

NASDCTEc Board of Directors  
Conference Call  
**MINUTES**  
November 4, 2014  
4 - 5 p.m.

---

**Attendees:** John Fischer, Scott Stump, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Rod Duckworth, Eric Spencer, Richard Katt, Mike Raponi, Bernadette Howard, June Sanford  
**Staff:** Kimberly Green, Kate Blosveren, Karen Hornberger

**Welcome:** Stump welcomed the NASDCTEc Board to the call. Hornberger took roll call to confirm a majority of NASDCTEc Board members were present, thus providing for a quorum.

**Review and Approval of NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board Minutes:** Honeycutt presented the minutes from the October 20, 2014, NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board Meeting. Howard requested that her name be added to the final minutes as she was in attendance at the October 20, 2014 Board Meeting. Lee Burket was also added to those in attendance.

**MOTION: To approve the October 20, 2014 NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board Minutes with noted corrections. Howard; Fischer.**  
**MOTION ADOPTED.**

**NASDCTEc Financial Report:** Honeycutt shared the NASDCTEc financial report for the FY 14 and the beginning of the FY 15. She stated that at fiscal year-end, NASDCTEc received 109% of its budgeted income. All main sources of income exceeded projections – dues, meeting registrations and sponsorships. Interest was below target, receiving only 92% of the budgeted goal. NASDCTEc expended 90% of its projected expenses. The reduction in expenses was achieved due to being very fiscally conservative. Overall, NASDCTEc ended FY 14 in a strong position.

**MOTION: To approve the NASDCTEc FY14 year-end financial statements as presented. Fischer; Raponi.**  
**MOTION ADOPTED.**

Honeycutt stated that it is early in the 2014-15 fiscal year but even at this early date, the income position is very strong. To date, 68% of our budgeted income has been received. State dues are coming in strong along with associate dues; meeting sponsorships have exceeded budgeted targets. To date, 23% of budgeted expenses have been spent and are also on target.

**MOTION: To approve the NASDCTEc FY15 current year financial statements as presented. Sanford; Raponi.**  
**MOTION ADOPTED.**

**Budget Modifications:** Honeycutt shared that there are two budget modification recommendations requests being brought before the Board. The first related to the CCTC alignment study: There were two states that did not have alignment results in their state-specific reports – Maine and Washington. Given that authorized funds were still available in the CCTC budget last fiscal year, staff approached these states to see if they would like us to invest in

obtaining results. Washington declined. Maine agreed. The work was originally projected to be completed in June 2013 (last fiscal year). However, the final report was not completed until July 2014, thus requiring a budget modification for the current fiscal year. The request is to add \$3,390 to the contractor line item. With this budget modification, the overall CCTC alignment study investment will still be \$1546.75 below budget.

The second modification relates to bonuses. When the FY15 budget was developed, no bonuses were included. This decision was predicated on having final FY14 financial statements and determining the health of the organization. Therefore, a budget modification of \$52,800 is requested to add funds to the bonus line item based on the FY14 year-end reports and employment contract. The Executive Director's performance evaluation has not yet been conducted for last fiscal year. The employment contract allows for a performance bonus each fiscal year. This liability will be budgeted for as the evaluation should have occurred in spring 2014 and again in spring 2015. The maximum liability for both fiscal years totals \$32,208.84. In addition, the recommended budget amendment establishes a pool of \$20,771.16 for performance-based bonuses. Due to the timing of evaluations, \$9,300 of this \$20,771.16 has already been allocated. This leaves \$11,471.16 to be allocated during the balance of employee evaluations/the fiscal year.

**MOTION: To approve budget modifications as presented. Katt; Howard.  
MOTION ADOPTED.**

**Investment Policy Statement Recommendation:** Honeycutt reported that this matter was brought to the attention of the Finance/Audit Committee and that they spoke directly with the Merrill Lynch Advisor, Mark Friese. She stated that Friese is proposing to increase the maximum amount of equity investment from 60% to 75%. She also noted that increasing the range does not require 75% of the funds to go into equity but it gives Friese/Merrill Lynch the flexibility to go up to that amount. The organization can also revisit or change the policy statement at any time. The Finance/Audit Committee unanimously voted to bring this policy amendment to the full Board for consideration.

**MOTION: To accept the recommendation from the Finance/Audit Committee to amend the NCTEF investment policy to increase the maximum amount of equity investment from 60% to 75%. Raponi; Katt.  
MOTION ADOPTED.**

**NASDCTEc and Officer Position Descriptions:** Hornberger presented draft Board and Officer Position descriptions for consideration. Most organizations have a description of their officers and board members' roles and responsibilities. After researching other organizations' descriptions, as well as getting input from the Executive Committee, the position descriptions were refined into what is being presented to the Board. Having these descriptions will also be helpful to the Nominations Committee as it seeks to recruit new leaders to the Board. It is expected that at the NCTEF Board's focus and work evolves, the descriptions will be further refined and likely separated for each organization, one for NASDCTEc and one for NCTEF. Once Board approval is received, a commitment form will be created for each Board member to sign.

Raponi mentioned that language should be added to be clear that all of the policies in the Board Policy Manual are under the jurisdiction of the Board.

**MOTION: Approve the NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board and Executive Committee Position Descriptions with a clarification to the language regarding of the role of the Board Member in approving organizational policies, as well as carrying out duties within the framework of the policies that are comprised in the Board Policy Manual. Honeycutt; Fischer.**  
**MOTION ADOPTED.**

**CCTC “adoption” Policy Modification:** Based on feedback from the October Board meeting, staff developed additional that gives flexibility to states to adopt the standards or to just adopt the career ready practices. Further, a state can adopt just the CCTC Career Cluster standards, as well as some or all career pathways by doing this, states will not be required to adopt career pathway standards for career pathways it does not currently have in the state.

Duckworth asked who is going to be asking the questions if we are using the CCTC in our states and how we are using them. Green stated that the information will be primarily used internally, to guide our work and investment in the continued upkeep of the CCTC.

The consensus of the Board is that the new language gives much more flexibility and latitude to the states. The approved definition of Adoption, Implementation & Endorsement of the Common Career Technical Core is attached for complete review of amendments.

**MOTION: To amend the existing CCTC adoption statement related to defining our implementation and adoption of the Common Career Technical Core as presented. Howard; Sanford.**  
**MOTION ADOPTED.**

### **Finalization of NASDCTEc’s Higher Education Act (HEA) Reauthorization**

**Recommendations:** Voytek shared an updated final draft version of the organization’s Higher Education Act (HEA) recommendations for board consideration and approval. These revisions reflected feedback received from the NASDCTEc board in October during its annual Fall Meeting. While much of the content from the previous version remained intact, several recommendations were more fully articulated, two more were added and other general revisions were made to significantly streamline the language overall. Among the changes presented to the board:

- Significantly streamlines introduction section and adds new overarching recommendation to approach postsecondary education in the same way as workforce development
- “Promoting Cross-Systems Collaboration” was added as a separate section— dual and concurrent enrollment, programs of study and career pathway models are highlighted more explicitly
- “Increase Opportunities for Experiential Learning” was added as a separate recommendation— section calls for HEA to support and encourage internships, mentorships and other work-based learning experiences
- Throughout the document, references to high-growth and high-demand professions have been used to encourage a stronger connection between future HEA legislation and the demands of the labor market

After presenting the final draft version of these recommendations, NASDCTEc board members voted unanimously to formally adopt this document as its public position on HEA reauthorization. These recommendations will guide NASDCTEc's advocacy efforts moving forward to effectively promote the organization's priorities in this policy area.

**MOTION: Approve the Higher Education Act Reauthorization Recommendations as presented. Honeycutt; Fischer.**  
**MOTION ADOPTED.**

**Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m. EST**

**NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Meeting**  
**Approved Definition of Adoption, Implementation & Endorsement**  
**of the Common Career Technical Core**  
**November 4, 2014**

---

The Common Career Technical Core (CCTC) are a set of voluntary standards that identify what students should know and be able to do after completing a program of study. Given their unique design as end-of-program of study expectations that can serve as an anchor for existing national, state and local standards, states are and can use them in a variety of meaningful ways. Below is the NASDCTEc Board-approved policy for how states can formally adopt, implement or endorse the CCTC.

A state is considered to have **adopted** the CCTC when:

- Through the appropriate process (e.g. regulatory, legislative or decision-making authority), the state has adopted all of the Career Ready Practices and/or all of the Career Cluster- and Career Pathway-level content standards for Career Clusters and Career Pathways currently authorized in the state

OR

- Through the appropriate process (e.g. regulatory, legislative or decision-making authority), the state has required all of the Career Ready Practices and/or all of the Career Cluster- and Career Pathway-level content standards to be used for any state-developed or state-approved programs of study.
- For Career Clusters in which the state has standards and/or programs, the state must adopt the Career Cluster-level standards and all Career Pathway-level standards for those Career Pathways employed in the state.
- A state cannot adopt Career Pathway-level standards without also adopting the Career Cluster-level standards for the Career Cluster in which that Career Pathway sits.
  - For example, if a state only has programs/standards related to the Finance and Health Science Career Clusters and planned to adopt the CCTC, the state would need to adopt 12 Career Ready Practices and the CCTC in the Finance and Health Science Career Clusters. The state would not be required to adopt the CCTC standards for the other 14 Career Clusters and their related Career Pathways.
  - If the state did not have any programs under the Accounting Career Pathway, under Finance, for example, the state would not be required to adopt those Career Pathway-level standards. However, if the state ONLY had programs under the Accounting Career Pathway, the state would still need to adopt the Career Cluster-level standards in Finance.
- A state may choose to just adopt or require the Career Ready Practices
- The state has addressed related policies to ensure implementation of the new standards. It is important to note that a state may continue to implement additional CTE standards (e.g. locally-, state- or industry-developed standards.)

A state is considered to have **implemented** the CCTC when:

- Through the appropriate process (e.g. regulatory, legislative or decision-making authority), the state has formally embedded the CCTC into the local program approval process (i.e., by requiring local programs to provide evidence of CCTC alignment) or the local articulation agreement approval process, or formally required the use of CCTC in ways that will directly impact program development and/or review.

A state is considered to have **endorsed** the CCTC when:

- Through the appropriate process, the state is using the CCTC to inform program development and/or review. Examples of such endorsement include, but are not limited to:
  - Use of CCTC in standards revision process (among other standards)
  - Use of CCTC in program of study development process (among other standards)
  - Use of CCTC in course approval process (among other standards)
  - Use of CCTC in program of study approval process (among other standards)
  - Use of CCTC in technical skills assessment revision, development, and/or approval process
  - Offer professional development, guidance or tools on use of CCTC to educators/administrators
  - Use of CCTC to help analyze secondary-postsecondary alignment of standards, courses, systems