

NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board of Directors' Meeting
MINUTES
BWI Marriott
Baltimore, MD
October 20, 2014
8 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Attendees: Rod Duckworth, John Fischer, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Scott Stump, Wayne Kutzer, Rich Katt, Jean Massey, Sheila Ruhland, June Sanford, Eric Spencer, Bill Symonds, Lee Burket, Bernadette Howard, Kathleen Cullen, Tim Hodges

Staff: Kate Blosveren, Kimberly Green, Steve Voytek, Andrea Zimmermann

Welcome and Overview of Agenda: Stump welcomed the NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board and staff to the Fall Board Meeting. Stump also welcomed new Associate Member Board Representative Dr. Sheila Ruhland to the NASDCTEc Board of Directors as well as new NASDCTEc Communications Associate, Katie Fitzgerald.

Review and Approval of NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board Minutes: Honeycutt presented the minutes from the June 24, 2014, NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board Meeting. No corrections were made.

MOTION: To approve the June 24, 2014, NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board Minutes. Howard; Sanford.
MOTION ADOPTED.

Review and Approval of Consent Agenda: Stump presented the consent agenda and asked if any items should be removed for discussion. No items were identified.

MOTION: To approve the consent agenda as presented. Kutzer; Hodges.
MOTION ADOPTED.

Fundraising Development and the future of NCTEF: With the phasing out of the National Career Clusters Institute – a major revenue stream for NCTEF – the Board discussed the future of the NCTEF, including its mission, identity and potential opportunities. The Foundation's work has ebbed and flowed with the needs of the organization since its creation in the 1980s, and major work included the development of the Career Clusters[®] and being a means for employers and other stakeholders to the table. Yet as Foundation's core funding has shrunk in recent years, there is a need to discuss how to diversify funding streams.

Calling the Foundation an under tapped resource, Green presented members with a graphical representation of a proposed restructuring for NCTEF, which includes a greater focus on research, technical assistance and broader systems change. Revenue generating work could include seeking fee-for-service contracts, grants and fundraising. The restructuring would retain the symbiotic relationship between NASDCTEc and NCTEF.

Members discussed three key issues: NCTEF's stated purpose and its identity, established areas of focus, and potential impact to NASDCTEc.

Purpose and identity:

Cullen asked for the rationale behind combining the NCTEF and NASDCTEc board meetings. Green explained that the combined meetings, which began a few years ago, started as the focus of NCTEF's meetings became less about revenue and more about design and implementation of the Career Clusters. Since NASDCTEc also did much of this work, the Board at the time felt meeting separately led to duplicative, less efficient discussions.

Katt expressed support for establishing a unique identity for NCTEF with a focus on new initiatives, rather than existing work. He recommended seeking to build partnerships that would drive new projects.

Areas of Focus:

In line with previous Board actions, Katt recommended that NCTEF not pursue curriculum development as an area of focus, but said research is a particular area of interest where NCTEF could contribute greatly. Others echoed both sentiments.

Howard said the Board should focus on fundamental systems change as an area of focus. Stump added that a version of the Council of Chief State School Officers' Innovation Lab Network could be an area of potential interest that could offer research and support exemplary systems around programs of study and other topics. He also said evaluation is implied in any research agenda, because CTE will increasingly be held accountable for its programs.

Others also supported the idea of offering technical assistance, both short-term and long-term. Another area of great interest was the role that NCTEF could play in the communications and messaging space in order to help raise CTE's profile and change perceptions. Green added that NCTEF should model the behavior it wishes to see in the broader community, and urged members to consider the Foundation as being part of the larger conversation.

In the past, the Association and the Board have always pursued 50-state initiatives, but Green asked whether the Board would be willing to consider pursuing smaller projects. Katt said this is an excellent idea and the best way to find promising practices.

Fundraising:

Members were asked to consider how the Foundation can grow its shrinking revenues. In the short-term, Katt said it was best to spend time pursuing grants from private foundations and the federal government. Kutzer, however, cautioned that the strings attached to government money along with the constant shift in priorities makes federal grants less attractive as a funding stream. Duckworth recommended that the Foundation step back to consider the bigger picture first and to let the Foundation's priorities drive the grants that are pursued.

Similarly, Ruhland suggested that the Foundation first develop a plan of action for fundraising, and potentially grants will be a part of that. She also cautioned that NCTEF will need to have a clearly defined niche when competing for the same dollars as the many other existing foundations.

In the context of the recent international trip to view Switzerland's vocational education system, Fischer said there is a lot of potential opportunity for the Foundation within the development community, including leading domestic trips of education stakeholders to increase their understanding of the U.S. system.

Impact to NASDCTEc/Staffing considerations:

Fischer asked how any changes to the NCTEF mission would impact current staffing levels. Green explained that consultants may need to be brought on initially if NCTEF chooses to provide professional development and technical assistance. Over time, depending on the work, permanent staff may be needed.

Career Cluster Products:

Last year, the Board voted to phase out the Career Clusters products. This was recommended because interest appeared to be waning and it was becoming an inconsistent funding stream. Recently there has been a surge of interest and orders, and inventory is getting low. Ordering a re-print, however, comes with many hurdles.

Duckworth recommended that NASDCTEc staff find a partner who could manage the business side but retain the NASDCTEc name. Members raised concerns about who would fill the space with products once NASDCTEc is no longer in the business. As such, members supported the idea of pursuing a partnership in order to retain the Career Cluster brand.

Action:

Although there was no formal motion on this discussion, there were several decisions made and some directives given to NASDCTEc staff, including:

- The NCTEF Board should have meetings separate from the NASDCTEc Board with clearly defined agendas;
- NCTEF's focus areas should be updated, clear and refined;
- Staff should seek a partnership to continue supporting Career Clusters products; and
- Staff should continue considering potential fundraising opportunities and innovative initiatives in light of the Board's discussion and recommendations.

ACTE VISION/NASDCTEc CCI Merger

Previously, the Board consented to merging its Career Clusters Institute with ACTE's VISION. Since that directive, NASDCTEc and ACTE have been working to reach an agreement on the merger's terms. Foundational to this negotiation was getting ACTE to acknowledge that the Career Clusters are integral to the CTE community and not simply a project of NASDCTEc.

Initial high-level discussions appeared to show both parties in agreement. However, as negotiations began to focus on how the merger would happen concretely, clear differences emerged. In early October, agreement began to emerge.

Basics of the Agreement:

The merger would take place over the course of three years, beginning in 2015.

- 2015: CCI would be a separate strand of sessions at ACTE VISION. (NASDCTEc retains full control)

- 2016: Integration begins. (Decisions will be made jointly by NASDCTEc/ACTE staff going forward)
- 2017: The Career Clusters becomes the structure for how the ACTE conference is delivered.

The revenue-sharing agreement is structured so that NASDCTEc's share will grow on a percentage basis as the conference itself grows. There is an expectation that the conference will certainly grow because there is a wealth of untapped potential because not all Career Clusters are currently being covered at the conference.

The memorandum of understanding is still being developed, but will include details such as NASDCTEc's right to review to ensure control of messaging and quality. Also, there is a cancellation clause as well as the ability to revisit the terms at the end of each year.

Honeycutt supports NASDCTEc taking an active role in quality control and messaging, and encouraged staff to remain focused on highlighting statewide best practices and all of the levels that CTE touches – secondary, postsecondary and workforce development.

Members asked if there were restrictions in scheduling and Green said she would look into this. Also, preessions were not listed on the paper distributed at the meeting, but these are being negotiated with CORD.

Fischer said his visit with ACTE's executive board showed clear fundamental disconnects. That said, Fischer called the partnership uncomfortable but important. This underscores the value of the phase-in approach.

Green said NASDCTEc will remain protective of the Career Clusters brand and marketing while also using it to show the broader CTE community that change is coming.

Kutzer also suggested connecting with state associations to help push this effort. Green agreed that there is an important role here and will follow-up with more details.

MOTION: To agree to key provisions within this proposal and authorize staff to continue negotiations. Kutzer; Howard.
MOTION ADOPTED.

NASDCTEc Vision Summit – 2015

During its Spring Meeting, the Board approved another Vision summit with the idea that states will bring teams of 7-8 people.

Staff made outreach to the 2010 Summit contractor, Pricewaterhouse Cooper's Innovation Labs. They said that bringing many diverse perspectives to the table the number of summit attendees (based upon seven to eight person teams) can make it hard to reach consensus. Given the time allocated to the Summit, this would be difficult attain with the current structure.

Staff proposed to the Board an adapted concept for the Summit:

- Two representatives per state, the State CTE Directors and secondary/postsecondary counterparts;
- A non-Washington, DC location (potentially Dallas or another centrally located city);
- Also bring in key national partners to represent state voices (i.e. NGA, CSG, CCSSO);
 - o Incorporate these voices over the entire year so that all participants arrive to the Summit well-informed;
- Invite a broad array of participants (initiative leaders, thought partners, etc); and
- Make the work activity-based and interactive.

By incorporating this array of voices, the resulting product would not be solely NASDCTEc's vision but rather the community's vision for where CTE should go.

Green said there is potential to hold regional summits with the help of national partners to help drive the work further down the pipeline. The 2010 effort did not have any state policy infrastructure to support such work.

Green also discussed the Summit's potential cost. With \$50,000 spent on the previous Summit, the new projections are higher – \$175,000 – due to the slightly larger group. However, Green was confident that this price can be reduced through negotiations.

Ideas for funding were discussed, including:

- Asking partners to pitch in \$5,000;
- How much NASDCTEc should invest as an organization in this effort;
- State Directors pay registration fees, but not national partners (similar to the last Summit); and
- Potential for Summit sponsorship and/or fundraising (was not done for last Summit).

The idea of sponsors was immediately panned again due to concerns about perceptions. Duckworth recommended that the organization provide some of the money, and expressed concerns about using fundraising and sponsors that are not national partners.

Sanford asked whether staff investigated other companies besides PwC. Green said this has not happened at this time, but could.

Katt and Ruhland supported the regional forum concept, because it can bring implementers to the table in a way that the national meeting cannot.

Members briefly discussed whether this is an appropriate launch pad for the NCTEF Board's new identity, or whether the Summit would be a shared venture of NASDCTEc and NCTEF.

MOTION: To authorize up to \$175,000 in NASDCTEc investment in the 2015 Vision Summit, and for staff to proceed with modified plan as put forth. Katt; Fischer.
MOTION ADOPTED.

Common Career Technical Core Adoption Language & Continuum

The Board was asked to consider the CCTC proposal in two parts – a change to CCTC adoption language (a continuum of adoption); and how best to track and monitor state adoption (to better target technical assistance needs).

Much discussion focused on the unrelated contention around the Common Core State Standards and how that affects communications efforts regarding the CCTC. Green asked the Board to provide staff with guidance about how NASDCTEc should approach this communications effort in order to avoidable damage while still moving the community forward. If NASDCTEc is unable to track and monitor state adoption, how can it know whether this is a good use of the organization and staff's time?

Action was tabled until the November 4 meeting, when staff will present the revised continuum during the November 4 meeting.

Higher Education Act (HEA) Reauthorization Recommendations

Voytek presented draft HEA recommendations to the Board for discussion.

In general, members said joining the HEA conversation would provide NASDCTEc will an opportunity to highlight the seamless education system and the many pathways for student success. Feedback was provided to modify the recommendations to include more of a focus on counseling and advisement, teacher preparation, and overall tone of the recommendations.

Action was tabled until the November 4 meeting, when staff will present revised recommendations that incorporates the feedback received.