

NCTEF Board of Directors' Meeting
MINUTES
Omni Shoreham Hotel
Washington, DC
April 7, 2015
8 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Attendees: Cheryl Carrier, Rod Duckworth, John Fischer, Tim Hodges, Jo Anne Honeycutt,

Absent: Bill Symonds

Staff: Kate Blosveren, Kimberly Green, Andrea Zimmermann

Welcome, Overview of Agenda/Annual Report: Fischer welcomed members to the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda.

Approval of the minutes: Honeycutt presented the minutes from the March 20, 2015 conference call meeting for discussion and approval.

Motion: **To approve the minutes from March 20, 2015.**
 Hodges; Carrier.
 MOTION ADOPTED.

Approval of the Financial Report: Honeycutt also presented the NCTEF Financial Report, and drew attention to the Foundation's current income status. Honeycutt reminded members that the financial status is on par with expectations given that there was no Career Clusters Institute this year.

Fischer asked whether sales of the Career Cluster[®] products were expected to pick up during this year's ACTE VISION conference and the integration of the Career Clusters into that event. Green said sales of products as well as CORD Career Pathway Effects books are both expected to generate some additional income, but also encouraged members to consider if there are additional areas where the Foundation would like to invest time and resources.

Honeycutt said that a local employer engagement resource would be extremely useful or a pathways toolkit similar to the U.S. Department of Education's resources. Local educators have a very difficult time starting the conversation with employers, Honeycutt said, and a there's an opportunity to develop resources that are oriented toward career pathways and how employers can lead that work. She also offered the idea of targeted technical assistance for as a revenue-generator.

Carrier said that coming from her perspective as an employer; employers are bombarded by so many teachers and schools asking them to participate. There needs to be a more streamlined, coordinated, possibly regional, approach.

Hodges asked about the correlation between workload decreases and staff time. Green explained that the Foundation and NASDCTEc budgets are complex, which is why the staff track their time according to multiple categories to help show priorities and where staff effort is being dedicated.

Green also said some revenue-generating projects have been put on hold and fundraising timelines are hitting differently than expected. With that in mind, Green said, the organization wants to be very strategic in how it uses the \$110,000 that will be moved from restricted assets next year to fund the Foundation's work.

MOTION: To approve the Financial Report.

Carrier; Hodges.

MOTION ADOPTED.

Strategic Priorities: Blossveren discussed strategic priorities for NCTEF as it continues to develop its core work and how that falls between NASDCTEc and NCTEF. When reviewing the organizations' combined strategic plan, there were activities that fell exclusively to one organization or the other, while some activities overlap with both. Blossveren presented the activities in three categories to separate current and future activities and asked members to provide feedback on priorities and whether there were missing activities as related to the Foundation's established theory of action and mission that is now separate from the NASDCTEc Board.

Fischer said he hopes the Foundation will focus and elevate how CTE links and connects labor, governors' initiatives, and education – and how CTE ties all of these together. Fischer asked who would be the eventual audience for the Foundation. While there is a lot of opportunity, the Foundation shouldn't have a scattershot approach that helps everyone everywhere. However, perhaps there is a role for the Foundation to provide support to locals, given the Association's primary focus in supporting state CTE leadership.

Green said the co-conveners who have signed on to the Future of CTE Summit (Summit) will broaden the potential audience for the Foundation's work and help to make some intentional connections.

Hodges said if locals are a potential target, how the Foundation's work would potentially overlap with ACTE. Green explained that ACTE is largely a federal policy organization that has historically done little direct delivery of professional development to states or locals. This role has largely been relegated to the state associations and/or the ACTE regional conferences (and ACTE national has a limited role in the content of these events).

Honeycutt said that as long as the technical assistance is strongly connected to the Foundation's core expertise and resources, then it is appropriate and worth pursuing.

Blossveren said the existing workshops with CORD would be an easy resource to push through the Foundation. Currently, it's unclear how effective the marketing has been for these workshops. Green added that the CORD workshops were developed in line with the CTE Vision principles.

Honeycutt said these workshops could be immediately useful for State Directors, who are looking for quality content to fill their summer professional development conferences. Also, professional development connected to the new regulations for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act would be very useful for states and locals. Fischer added that it would be extremely useful to create a stockpile of professional development opportunities in preparation for the reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Career Technical Education Act (Perkins).

Honeycutt said another area of opportunity for the Foundation could be in serving as an intermediary, or translator, for CTE. There is a lot happening that is all related, but no one is really connecting it all together, and it is creating a lot of confusion. From the state perspective, Honeycutt said it is very powerful to get all of the relevant parties together in a room to conduct an inventory of existing work and then see how those connect to the state's goals. As a state participating in the National Governors' Association Policy Academy, North Carolina is working on this, but still haven't achieved this level of coordination. While this can be a state-level conversation, there is a similar place for locals and regions to do this and figure out where the labor market need really is. Also, there is often agreement in principle but dissension in operation and implementation, and this has resulted in greater turf wars, rather than breaking down silos.

Carrier said Ford Next Generation Learning is working in this space at the community level by using an alignment model, but nothing is being connected to what is happening at the state level. There is a need to bring the locals, regions and state together.

Fischer said he sees the Foundation as being the connective tissue between all levels. Connection and translation keep coming up. Perhaps the Association helps the State Directors navigate the minefield, and the Foundation helps lead everyone else in this space, therein providing leadership to the State Directors as well. Green added that the Foundation could be an incubator of innovation, versus the Association, which is limited by the need for 50-state consensus.

Fischer recommended considering some kind of coordination with the Council of Chief State School Officers' Career Readiness Task Force to maximize the Foundation's efforts, particularly as it relates to accountability, career counseling, pathways and partnerships.

Related to partnerships, Carrier recommended being clearer about the benefits for employers, if they were to get involved in the Foundation's work. CTE is more than workforce development, but is also about community prosperity, she said, but employers find it difficult to talk about CTE. They understand STEM and career academies, but CTE more broadly – they get lost. Green added that the Foundation can also help employers and other stakeholders navigate the value proposition of CTE. She pointed to Boeing as one company that understands the long-term reasons to be involved with the effort to reauthorize Perkins.

DBA Versus New Name: As the Foundation establishes its new identity, considerations need to be given to whether the Foundation formerly adopt a new name or select a new name that implemented as a DBA (doing business as). Staff conducted research and presented a report that laid out the benefits and costs of the options. It is the staff recommendation that the Board

choose the “DBA” option because it is a relatively fast, cheap, easy switch and also allows the organizational to protect the NCTEF name until further notice.

Hodges agreed with this recommendation based on past experiences.

**MOTION: Once a new organizational name is selected, to implement the new name as a DBA rather than a full, legal name change.
Honeycutt; Carrier.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Branding Exercise: Blossveren led members through a branding exercise to help members establish the work and focus of the Foundation, how the Foundation differs from NASDCTEc, potential competitors of the Foundation, and the unique role that the Foundation can fill.

Work/focus of NCTEF

Some of the themes include: Champions for CTE and articulating common interests/values, advocates for an integrated approach, professional development products, technical assistance/implementation support, translator/connector/builder of partnerships, define and promote high quality CTE, and policy development.

Green said the Foundation could be a quality arbiter for high-quality CTE, and help define what that means. The Foundation might develop a diagnostic tool for states and locals to help define high-quality CTE. This is concept, nor the concept of evaluation of states, is included in the current strategic plan – so this would be a shift in that would need to be validated by the Association. Honeycutt added that this tool could be developed by states, who could in turn develop a local-focused tool, which could potentially be connected back to the federal government. Blossveren also shared that the report series “State of Career Technical Education” – currently a NASDCTEc activity – are less evaluative than they could be because of the restraints on NASDCTEc.

NCTEF vs. NASDCTEc

Themes include: Connector, thought leader/innovator/incubator of best practices, lobbying (NASDCTEc-only), interpretation of CTE structure and who we serve, Association has members (limited to state structure and hierarchy)/Foundation has no members (can serve a broader audience)

Green added that NASDCTEc is within CTE while NCTEF is connected to CTE.

Competitors of NCTEF

Organizations include: JFF, CCSSO, NGA, SREB, ACTE, REL, NCICTE, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and NASDCTEc (the way we communicate about each organization will need to be much nuanced to establish what work is under NCTEF versus NASDCTEc)

Honeycutt reminded members that NGA is only in the CTE/workforce development space temporarily because it is a current Chair’s priority.

Carrier said that there is another list of “potential partners” that could be created, rather than thinking only of competitors. Carrier cited Next Generation Learning as a potential partner.

Green also recommended considering where states are already investing their resources and how do those membership groups within CTE align in terms of their respective missions. Similarly, Blossveren asked who we can add capacity/value to and with whom we can add capacity/value to CTE.

Fischer said each of these competitors are in the conversation, but some are likely to become less invested. However, the Foundation should consider how it could amplify these organizations’ work, he said.

Unique Role

Themes include: closely related systems/thinking, integrated models, research and policy implementation/technical assistance, state member and independent research, messaging/marketing promotions, reach broader stakeholders (i.e. CTE=CCR), and collective impact around workforce development.

Honeycutt said that the Foundation has a real opportunity be a leader around the idea that CTE is workforce development.

Blossveren then asked each member to describe the Foundation in two words:

- Honeycutt: flexible and innovative
- Hodges: action and integrators
- Fischer: curator and convener
- Carrier: convener and deep
- Blossveren: impactful and expert
- Green: curator of quality (provocateur) and leader/expert

NCTEF Public Board Member Criteria: Per the direction from the Board, staff contacted the organizations’ attorney and accountant to consult to see if it was advisable to expand the number of public Board members on the NCTEF Board but to provide those members with a vote that was not equal to that of the officers, to ensure that the Association maintained the majority vote. Neither the attorney nor the accountant advised moving in this direction. In fact, the attorney noted that this type of change would violate the Foundation’s articles of incorporation. This means that a liaison role is the best route in order to grow the Foundation’s Board.

Therefore, staff updated the proposed criteria for the three public Board members on the NCTEF Board and developed some thoughts for consideration related to the creation of new non-voting liaisons to the Board.

Hodges said the criteria should not be too structured to provide the Foundation with enough flexibility to choose the right partner at the right time. Green also said that the criteria should hold the Foundation accountable so that it does not simply choose people it already knows.

The Board must vote on the proposed public Board member criteria and related policy changes, as well as to determine when the new criteria would become effective. Regarding the potential of new liaison positions, Green said there are two categories to consider – formal (with a more permanent place on the Board); and informal (which could include organizations that represent different communities of individuals or tap expertise that the Foundation may need for a period of time). The Foundation also has flexibility to decide what voices are missing from the conversation and how to fill those gaps through formal and informal liaisons.

Honeycutt recommended leaving this discussion as guidance, rather than to make any sort of formal policy declaration.

(See addendum for approved public member criteria, updated policies and rotation schedule.)

MOTION: To approve proposed nomination criteria, which includes policy changes, as it relates to the high-priority Foundation public member.
Hodges; Honeycutt.
MOTION ADOPTED.

MOTION: To follow the rotation schedule as recommended for the Foundation public member.
Honeycutt; Hodges
MOTION ADOPTED.

Brainstorming for FY16 Public Board Position: Green asked members to give consideration to potential candidates for the public Board position. Each year, one of the three positions is up for election.

Honeycutt said she would support someone that comes from the career readiness perspective such as a State School Chief. Outgoing CCSSO leader and Kentucky State Superintendent Terry Holliday, who will retire from his position later this year, was one of the names mentioned. Fischer said they could consider tapping him as “chief emeritus” to the Foundation.

Honeycutt also asked if any of the listed “competitors” would have an interest. Green also suggested a former State Director. Other ideas included former governors, thought leaders and high-profile members of the philanthropic community. Fischer and Carrier agreed to work with staff to develop and vet a slate of candidate, which will be brought to the Board for a vote in June. Due to time considerations, the discussion of vendor partnerships was tabled for future consideration.

MOTION: To adjourn meeting of the NCTEF Board at 11:10 a.m.
Honeycutt; Duckworth.
MOTION ADOPTED.

ADDENDUM:

Approved Policies Related to NCTEF Public Board Members

Approved nominations criteria for NCTEF Public Board members:

- Actively involved in the field of education (per the bylaws).
- Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of Career Technical Education or workforce development
- Commitment to the vision, mission and strategic goals of NCTEF.
- Willingness to serve as a spokesperson and advocate for NCTEF.
- Willingness to participate in the development activities of NCTEF.
- Willingness to commit to the NCTEF Board member position description requirements and obligations.
- Ability to serve (support of individual's administrator or Board for travel, time, etc.)

Approved rotation schedule for NCTEF Public Board members:

NCTEF Public Board members will represent diverse stakeholders. Therefore, the following phase in of the new criteria will be implemented. Subsequent years will follow this rotation schedule:

- FY16 (term July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018): high-priority partner representative
- FY17 (term July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019): employer representative
- FY18 (term July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2020): philanthropic representative

While not formal policy, it was the request of the Board to keep the following information accessible with the rotation schedule and Board criteria as a reflection of the types of candidates that could fit into each stakeholder category:

- *Employer community*: A leader from an organization/association that represents business, workforce or labor interests, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, or the AFL-CIO. This position could also be filled by someone who works for a specific company (e.g. IBM, Caterpillar or PG&E). The specific role this individual has within the company, or the division in which he/she sits (e.g., Human Resources, Corporate Social Responsibility, etc.) is less important than the candidate's understanding of and commitment to education and workforce development and ability to be an active contributor. This requires a baseline of knowledge about CTE and a national perspective.
- *Philanthropic community*: These are representatives of organizations or companies that provide grants or other investments aligned to or supportive of NCTEF's mission and theory of action.
- *High-priority partner*: This is the broadest category of all. It is intentionally undefined with the expectation that the Nominations Committee would consider the strategic goals and near-term priorities, as well as the experience and perspectives that the other two

public Board members bring to the organization. It is intended to give the Nomination Committee flexibility in identifying the most critical voice needed on the Board.

Approved NCTEF Board member policies:

- No NCTEF public Board member can serve more than two, three-year terms. This policy would go into effect immediately and apply as current Board members' terms expire.
- Rescind travel cost reimbursement as it is in direct conflict with the existing Board commitment/nominations criteria "ability to serve (support of individual's administrator or Board for travel, time)." This policy would go into effect beginning FY16 or July 1, 2015.
- Retain the current policy to provide complimentary registration for NCTEF Public Board members to attend the two NASDCTEc annual conferences remain in place. This is valued as \$1,250 for non-members.