

NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board of Directors' Conference Call

MINUTES

August 26, 2015 3 – 4 p.m. ET

Participating: Jo Anne Honeycutt, Sheila Ruhland, Wayne Kutzer, Marie Barry, Vanessa Cooley, Lee Burket, Pradeep Kotamraju, Rich Katt, Bernadette Howard, Tim Hodges, Eric Spencer, Kathleen Cullen

Staff: Kimberly Green, Kate Blosveren, Katie Fitzgerald

Unable to participate but provided a proxy (proxy noted in parentheses): Eleni Papadakis (Bernadette Howard), Rod Duckworth (Jo Anne Honeycutt), Cheryl Carrier (Tim Hodges), Jean Massey (Jo Anne Honeycutt)

Absent (no proxy available): Mike Raponi

Welcome: Green welcomed the Boards and walked through an overview of the brand platform and member survey results. She reminded the Board that they approved the platform and that it's being used to guide the selection of the name and the tagline. The Board is the only group that has seen the platform.

Green noted that we received a very high response rate from the membership survey, including almost 90 responses in the first 24 hours. Patterns of state director responses and associate responses were very similar; staff is happy to share more details with any interested Board members.

Slide four of the PPT shows what the membership was asked in the survey. Slide five highlights the ranking of names through averaging all "Very Well" and "Somewhat Well" responses. *NASDCTEc* scored the highest while *CTE America* had the least positive responses. Slide six shows the hard negatives to the names, with *Learning that Works Consortium* resonating with membership the least.

The survey then asked the same questions regarding the taglines. Green noted that the taglines resonated much more with the membership. The top rated tagline was *State Leaders Connecting Learning to Work* and the tagline that had the least positive response was *State Leaders Advancing Excellence in Action*.

Green shared that Fratelli raised a red flag that only 40 percent of our membership responded favorably to the tagline *State Leaders Connecting Learning to Work*, as a concern that this may indicate a disconnect in our membership. Staff did not have such a strong response to this but wanted to raise it as a topic going forward.

Green summarized the comments in the survey, which found that, overall, 1/3 like the current name, 1/3 would be satisfied with one of the suggested names, and 1/3 said we did not go far enough. Despite this, trends emerged in focusing on "states," "CTE" and "leadership." There was no agreement on whether CTE should be spelled out or kept as an acronym.

Kutzer expressed surprise at how relatively even the responses to the names were, suggesting it may indicate an underlying issue.

Katt shared that he presented the list to his staff whose general reaction was that the names were very similar. He noted there wasn't a great diversity in the feel of the names and taglines and that the even spread may have been because they are similar feeling names.

Green explained that we don't know or have a way of knowing if the 38 State Directors who responded are the older or newer State Directors. It's important to staff to make sure that the input is reflective of the newer members. NASDCTEc has 12-15 new State Directors since the Fall Meeting and we are wondering if that in any way influences the responses. The current name may be more meaningful to those who have been a part of the group for a long time.

Green also noted that a significant lesson learned is that we failed to present the names and taglines without proper framing to the membership which may have influenced the responses. Staff should have provided more context to the name and a descriptor of why the name was chosen relating back to the brand platform. Staff also should have presented the name with the tagline. The way the survey was constructed caused confusion for some members.

Another lesson learned is that staff did not adequately present different ideas of what an organizational name is or can be (such as Achieve or Alliance for Excellent Education). NASDCTEc membership has been very comfortable with a very descriptive name. There is an opportunity to explain that there are options to the different types of names.

Green shared the recommendation to drop *Learning that Works Consortium* and *CTE America* for consideration. While *CTE America* and *Advance CTE* weren't too far apart on the rankings, *CTE America* had a negative response in a number of the comments. The tagline *State Leaders Advancing Excellence in Action* did not have a good response so staff suggests dropping this from consideration as well.

In order to gain clarity that was not achieved during the first survey, Green laid out the proposal for sending a second survey to the membership that offers names plus taglines for feedback with more framing around the brand platform. The names/taglines for consideration would be:

- Advance CTE: State Leaders Connecting Learning to Work
CTE Works: State Leaders Advancing Career Technical Education. (*This tagline is new since the last round of taglines were released.*)

Green identified the purpose of the survey – to determine whether the membership would respond to a name with a descriptive tagline or would rather have a variation of our current name. If the survey doesn't give us the clarity we need to move forward, or it is clear that these names are not working, then the options are to: do nothing, go back to the drawing board to create a new slate of names, or refresh the existing name (i.e., drop a few words from NASDCTEc).

If the Board approves the vote, the survey would go out on Friday (8/28) and be open for a week. Then staff would analyze the results with Fratelli and the Executive Committee on September 10th. Green shared that if staff had clarity at that point, we would develop an informational packet and a possibly pre-recorded webinar that would dive into the new name, how we got there, how it connects to the brand platform, etc. to be shared at least a week prior to the next full Board meeting on September 25.

Howard said that she understands why we want to go into the Summit with a new brand, but maybe we should focus on doing this after the summit, once we have all the information gained from the summit.

Green noted that the activities of the Summit will not provide information around our new brand and name, since the name is directly linked to the brand platform, which shouldn't change based on the Summit. However, perceptions of the members might change after the Summit and make them more open to a rebrand.

Ruhland said that she is going to remain confident that should the vote come into do the second survey...(CUT OFF)

[TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES REQUIRING THE BOARD TO CALL BACK IN]

Kotamraju referenced Slide 15 and asked would the refresh of the existing name means we stick with the full NASDCTEc.

Green explained a refresh would mean that we would develop a similar but shorter name than NASDCTEc.

Cooley mirrored Howard's response in continuing the name process after the Summit.

Blosveren discussed the concept of conducting a short survey of external partners and organizational leaders to see what their thoughts are on the impact and resonance in the new names. The Membership will be the most important audience, but an external survey may give us a fuller picture and provide another perspective on the organizational brand.

Green explained that we have had some engagement with external audiences through the communications committee, but this would be more intentional. The summit co-conveners and funders would be good audiences for this.

Green highlighted the necessity to engaging full member and not picking a name for names sake, but also not creating a process that drags on indefinitely. The Board vote will be whether we proceed with the survey within the timeline we have presented.

Cooley shared her preference for having the ballot say proceed with survey as originally presented, or in lieu of having the survey, postponing the entire process until after the summit.

Howard asked where the external survey would fit into the Board vote. Green shared that we'll add that into the ballot.

Kutzer suggested conducting the member survey now because the membership is already engaged and we could frame the survey as refining the name and taglines based on their feedback. If there isn't a clear winner then we could move the process until after the summit. This survey would help the members see that there is a plan and continuity. If all the sudden they don't hear anything until after the summit that may be too long of a delay.

Blosveren walked through the survey, which will include:

- 5-6 questions
- Both names and taglines combined with short descriptions
- Then same questions we asked on first survey – how well does this name reflect our mission/vision?
- A question of whether members like the proposed names more or less than NASDCTec
- A question asking members to rank the three names in order of preference.

Blosveren noted that the goal of this survey is to help us determine whether we move forward or take a step back in the process.

Ruhland suggested staff keep process moving and asked that when the survey is released if we will again explain why we are rebranding the organization.

Kotamraju echoed the concept of moving the process forward.

Howard also agreed with moving forward.

Green explained we will have another vote on September 25 that will give the Board the option of how to proceed next in the process.

Barry is comfortable with this and moving forward knowing that at any point there may be a stop point where we need to reconsider.

Green shared next steps. Blosveren will send the minutes of today's call along with a ballot. Assuming there is a majority vote to proceed, we will move forward as laid out. If there is not a majority we will pause and connect with the Executive Committee on next steps. Board members will have until tomorrow to submit their votes and on the 28th; Blosveren will share a summary of the votes. The survey will also go out the same day if the ballot is approved.

Green thanked everyone for their participation and feedback.

Meeting convened at 3:59 p.m.