

NCTEF Board of Directors' Meeting
Conference Call
September 11, 2015
2 – 4 p.m. ET

Attendees: Rod Duckworth, Marie Barry, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Cheryl Carrier, Tim Hodges

Absent: Pradeep Kotamraju

Staff: Kate Blosveren, Kimberly Green, Karen Hornberger

Review and Approval of Minutes: Duckworth presented the minutes from the August 26, 2015, NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board of Directors' conference call. No corrections were made at this time.

MOTION: To approve the August 26, 2015 NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board Conference Call Minutes as presented.
Raponi; Massey.
MOTION ADOPTED.

NCTEF FY 15: Hornberger stated that income trailed projections, at 54% of the budget. The largest disappointment has been the lack of revenue from workshops, which only achieved 10% of the budget. Hornberger noted that only 53% of the planned reserve withdrawal was used to balance the budget due to additional revenue from product sales, contracts and the revenue share with NOCTI, as well as the staff's very fiscally conservative approach to expenditures.. Hornberger stated that expenses were in line with revenue, at 54% with a few over overages as the Board and Finance/Audit Committee have been made aware of throughout the fiscal year.

Green shared that the expenses aligned to the shifting priorities of the organization throughout the fiscal year, which has been a year of reimagining, strategic thinking and rebuilding.

MOTION: To approve the NCTEF FY15 year-end financial statements as presented.
Carrier; Barry.
MOTION ADOPTED.

NCTEF FY 16: Hornberger shared that income is minimal, being that we are 8.5% of the new fiscal year. There were no products sales in July but we have received a few orders in the month of August and September due to marketing and a sale to move the older products. Expenses are in line with income, at 1% of the budget. Green added that the Career Cluster products are being refreshed, with a target launch in November 2015 at the ACTE VISION conference. She also noted that the reimbursement from ACTE will occur in the first quarter of 2016. The NASDCTEc reimbursement to NCTEF for project –based work will take place after December 31 and again at fiscal year-end.

MOTION: To approve the NCTEF FY16 financial statements as presented.
Honeycutt; Barry.
MOTION ADOPTED.

MOU Between NASDCTEc and NCTEF: Green presented the draft MOU between NASDCTEc and NCTEF stating that we usually try to secure tax exempt status in the state we are holding our conferences in an effort to reduce meeting-related expenses. We were able to do so in Florida, but only through NCTEF, which is a 501(c)3, while the Association is a 501(c)4. As such, we shifted the hotel contract over to the NCTEF to protect the tax exemption. However, we need documentation in the form of a MOU between the two organizations to allow NCTEF to pay the bill and be reimbursed by NASDCTEc. Green shared that there are no fees or surcharges to be paid by NASDCTEc. The organization will be saving about \$5400 as a result of this action.

**MOTION: To accept the MOU between NASDCTEc and NCTEF as presented.
Carrier; Honeycutt.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Vendor Partnerships: Blossveren shared that discussions began last spring around our potential relationship with vendors, within the context of developing a new fundraising strategy for NCTEF. Currently, the main vehicles for engaging vendors are NASDCTEc's organizational membership category, sponsorships and NASDCTEc's Fall and Spring meetings, and other partnership activities. Blossveren continued that in the past year or so, staff has noticed a greater interest in partnering in other ways such as curriculum development and validation particularly as more vendors enter the CTE space.

Blossveren asked the Board that given the potential opportunities, as well as conflicts of interest, the staff wanted to get feedback on how we might work with vendors. She shared two potential approaches:

- 1. OPTION 1: Maintain all vendor relationships through NASDCTEc, including pursuing year-round sponsorships. (STATUS QUO)**
- 2. OPTION 2: Accept donations and/or funding from vendors, but based on pre-developed criteria, for activities such as research and co-convenings, and make this part of our development/fundraising strategy.**
 - **2a: We limit any funding to donations and/or funding for work aligned to theory of action/strategic plan.**
 - **2b: We also explore building out a new line of fee-for-service work to evaluate alignment of materials to CCTC.**

The consensus of the discussion from the Board is that the organizations could run the risk of endorsing products and opening something that could cause conflict between vendors. The Board was also concerned with how to fill the manpower to ensure alignment to our theory of action and strategic plan. Overall they felt that staff could take it on by a case-by-case basis and if there is any gray area the staff can come back to the Board for further direction.

Career Cluster Leadership Pilot (CCLP) Update: Zimmerman shared that last October, two consortia of nine states came together for a one-year CCLP project in the Manufacturing and Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources (AG) Career Clusters. The Career Clusters were chosen based on a survey of the State CTE Directors in June 2014. Zimmermann reported that an in-

person kick off meeting in October allowed the groups to form a consensus around the main issues facing each Career Cluster. During subsequent virtual meetings, the two groups prioritized the issues and formed the following subcommittees:

- AG: Work-based Learning (joint effort with Manufacturing); Agriculture-related Labor Market Information; Career Ladders in Agriculture
- Manufacturing: Work-based Learning (joint effort with AG); Course Sequences; Industry-recognized Credentials; Employer Engagement

At the Spring Board meeting, the Board decided to phase out the pilot after the main deliverables were complete. Zimmermann stated that CCLP did offer NASDCTEc a ready-made group of states that could come together around a common interest, such as industry-recognized credentials and work-based learning. As such, this has helped NASDCTEc position themselves to partner with interested organizations on these topics. For example, the states participating in the IRC subcommittee may participate in a project with WorkCred/American National Standards Institute, as they look to test their IRC rubric. Also, the work done by the WBL subcommittee has positioned NASDCTEc to be a content expert for the National Governors Association's upcoming STEM-focused Work-based learning Policy Academy.

Blosveren stated that the experience of the pilot brings us back to the central questions: What is the role of the Career Clusters in our organization's work, vision and mission? Are we OK with the Career Clusters being a way of pulling us together as a community rather than setting the expectations for programs?

Hodges stated that the Career Clusters' Framework helps us more easily articulate what CTE is especially to a non-CTE audience. Barry shared some thoughts and felt that some of the goals were lofty and to get employers engaged around the Career Clusters may be difficult. She stated that although the Career Clusters are organized around a common framework – each state is different. Bringing industry to the table was not easy when we didn't know what we were discussing. We need to do something to keep the Career Clusters refreshed and validated. Barry felt that one of the real takeaways from this experience was how much expertise that we have around the states, particularly among the state staff. Team members felt that it was valuable to be part of a national dialogue and felt that it was something that they could contribute to.

Partnership Update: Green provided an update on a recent meeting with the CEO of JPMorgan Chase that will position the Summit's outcomes as a potential framework for JPMC's investments in Career Technical Education. Green shared that we are seeing more partnerships getting stronger due to the Summit. Blosveren shared that we have been invited to speak at the upcoming CCSSO meeting, NSCL meeting, NASBE conference, as well as participate in a small-group roundtable hosted by NGA. All of these partnerships are deepening and strengthening.

Branding Update: Green shared that Emily DeRocco cannot commit to serve on the Board due to other existing work and the conflicts it poses to her time. We need to begin recruitment efforts to fill this position after the Summit.

Blosveren shared that the staff is in the process of putting out another survey with more context and matching the name to the taglines for ease of understanding. Both names have been receiving very positive responses but more positive results are for *Advance CTE: Connecting State Leaders to Work*.

Blosveren reported that a survey also was sent out to approximately ten external partners and select people and they all overwhelmingly liked *Advance CTE: Connecting State Leaders to Work*. She also shared that it was decided to change our name to better represent the organization. Blosveren stated that next week the staff would be sending out a PowerPoint to remind the membership where we started and how we got to *Advance CTE: Connecting State Leaders to Work*. She reminded the Board that this was a DBA and not a full-on formal name change.

Duckworth thanked the Board and adjourned the meeting at 3:33 p.m.