

NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Conference Call

MINUTES

October 22, 2015 4-5 p.m. ET

Attendees: Rod Duckworth, Marie Barry, Pradeep Kotamraju, Vanessa Cooley, Lee Burket, Wayne Kutzer, Mike Raponi, Eleni Papadakis, Bernadette Howard, Tim Hodges, Cheryl Carrier
Absent: Jo Anne Honeycutt, Jean Massey, Kathleen Cullen, Eric Spencer, Sheila Ruhland
Staff: Kimberly Green, Karen Hornberger, Kate Blosveren, Katie Fitzgerald

Welcome and Overview of Agenda: Kotamraju welcomed the NASDCTEc Board and staff to the NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Meeting. Hornberger took a roll call of the NASDCTEc Board and confirmed attendance.

Review and Approval of NASDCTEc Board Minutes: Kotamraju presented the minutes from the September 25, 2015, NASDCTEc Board of Directors' conference call.

**MOTION: To approve the September 25, 2015 NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Conference Call Minutes as presented.
Howard; Barry.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Summit Debrief: Green asked if the Future of CTE Summit met the Board's expectations, and was it a productive use of their time. Kutzer noted he was at the last Summit and there was a similar process but he enjoyed interacting with so many different people from different organizations. He found there were great conversations and enjoyed the process. While some of the conversations were uncomfortable, he recognizes sometimes you need to get a little uncomfortable to come up with new ideas.

Cooley shared that she enjoyed the process and thought PwC did a great job of moving people around and setting up a range of interactions. Kotamraju stated that he also enjoyed the process and noted it was very interesting to see PowerPoint slides (used during the Design Team meetings) coming to life. He did share the concern that often earlier groups were the boldest and then ideas got watered down as the Summit went on. Barry stated that she agreed with Kotamraju and added that having outside/external stakeholders as part of the discussion really enhanced the event, focusing us to look outside of ourselves and to think different. Barry also noted her colleague also loved the process and was very impressed.

Katt stated that he agreed on the value of the diversity of participants, which enhanced the discussion. He also noted that he felt that we went further in the process than the last Summit.

Carrier shared that it felt like it took a little while to get "bolder" but she did notice that there was some regression in the level of boldness as the Summit went on. She stated that initially, a lot of people thought it was 'out there' but they generally came along with the idea that we could change perceptions and shake things up.

Green said that may have been because once we started asking for action steps on day 3, participants got a little less bold and started thinking about barriers and what is possible rather than what could be possible. Kotamraju commended Green with the last minute suggestion to

have a “go bolder” working group – for folks who wanted to push even further. There seemed to be a lot of energy toward that group.

Green asked if there is anything we should have done differently? Anything we should consider as we move forward into the next steps?

Raponi noted that he attended both Summits, which he sees as such a unique process. PwC took brainstorming to an exponential level. His favorite part was the one-on-one interview, as it was mechanically extrapolated into bigger groups. He also shared that there are some key documents that are so well developed on issues like career guidance, accountability, etc. that could be used as starting points for future discussions. Green suggested maybe we create a library of resources to go along with the final vision.

Duckworth shared that this was his first summit so he was new to the process. He really liked the process and how it was very open. He noted more business/industry would have been good and overall it was a good meeting.

Cooley agreed that more business/industry participation would have been good, but appreciated how much they were considered in the discussions.

Green also agreed that we would have preferred more employers. She shared that we had the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation as a co-convenor, but many of the employers we and co-conveners invited declined the invitation. She noted that we will be diligent about engaging employers in the next steps. Carrier committed to helping engage more employers in the process.

Hodges shared that he thought that only having names on the name tags was helpful. He stated that in some groups, there were no introductions that facilitated open conversations. In groups where people did introduce themselves, we lost a little bit of that openness and willingness to challenge assumptions.

Blosveren walked through early finds from the evaluations:

- One quarter of participants have responded to the evaluation so far.
- 95% responded event met objectives. Handouts were effective. Physical environment was conducive to environment. (1-2 people remained neutral)
- Some thought the Summit could have gone bolder.
- PwC was popular; people liked no titles, liked random pairings.
- People didn't like: days were long, not enough opportunities for reflection, more structured networking.
- People want to remain engaged.
- Number of State CTE Directors want to replicate the process at their state/local level
- We may provide something at the spring meeting around suggested materials/activities, etc.

Proposed timeline and process for the new vision: Green noted that we are already seeing dividends in partnerships with co-conveners and positioning at the national level. She also shared that PwC's involvement ends after tomorrow's design team call; they are not responsible

for the development of the vision document. Green shared that while our initial plan was to share the vision at our Spring meeting in May 2016, there appears to be too much urgency to wait that long. Therefore, we are looking at an earlier release date. She stated that our strategy will be to have each co-convenor continue to play a role in the vision development by having one person from each co-convenor organization to serve on the writing team.

Green reported that the staff will be crafting a summary to share high-level outcomes with participants as well to those members and partners who did not attend. She stated that the final big buckets explored on day three will be used as a framing or outline. Green also noted that the staff will also be looking at all inputs (from all three days) because in some cases there are bolder ideas in earlier activities. The target release goal is currently the first quarter of 2016. The release will include a new vision with principles and actions among stakeholders, and, ideally, some clarity about roles for each of the co-convening organizations and their members.

Green shared that the plan to have an executive director-level meeting for all co-convenors to plan out at what level of commitment they want to have to this vision. Ideally, we'd like to have each organization endorse/sign on to the vision as well as map out how their existing work aligns and what new work they will take on that aligns. The staff is tentatively thinking about a release date of March. The staff is also working now to figure out the best way to share the raw information with participants and other members/partners in a way that is transparent but also streamlined and honors the process. Duckworth encouraged the staff to be as transparent with members as possible, especially in the run up to our spring meeting. He noted he is comfortable with moving up the timeline.

Kotamraju agreed that we should be communicating often on the process and progress. Green shared we'll likely have two strategies – one for those who attended the Summit and one for those who were not at the Summit. She noted that it is important to honor the work done at the Summit, but also to vet it with those who were not able to attend.

Raponi asked about communications with those who attended. Green shared that the staff will have a set of planned communications, and will be sharing the concept cards, photos of the work produced at the Summit, resources, summaries, etc. This will likely include materials that will not be made available to the public, as the context of participation at the Summit will be key to the utility and understanding of these assets.

Rebranding Next Steps: Blosveren shared the proposed timeline and process for the rebranding. She proposed how we are transitioning to the new name and how we want it to be impactful and successful.

Blosveren shared that we are in Phase I now, which includes having communicated to our members, updated partners who we've communicated with but we have not transitioned to any formal branding yet. Moving to Phase II, includes developing brand guidelines for Advance CTE: Learning that works for America, mapping our assets and resources, determining what is new that we need to create, creating a toolkit of materials to help tell the story of the new brand and what this brand means. Blosveren shared that we are aiming for the new logo and brand guidelines to be completed in November. The plan is to have a variety of materials including webinar, media engagement, press release, FAQs, and one-pagers to tell the story. She shared that the goal is to have a hard launch in January as the New Year is a good time to turn over with a fresh start.

Cooley shared that she heard some concerns about new branding and asked whether we should wait until the spring meeting. Green and Duckworth noted that it's important we know about the concerns so we can address them proactively as we plan our roll out. Kutzer shared that he did not hear anything negative.

Green shared that the staff plan to use the Communications Committee as a sounding board for the roll out strategy and development of resources. The plan is to shift more of the hands on feedback from the Board to the Communications Committee given they have specific skills and expertise in this area. The Communication Committee will be much more heavily engaged in providing input along the way. Green asked if the Board is comfortable with that shift.

Burket noted that the Board should still be engaged. Katt agreed that the Communications Committee is probably better positioned to provide input, but that the Board should be kept in the loop. Green agreed to keep the Board up to date on the branding communication and shared that any Board member is welcome to join the Communicates Committee.

Budget Modification: Green presented the budget modification stating that when we created the budget for NASDCTEc FY 16 we did not anticipate the rebrand of NASDCTEc. Therefore, in order to effectuate the transition to the “DBA”, a budget modification is being submitted for Board consideration and action.

Budget Category	Amount	Explanation
Legal Fees	\$2,000	Covers the legal research to be conducted, filing fees, etc.
Consulting	\$6,000	Fratelli Communication (1/2 of contract costs) plus design firm to create new logo
Shipping	\$2,200	Shipping of packets re: new brand to membership. Shipping of new assets (letterhead, etc)
Printing	\$2,750	New business cards, letterhead, envelopes, checks, signage for meetings
Supplies	\$1,750	Packaging and branding transition packets/trinket with new name/logo to membership
Total budget modification request	\$14,700	

**MOTION: To approve the budget modification for rebranding as presented.
Kutzer; Raponi.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Reauthorization Update: Green shared

- House has a hearing Tuesday – intro on CTE. Not as much collaboration on House side as there is in Senate.
- If Bipartisan bill doesn't move in the House, going to be difficult to get it passed
- Looking at issues around accountability

- Doing a call with ACTE to do a deeper dive into reauthorization for SD who have members who are in the committee. Outreach has been made to those individuals. Board welcome to join. Going to be an off the record call.

Other Updates: Green shared that JP Morgan Chase will be making a significant investment in Career Technical Education/Career Readiness. The funds will go toward system-wide/statewide transformative efforts. NASDCTEc is at the table with CCSSO as a key partner in developing process, RFP and as a primary technical assistance provider. We anticipate a fairly significant contract to be coming our way to support our role in this work.

Duckworth thanked Green for the update. Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.