lot of money. In this scenario, with the 61 (approved campuses), it'd be \$122,000 per campus."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** said, "So this is just a new designation. Like, the money existed — we're just calling it something else."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Yes. Not a lot of dollars, but some help to those campuses. Kiamichi is the one that really should come to the forefront of your mind when you're thinking about campuses, because they're such a large geographic area. I don't — is it nine approved campuses Kiamichi has now? It may be 10. They have a ton of campuses because it's too far to transport students from one side of the district to the other. It's all of southeast Oklahoma, really. So they have to have a lot of campuses to cover the schools, and there's a large number of schools in that district as well — K–12 schools.



Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

"OK, so as we look at this, 10% also comes from our cost-per-program formula. You guys may not be aware of that. We have a breakdown where we track the expenses of every school. Lisa's team works on that — actually, one team member really does the majority of the work tracking their expenditures and income. And so those are the categories that you see in front of you that are considered. Those are the categories that statute says we as a board must consider: classroom activity, guidance and counseling, instructional support and student transportation. Those are all then put together for a total, and then that is compared to total expenses. And it creates a percentage of those four categories to total expenses. So think of it as how much money am I spending on the classroom? That's really the way to think of it. Those are the categories we must consider.

"So the way we've broken it out currently is this would create a percentage. That percentage is then compared to the average, much like the first formula is. If they're above the average — spending more on classroom activities — then we will provide a bonus. If they are at the average, they do get less of a bonus, but they still get a bonus. If they're below, they receive a reduced or no amount, depending on how low they are. So there's a whole sheet for this. I didn't put the whole sheet together, but I'd be happy to do that for anyone that has questions.

"The whole goal is to focus resources to the student. So this part of the formula makes sure that we're not wasting dollars in other expense areas. But schools do have to balance. There may be times when they have to use savings to provide new structure or new equipment. So there are some changes that may be made from year to year. And these are broken up into different tiers depending on the size of the school as well. That one's a little bit confusing.

"Last number coming from that 11 million — That's their total. For this tech center example, that would be total instruction and activity expenditures — so all expenditures except building fund.

Does that make sense?"

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** asked, "So a tech center may have 11 million in expenses that year, and only 4.9 of them are coming from those categories — those four categories?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "That's correct. So you'd have a little less than 50% in that example. If I remember right, that school would not receive dollars. I think that one's below the average, so they wouldn't receive any of this money. They'd have to be above this. If I remember right, the state average was 61%. That one's a little bit confusing, but it's what we needed to do statutorily to meet our requirement to consider these different categories. Best way we could come up with to do it. OK, any questions?"

"This is really small, [referring to the document shown on screen.] I can email it out to you — or there are screens right behind you if you need to look at those. This would be a breakdown of how it would all work together: the four different mechanisms all in one place and then distributing a total allocation.

"I gave you an example of what looks like five different tech centers — what their ad valorem is, how many programs they have and which ones would receive money. As you notice in that last line there, they have enough local dollars that they are above the average in per-program available dollars, so they would not receive any aid in that green category. They would receive their campus allotment, and they may receive money in the other categories if they're serving enough students or if their expenditures are the correct amount above the percentage.

"So that's the way we have determined to provide some equity to the system — make sure you're doing your job and you will receive money. If you're not, you're not going to receive money.



Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

Of course, we only control about 20% of the state's allocation at this time — about 80% is local dollars. It's a lot to think about. I've been thinking about it for months, so you guys are getting it quick."

**Superintendent Walters** said, "Director, if you don't mind, I've got a few questions. I do want to start by saying this is tremendous — what you just put forward for us to start digging into. Incredibly complicated stuff. You move anything, it has impacts on everyone. Very well done, well thought out. I just want to say, first of all, just great job of putting this together. I have a few questions just to help kind of our understanding of it. But I think it's tremendous. I love you looking at kind of how do we incentivize, you know, the best practices, best behavior.

"And again, to what the director pointed out — with controlling about 20% of the dollars — it's enough to be able to do that. But at the same time, you want to do it in a way that you feel is fair to everyone. So can I just ask you when you look at this, who do you anticipate (and I completely understand if the answer is, at this point in time, we wouldn't know) but who do you anticipate being kind of your biggest winners and losers? And I don't mean necessarily this district or that district, but what kind of district would benefit most? And could you maybe walk us through that?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "I'm pretty open with it because the tech centers have been made aware of that same question, so I don't mind sharing. Since we've been stuck in the funding formula, we have some districts that have been really hurt over time. Western Technology Center is my biggest example. As I run through this funding formula, you would see that they have been losing ad valorem for years and years and years — and not receiving any more state aid. Their state aid is down to less than \$500,000 now total, to a school that has three campuses and is serving 31 programs. This would help fix that.

"They would be a large winner — and primarily rural areas that have been decreasing. But also, here's a weird one to think of — Canadian Valley Tech Center is one of our fastest growing areas of the state. It is business and economy. It would support them because they're adding a rapid number of programs faster than ad valorem is catching up. What would happen is over the next four or five years, my estimate is they would receive a pretty good share of this, but then lose money as the ad valorem caught up. So that's the good part — as they were built, and then the ad valorem came in from the businesses, then they would start to lose the state dollars while their local money came up.

"It doesn't do a lot to support urban areas. Metro would receive some support — Metro Technology Centers — because they've had 22 TIF districts come in since, gosh, really the last 15 years, so they've lost a lot of ad valorem. But other than that — your Francis Tuttle, Tulsa Tech, uh, trying to think — EOC — not even a lot. Most of those schools, Mid-Del, would not receive a large portion of this money. Now everybody's going to get their campus portion. Everybody would get their instructional dollars if they're doing their job there. But they may not receive a large portion of that big chunk, which is that green category. So your urban settings that have traditionally had high ad valorem — they would receive less dollars than those that have low ad valorem.

"Wes Watkins is not going to be as big a benefactor as you would think from this because they already receive 80% of their dollars from our funding formula — so they already are a big winner. It's not going to change them dramatically. But those that have been miscalculated by changes — that's where it's going to make an impact.

"I'm doing my best to make sure and hold schools harmless, but even at \$75 million, there are three schools that would receive some cuts over time if we did not get more dollars — because

Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

they are over the amount. Because the amount has not changed in 15 years — as their ad valorem came up, they kept getting the same amount of state dollars, and they should have been brought down slowly.

“But because that’s such a large time span, what I’m hoping to do is hold them flat until we can get some more allocation — or they can catch up with the total number of programs. They get to choose how many programs they have, and if they can fill those — if they can serve more people — then they get more from the formula.

“That’s a great question — winners and losers. I think everybody is a winner in the system because what it does is as I don’t need money in my school and I’m getting more local dollars, I support another part of the system. It fluctuates back and forth so that everybody should provide some winning to this. The schools that would be the losers and the big winners have not adjusted like they should over time.”

**Superintendent Walters** said, “Thank you, Director.”

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, “Be similar to what we do in K-12 with a per-pupil. This is per-program, because programs have a great expense to put in. You can see that average cost per student is \$14,000. We’re about \$226,000 — the average program cost. To add a program, you have a significant investment. So that’s why we use a program model versus a student. But it’d be very similar to a per-student ADM.”

**Superintendent Walters** asked, “Can I also ask what would be next steps with this? If you could walk through — and I do appreciate you bringing us to this early to start the discussion — but can you kind of walk through what would be the next steps? What would be a timeline on this?”

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, “That is a great question. The reason I showed this to you a little bit early — of what I was thinking, the areas and things — now we have a lot more meat behind it. I’ve met with superintendents, our finance committee, and they’ve put their thoughts behind it and we’ve made some changes and adjustments. I wanted to present it as it is almost finalized here and then in June, hopefully, if we do get an increase in allocation, we would start making adjustments to implement. So in June, you will likely see an action item to bring this formula forward — either in this fashion or a different fashion depending on how much money comes in. “It looks like right now we’re going to get an increase of about \$9 million to our state allocation. That is enough money that I can start making some of this work. I think that in June, we will likely have an action item before you. What we may have to do is make a three-year plan to implement — because I don’t want to change a school too much at one time, either positively or negatively. Because big influxes or big decreases are not good for anyone. So we need to make sure that we implement correctly. There will be several items probably in June — and probably a lengthy discussion on the funding formula — so that we could implement July 1.”

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** asked, “One other question, if I may — just real quick. Do the local centers have any say on how much ad valorem they contribute?”

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, “So yes and no. Really, the patrons have the say when they’re formed or if they bring a new vote to the table. So when you are becoming a tech center or voting to join a tech center, you have up to 10 mills that you can vote in. Five is mandatory — has to be — to even come in. Up to 10 mills in your general operation fund. Those two categories I talked earlier — building fund can be anywhere from 0 to 5. So that is up to the ballot initiative that is brought forward — approved by this board, of course, before it goes out. We recently had changes though — and those don’t have to come to us. A tech center board can decide if they want to vote a millage increase. Green Country decided they wanted to do that. That’s in Rob’s



(Mr. Rob Seeman) area. They actually approved that on the 13th — that they would go from a two-mill building fund to a five-mill building fund. That's the max that they can approve.

So the community that makes up the tech center gets that say."

**Ms. Shaelynn Haning** said, "But if the community doesn't have the money, even if they want it, then they're bound by the fact that they don't have the money, right?"

**Mr. Leonard McCullough** said, "Yeah. That would be my only recommendation as you finalize this — with balancing out the goal of providing some equity, but also making sure that we're not throwing money at a community that doesn't really care whether they have a center or not. So I'd want to make sure we have a stopgap for that."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Absolutely. That's a good question. This board has to make the approvals on several things — accreditation being one of those things — but also if a community gets to vote or not to have that initially. So you had to — you didn't get to experience this — but Beaver County was a new county to come on and it had to come to this board first. We've had several that have decided that lately — Thomas-Fay-Custer community. So usually that's how we know that they want it to happen. They also have the opportunity to vote to come out of a district. So we usually know up front if they have that idea or not — that they want to or don't want to be a part of the tech center."

**Mr. Randy Gilbert** said, "Very good and, I hate to say but very long overdue. Thank you, Lisa, and thank you, Director, for your efforts."

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "It's been a lot of work, but I think its going to be meaningful. It's not an easy discussion because it's change, but I think it's going to be good for the system. I appreciate the support."

**Superintendent Walters** said, "Can I ask you, Director, anything that we can do to be of assistance between now and in June on this front? I know it's a lot of information. We've got a lot to dig into but is there anything we can do to be helpful? I know it's a big change, and I know that I've heard this a dozen times, you've been very good on communicating this to districts and superintendents a lot of conversations, no one is going to be surprised on this, you've talked about this for months, but is there anything between now and those summer board meetings that we can do?"

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "That is a great question — I should have told you. Once we have a finalized budget from the legislature, I will put scenarios in play with real money and get those examples to you digitally so you can start going through those. Then, ask me questions, have meetings with me if you'd like to, so you can understand it better. But we'll put real money into a formula and give you an example of it. That's the best way, I think, to educate yourself. The legislature is aware of this as well.

[Mr. Michael Brown exited the meeting at 10:00 a.m.]

"I've made the education committees aware that we need to do a better job at the agency to build their confidence in what we're able to do. So hopefully you'll be able to share that with them when asked. I know many of you are active legislatively and can show them that, hey, we're able to put equity into the system."

### 1.01 OPENING COMMENTS CONTINUED

**Superintendent Walters** said, "I do want to commend the director for being very active, both at the Capitol and in the districts. I think that he's done a tremendous job. Again, this is a big



Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

undertaking — and I know we've already heard it — but, you know, one of the things I want to say is, I mean, it impacts everybody. It'll impact every district. It'll impact every local community.

"I think board member McCullough made a great point — we don't want to de-incentivize local investment. We always want that local buy-in first, and so that's something that I think, when we look at this, we never want to supplant that or step in the way of that. It needs to come from the local districts first.

"But I think the director's done a tremendous job of giving us something. And I know board member Gilbert's talked about this for years — but, I mean, this has been here for so long, and frankly, I think it hasn't been taken on because it is such a big bear. It's such a big lift. There are so many folks involved with it.

"The easiest thing to do is say, let's just kick the can down the road. So I do want to commend the director for taking on a really heavy lift and presenting, I think, a really good plan for us moving forward with that.

"And again, that was really kind of my only comment here moving in. I know that we're still trying to get more information from the legislature. A budget deal was reached yesterday. Our director does a great job of keeping us in the loop on what those things are.

"I'll tell you — from our end, we don't know the specifics yet. That's kind of being discussed today. But I hope by the end of the week, we'll know more specifically what that looks like.

"But again, all I wanted to say was I want to commend the director for that. I think it's a big ask, I think it's a big task, but I think it's one that's very worthwhile for us to dig into.

"And I do appreciate the time for us to be able to talk about it today and be able to get back to you in the next month or so. So, thank you for that, Director."

#### 1.01 DIRECTOR COMMENTS CONTINUED

**Mr. Brent Haken** said, "Thank you. I would add a few comments that we didn't do in the beginning. First off, I had the pleasure this year — I didn't get to last year — of going to SkillsUSA, and I try to make it to every CTSO event. If you have not been to Skills, you need to go. If you sit on this board, I think you ought to go to that. It is the biggest display of what we do to impact vocational education still. I think the magnitude of it — from starting putting up masonry walls on one end to cosmetology at the other and robotics in between, building a tiny house in an eight-hour day with a team of five students — is pretty incredible.

We haven't, probably as the agency, done a good job of getting that out to the public to show what actually happens. So I plan to do that better in the future. We're going to invest in telling our story there so that we have a time-lapse video, and then we get the legislature in there to see what is really going on. It's pretty remarkable what students do.

"All of our CTSOs do a really good job, but that — and what we have done for competitive events in FFA — are our foundation, and we often forget our foundation. So I want to make sure that you have an invitation — an open invitation — to see that event. They will be going to nationals later this summer, but the Skills competition is huge. It is impressive. We need to make sure that we are showing that off more. Just got done with FFA convention — great, great convention. Again, next year will be the 100th, so we'll be celebrating that.

"A couple of updates: I will tell you we had a great policy legislative session. We got a bill passed that will allow our pharmacy students to now do clinicals. That has never happened

before. We had to work with the pharmacy board — well, didn't have to, but we chose to work nicely — and we did get it done together to make sure that we have clinical opportunities for students so that they have actual hands-on work. Very excited about that.

"We have a variety of other small things. A communication bill is up today to make sure we define adult students — should not be hindered by K-12 impacts on communication devices, because many times they need that. So we have an amendment there so that if you're going back to the tech center now, we don't need to probably call your mom and dad and let them know what's going on — we probably just need to communicate with you. But you're still a student, so we need to make sure that we define that clearly. We're working on that.

"It looks positive for funding. We had asked — as you guys know, because it comes before you — for \$40 million, but really the focus was to get the one-time dollars, the \$28 million that we got last year, into our base moving forward. It looks like we're going to get about a third of that into our base moving forward. So that's net positive for us — very good movement. Excited about that. Not everything that we want, but it's a small step at a time when the state's really in kind of a flat budget period. So it's good, very good momentum.

"Also, would mention — we tried something new this year with the legacy capital fund that other entities use. It's a new mechanism in the legislature to fund capital projects. Since Beaver County came on last year, and western Oklahoma is losing population, we're going to try to build a site there in Woodward that would bring postsecondary opportunities to western Oklahoma.

"They had a donation of a building this year — didn't run through this board — it's actually driven by business and industry to give \$25 million to us, to a board. But it was pushed by business and industry so that we could help build that site out in western Oklahoma. That did not go through, but I would imagine we'll see more of that in the future, where business and industry will be pushing to help CareerTech expand.

"So that's pretty exciting as well. That would be my updates. Our team's doing a fantastic job. We're rounding out the year and we are getting ready for another one.

"Thank you, Leonard. Good luck. Any questions?"

Mr. Leonard McCullough excused the meeting at 10:05 a.m. causing the meeting to lose quorum.

### **3 NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **4 ADJOURNMENT**


There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

The next regular meeting of the State Board of Career and Technology Education will be held Thursday, June 19, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education, 1500 West Seventh Avenue, Tuttle Seminar Center, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Minutes of the Meeting of the State Board of  
Career and Technology Education  
May 15, 2025

A copy of the minutes is on file at the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ashley Rink, Executive Assistant  
to the CareerTech State Director and  
Secretary of the CareerTech Board

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
~~Ryan Walters, Chair of the Board or~~  
Brent Haken, State Director,  
Ex-Officio Nonvoting Member  
State Director